MEETINGS OF THE
Management Committees

| TMC/RMC Joint Meeting | Transit Management Committee (TMC) | Rail Management Committee (RMC) |

Date:
September 1, 2021

Starting Time
11:00 a.m.

Meetings to occur sequentially

Location:
Valley Metro
Boardroom/Webex
101 N. 1st Avenue, 10th Floor

In compliance with the Federal Transportation Security Administration’s mask mandate, Valley Metro continues to require the use of face coverings in its facilities. Employees and guests must wear masks, regardless of vaccine status, in hallways, common areas, and any time social distancing cannot be maintained. If you are in a conference room where 6’ distance cannot be maintained, masks are to be worn. We appreciate your cooperation in complying with this federal law.

If you require assistance accessing the meetings on the 10th floor, call 602.262.7433.
Agenda

August 25, 2021

Joint Meeting Agenda
Transit Management Committee
And
Rail Management Committee
Wednesday, September 1, 2021
Boardroom/Webex
11:00 a.m.

1. Public Comment (yellow card)

The public will be provided with an opportunity at this time to address the committees on non-agenda items and all action agenda items. Up to three minutes will be provided per speaker unless the Chair allows more at his/her discretion. A total of 15 minutes for all speakers will be provided.

2. Chief Executive Officer’s Report

Scott Smith, CEO, will brief the TMC/RMC on current issues.

CONSENT AGENDA

3A. Minutes

Minutes from the August 7, 2021 TMC/RMC meeting are presented for approval.

3B. Network Hardware Maintenance Agreements

Staff recommends that the TMC/RMC forward to the Boards of Directors authorization for the CEO to continue procuring necessary network hardware maintenance Cisco SmartNET maintenance will be procured from HyeTech Network & Security Solutions, LLC. through the 1Government Procurement Alliance (1GPA) cooperative contract. The amount of the authorization is not to exceed $155,600.

Action Recommended

1. For Information

2. For information

3A. For action

3B. For action
3C. **Title VI Program Update**

Staff recommends that the TMC/RMC forward to the Boards of Directors approval of the 2021 Title VI Program Update.

3D. **Federal Government Relations Consulting Services – Cardinal Infrastructure, Inc. Change Order**

Staff recommends that the TMC/RMC forward to the Boards of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute a contract change order in the amount of $224,000.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

4. **Travel, Expenditures and Solicitations**

The monthly travel, expenditures and solicitations for Valley Metro RPTA and Valley Metro Rail are presented for information.

**At this time there is no travel to report.**

5. **Future Agenda Items Request and Update on Current Events**

Chair Brady will request future agenda items from members, and members may provide a report on current events.

6. **Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the TMC/RMC is scheduled for **Wednesday, October 6, 2021 at 11:00 a.m.**

Qualified sign language interpreters are available with 72 hours notice. Materials in alternative formats (large print or flash drive) are available upon request. For further information, please call Valley Metro at 602-262-7433 or TTY at 602-251-2039. To attend this meeting via teleconference, contact the receptionist at 602-262-7433 for the dial-in-information. The supporting information for this agenda can be found on our web site at [www.valleymetro.org](http://www.valleymetro.org).
AGENDA ITEM 1
August 24, 2021

SUBJECT
Public Comment

PURPOSE
The public will be provided with an opportunity at this time to address the committees on non-agenda items and all action agenda items. Up to three minutes will be provided per speaker unless the Chair allows more at his/her discretion. A total of 15 minutes for all speakers will be provided.

COST AND BUDGET
None

RECOMMENDATION
This item is presented for information only.

BACKGROUND | DISCUSSION | CONSIDERATION
None

COMMITTEE PROCESS
None

CONTACT
Scott Smith
Chief Executive Officer
602-262-7433
ssmith@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
None
Information Summary

DATE
August 25, 2021

AGENDA ITEM 2

SUBJECT
Chief Executive Officer’s Report

PURPOSE
Scott Smith, Chief Executive Officer, will brief the TMC/RMC on current issues.

COST AND BUDGET
None

RECOMMENDATION
This item is presented for information only.

BACKGROUND | DISCUSSION | CONSIDERATION
None

COMMITTEE PROCESS
None

CONTACT
Scott Smith
Chief Executive Officer
602-262-7433
ssmith@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
None
Minutes

DATE
August 25, 2021

AGENDA ITEM 3A

Joint Meeting of
Transit Management Committee
and
Rail Management Committee
Wednesday, August 4, 2021
Via Webex/Phone
11:00 a.m.

Transit Management Committee Participants
Chris Brady, City of Mesa, Chair (phone)
Mario Paniagua for Ed Zuercher, City of Phoenix, Vice Chair (phone)
Cherlene Penilla, City of Avondale (phone)
Josh Wright, City of Chandler (phone)
David Trimble for Grady Miller, Town of Fountain Hills (phone)
Mary Goodman, Town of Gilbert (phone)
Kevin Phelps, City of Glendale (phone)
Julie Karins, City of Goodyear (phone)
Cameron Doelling for Jacqueline Edwards, Maricopa County (phone)
Erik Strunk, City of Peoria (phone)
Bruce Gardner, Town of Queen Creek (phone)
Mark Melnichenko, City of Scottsdale (phone)
Mike Gent, City of Surprise (phone)
Steven Methvin, City of Tempe (phone)

Members Not Present
Roger Klingler, City of Buckeye
Crystal Dyches, City of El Mirage
Shatawn Reed, ADOT (phone)
City of Tolleson

Rail Management Committee Participants
Chris Brady, City of Mesa (Chair) (phone)
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 11:00 a.m.
Chair Brady said Thank you everyone for being here. I will convene the meeting -- the August meeting. If Committee members would like to ask a question or make a comment during the meeting, please type your comment in the box and it will be read aloud and answered.

Can all meeting attendees please mute your computer microphone or phone.

1. **Public Comment**

This is William Charles "Blue" Crowley, III and I'm calling for the August 4th, 2021, meeting of the Management Committee of the TMC and RMC Joint meeting, the Transit Management Committee and the Rail Management Committee.

I don't feel that it's necessary for us to do this written way because when I'm communicating with my public comment its current and the way that you guys are doing it, if you read it at all, is when you get it in the minutes not when it should be. And I'm going to be commenting on the Transit Management Committee next for the Waymo stuff now. When the Board and yourselves got the briefing from Waymo they couldn't really brief you because they said it wasn't until June that they were going to be getting their thing so they couldn't explain what in actuality they had or hadn't been doing and now you're saying well, we need to just extend the contract.

One, we've been under serious air quality alerts for almost two months now to the point of its seriousness. When it's ozone and particulates even if the Waymo vehicles are electric, the PM 10s are being caused by the deterioration of their tires. So, when it's a single occupant vehicles how are we contributing to eliminating some of the negativity associated with single occupant vehicles and get people to ride together? Thank you and you have a pleasant.

2. **Chief Executive Officer’s Report**

Mr. Hillyard provided an update on the following:

- U.S. Transportation Secretary visit
- Clean Air Campaign Awards Annual Luncheon
- Valley Metro App
- S. Central/Downtown Hub Student Art Project
- Calendar
3. Minutes

Chair Brady said the minutes from the June 2, 2021 TMC/RMC meeting are presented for approval.

IT WAS MOVED BY DAVID TRIMBLE, SECONDED BY JULIE KARINS AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE JUNE 2, 2021.

4. Consent Agenda

Chair Brady said the Consent Agenda is presented for action. Are there any questions from members of the Committee or any items that need to be pulled for separate discussion? If not, we will request a motion and a second to approve the Consent Agenda and forward the items to the Board of Directors for approval. So, there are three items on the Consent Agenda, do we have a motion for approval?

IT WAS MOVED BY MARIO PANIAGUA, SECONDED BY STEVEN METHVIN AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA.

5. Draft Valley Metro FY 2022 Strategic Plan

Chair Brady said, Jim Hillyard, we're going to have you give us a presentation on this.

Mr. Hillyard said thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, so as you may know, Valley Metro is due for an update to its strategic plan. We began this process in 2019, but shifted our focus to the pandemic in 2020. Therefore, the purpose of this presentation is to share with you the draft plan and to gather your feedback and ultimately, the Board's feedback on the draft and should the Board choose, to adopt the plan for FY2020. For the purposes of today's presentation, I'll be working off of the table that's in your packet. It's a two-sided table with a purple banner at the top.

And so, if you turn to that table, there are three improvements over Valley Metro's previous strategic plan that I think we were focused on in this update. The first was to draft goals that we felt better captured our priorities and the value of connecting communities and enhancing lives. So, the 2016-2020 plan had four goals, increase customer focus, advance performance-based operations, grow transit ridership, and advance the value of transit. We felt those were all great concepts, but we didn't think they captured the breadth of the work that Valley Metro does, nor did we think they communicated as clearly to our community the value of transit. Therefore, we propose the five goals that you see in the top row of the table in your packet.

Three of these are customer focused. The first, excellent rider experience. The second is enhance lives through regional mobility in our current system, and then the third, enhance lives through regional mobility in the future system. We felt that inclusion of
this future system goal was important to reflect the fact that so much of the work that we see, for example, up and down Central Avenue today is the product of almost a decade of planning and work. And so, because transit has to be so forward looking, we wanted to make sure we had a goal that sort of highlighted that looking forward to the system of tomorrow.

Next, we wanted to include a goal that focused on our regional partners and you see that in the third goal, maximize efficiency and member city engagement. Those were the two major themes that we heard in a series of meetings that Alexis and I held with many of you, your teams or your Board member.

And then lastly, we felt it important to include a goal that focused on Valley Metro's growth as an organization because building those capabilities would naturally be critical to achieving the other four goals noted.

So, the second improvement that we saw in this plan, was to really expand our ability to measure our progress toward those goals. The original 2016-2020 plan included only five performance measures. They were: boardings per revenue mile, boardings per revenue hour, boardings per trip, fare box recovery, and on time performance. Once again, we think those are excellent metrics and most of them have been included in our recommendation, but we certainly didn't feel they covered the breadth of our objectives as an organization. And so, then you see in the bottom section of that table, the performance measures for the 2020 year that we suggest including.

These measures fall into two categories. You'll see under each goal there's a column labeled Valley Metro performance. So those are performance measures that we would intend to set targets for and to work to improve as an organization. Under the current system and future system goals, you'll see a second column labeled regional indicators.

So, as we worked on capturing the data that we thought was important to illustrate progress toward these five goals, we noticed that there were a number of data points that we thought were critical for understanding transportation in the region, but where Valley Metro didn't have full control over those outcomes. And so, a perfect example, for example, under the current system goal, would be the last three measures that we propose, employment population and education within a half mile of transit. So, as you all know, route planning is very shared process in our region with the vast majority of routes being funded by cities. This being able to gauge the spread of our service is critical, important context for us as managers and for the Board, but not something that we think we could set as an outright performance measure given, you know, the competing budget priorities that all of us face in deciding, in making route planning decisions. And so, you see regional indicators listed under both the current system and the future system for those things that we think are critical for us all to have as context, but not necessarily measures of Valley Metro’s performance as an agency.
Lastly, please turn to the second page of the handout or the second section of the table, if you're looking at it online. We wanted to make sure that we were able to go from our top-level goals as an organization to the measures that we were hoping to impact and then finally, to the work plan for each year and to engage the Board in a discussion of the priorities of that work plan for the agency in the upcoming year. And so, what you see on this table then is the incorporation of the work plan presented by the CEO to the Board in June and approved by the Board in June for the upcoming year categorized per the goals that they're intended to impact. And so, our proposal would be that each year as part of the CEO's planning process with the Board that there's a dialogue about those priorities and that they're incorporated and displayed to show the areas of focus that we've set for the upcoming year.

So, with that sort of orientation to the document, I'd appreciate any questions or feedback.

Mr. Phelps said so thanks for the presentation. So, is this the actual plan or is there then an additional body of work that the team is going to do to kind of further develop the plan? Or is this -- when you say, this is our strategic plan. Does this kind of represent that?

Mr. Hillyard said yes. We had really hoped to keep this document as concise as possible. You know, we felt it needed to do three things: What are you focused on? How will you know that you're progressing? And then what are you going to do to move the needles? And we thought this accomplished that. Obviously, behind the scenes, for each of the items on this -- on the work plan that you see in the second table, they'll be a separate project plan of how we're moving those things forward. We just didn't think that level of detail was useful for this purpose.

Mr. Phelps said yeah. I think it's that last goal about it's one thing to know kind of where you want to go and how you want to measure whether you've arrived or not. In my mind, the strategic plan is really all about what are, you know, what are you have in place to get you to where you want to go that when you measure it that you know that you've got success. So, I just didn't see a lot of kind of the meat of what I would usually say needs to be part of a strategic plan which really then talks about what are the things we're going to do as an organization to make sure we can achieve where we want to go.

So, I mean, there's not a lot of talk about, for example, things like organizational capacity. There's not things talking about systems and processes. There's not elements here that talk about the financial component of managing it and how we do all that. So, I would just -- I just thought -- I was hoping I'd hear there would be a little bit more in terms of the actual strategies that the organization is going to implement to get you where you go.
I think you've set really good measures and you've got a good way to get there. I'm just not sure this would tell me as a Board member what's your strategy and how you're going to get to success. Thank you.

Mr. Hillyard said thanks for that feedback.

Mr. Paniagua said yeah, Mr. Chair, just a couple questions. So, just wanted to echo Mr. Phelps’ comments that I think you've got a great start and you guys are -- you have some good items in here to be striving for. A couple of questions. One of them on the goals and measures for -- under organizational excellence. On percentage of promotions filled internally, I was just hoping to get a better idea of what you were shooting for with that one. Is there a specific percentage that you're looking to achieve? Or? Because I just want to make sure that that doesn't create incentives that kind of work against other goals.

Mr. Hillyard said absolutely. Thanks for the question. So, I think what we're trying to get at with that measure is the efficacy of our internal succession planning work and development of staff. That we're providing training for folks because we want them to be able to grow as professionals with us and one way you know that's working is you're seeing people be prepared for the next steps in their career and able to sort of -- and able to promote.

At this juncture, we have not been capturing that data historically so our first step will be just to baseline to see where we're at. And then, you know, and then we would want to think about, you know, what is that telling us about the effectiveness of our employee development, of our succession planning processes. So, I think we're too early on to say, you know, whether there would be a hard goal for that or what it would be, but I think the issue that you're hinting at, you know, you wouldn't want an effort to achieve some number on that measure to then result in the promotion of folks that maybe weren't the best candidate for a particular role and we couldn't agree more with that.

You know, the overall goal of this is organizational excellence. And so, that will happen by having the right person, you know, in each role whether they happen to be an internal or an external candidate. We just want to know that we're doing everything we can internally to invest in our folks and thereby build a stronger agency over time.

Mr. Paniagua said thank you, Jim. I guess, moving off to the work plan itself and again, under organizational excellence, there's an item that just refers to the CFO, CEO reporting structure. I know that there's been quite a bit of discussion on that over the years and just wanted to see why that's on there, what that is.

Mr. Hillyard said absolutely. Thank you. As I said, the items that you see here were items that Scott presented to the Board at its June meeting for his work plan for the upcoming year. And I think that was at a time when we were just beginning on the CFO recruiting process and so, I think it was one of the things that he was hoping early in the year to clarify was, you know, how we would proceed in the hiring of the CFO and his
role as CEO in doing that. So, you know, that may be one that I think has already been addressed by the conversations that happened at that time. I don't know if Alexis has anything she's like to add to that.

Ms. Tameron Kinsey said, Mr. Chairman, Board members. I don't believe that there's much more to add on that front. It was a conversation that the CEO had with the Board I think it may continue to be an ongoing conversation in terms of organizational structure moving forward, but I have not been privy to any additional conversations since that June meeting.

Mr. Strunk said yeah. Just a couple of questions. And thank you for the presentation, Jim. When I kind of looked at this in the packet, it -- I kind of think it was missing a few pieces. And in my mind, it's a little bit more of the weedish stuff, if you will, some of the categories, some of the items on there are not defined, percentages and whatnot. I know this is draft. I was hoping maybe there might be a little more narrative to this. This seems to be a high level summary and, you know, there's a few things on here that I think we've asked you questions on, but if there's any chance of developing that a little more robustly, I think that might be helpful and I wasn't privy to the conversation Scott had with the Board and what they indicated even if they get this in this format, they're going to have a few questions and they're going to seek a little more clarity. And I think it would be very, helpful moving forward if that's at all possible to be -- maybe be a little more robust in the narrative on some of this. Lay it out a little bit more.

One of the big questions I had in my mind, was how did we fair? How did we do from 2016-2020? And you alluded to you like those objectives, but what's the report card on that? I think we've seen little bits here and there but piecing it all together into one would be very, very helpful, I think as we move forward. So, I just wanted to share that with you.

Mr. Hillyard said thank you very much.

Chair Brady said anyone else? So, Jim I going to go with -- kind of follow up with Mario and Eric. I would say that I appreciate the effort on the strategic plan, but I think if you were to go look at strategic plans that municipalities put together or large organizations, this is probably not what I would consider a strategic plan. A strategic plan would have a little more narrative, a little more broader kind of policy directions. It feels like it's kind of trying to be a lot of different things and maybe in the future, i think it would be good for the staff and helping the Board and we recognize this is a challenge sometimes with Boards but establishing the kind of the higher-level strategic vision and broader goals and objectives and then separating that from the action plan and the specific performance measures. There seems to be in here a combination. I think it's kind of scattered in the different columns.

So, sometimes it feels like we're trying to talk about something that's a broader strategic plan and then sometimes it feels like we're trying to measure a specific performance.
And I think normally that would be -- there would be a very distinction of that in kind of a sequence of how it would be presented in a document maybe going to Kevin’s point. It would be a lot -- a little more of a narrative and a policy conversation on the strategic vision and statements and then underneath of those you would have some objectives and then you would kind of have a work action plan that would be driven and you would have, to Eric's point, you would have here’s what our -- these falling under the strategic plan and vision have specific performance measures and here’s how our performance has been in the past and here’s how the goal was and how close we came to the goal.

I think if this needs to keep moving forward and maybe this is the way -- this is more of a conversational item with the Board, that's fine. But I think, it would be good for Valley Metro, at least from my perspective, to find a way to kind of maybe mirror some other strategic plans with objectives and performance measures that are more typical than probably what you’re hearing from the cities as what we experience. And I don't know if anybody wants to weigh in on that. That’s my just thought looking at this. For an organization as sophisticated and flex as this a front and back pages is probably not going to meet the standard of a strategic plan, but it's maybe a start. But maybe it’s something we can work on in the future. I don't know. Any thoughts from anybody else on that? I don’t know if I’m off base on that.

Ms. Goodman said I would completely agree with what you just shared and the sentiments. I think that -- and also from Mario and Eric. I think expanding on this, but I understand the desire to keep it high level. But I think it may have gone maybe too far in that direction so adding some of that narrative and some structure would be helpful.


Ms. Karins said could I just add one additional comment? Is the reporting aspect of it, you know, I think that would be good to nail down as well as to, you know, would they be quarterly updates or, you know, every six months or once a year. Because I think this is just a one-year plan, but I like that thought of having some type of report that summarizes it at the end.

Mr. Chair said very good. And I would encourage especially Gilbert and others that I know some of you do strategic planning and you have documents that are -- go to your council. It may be good to share those with Jim just so he kind of gets a sense of what we're talking about. I think that always helps so.

All right. Okay. Any other comments on -- what is this? Item 5. I guess, we can go head and forward it to the Board, but I think with the caveat that we think there’s more work to be done in the formatting and the detail in the future. Is that fair? I think -- I'm sure this Board likes to have a conversation about the direction of what -- where the staff is going, but maybe the formatting and the approach can be -- continue to be modified so with that are there -- do we have motion to forward this to the Board of Directors?
IT WAS MOVED BY JULIE KARINS, SECONDED BY ERIK STRUNK AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO FORWARD THE DRAFT FY 2022 STRATEGIC PLAN TO THE BOARDS OF DIRECTORS.

6. Quarterly Reports

Chair Brady said this is presented for information. Are there any questions on the Quarterly Reports? Kind of goes into some of that detail maybe Julie was talking about. And I think what would be great is having these Quarterly Reports link back to that strategic plan; right? So, how do you -- when you read this strategic plan you're saying, oh, here's the narrative of the policy direction and underneath that strategic plan, I can go to the Quarterly Report and know that there's a specific performance measure or metrics that's being -- that will be presented each quarter.

Any other comments or questions on item 6?

Mr. Strunk said just a real, real quick question. I'm kind of curious on all accounts like on time performance. It -- obviously, and there's probably a good reason for that, but I was wondering if Jim or whoever could just take a few minutes, and do you see a pathway to increasing on time performance any time soon? But I did note that it's seems to be a little off in all categories.

Mr. Hillyard said thank you, absolutely. Mr. Abraham, would you mind speaking to that.

Mr. Abraham said thank you, Jim. Mr. Chair, members of the TMC/RMC, yes, our actual on time performance is less than our targets and it's mainly due to the fact that we have a new system that it monitors the on-time performance as you may have heard us talking about over the last couple years, we put this clever device system in. And quite frankly, the big difference is our old on time performance and our old targets were set on an arrival-based system that we had previous. The clever device system is now a departure-based system. So, your on-time performance will somewhat drop due to that.

And secondly, we've been doing a lot of research in our on-time performance category and we are probably higher than industry standards that our numbers of 92% were, you know, rather ambitious over the years and to be able to provide 85-86% or higher on time performance is actually rather good in the industry. And again, I've said it changed a lot due to arrival or departure, I'm sure I understand what that means. A bus pulls at a time point on time, by the time it picks up people, picks up a wheelchair, whatever, they depart late so now it's considered a late trip as opposed to one on-time trip. That's fundamentally the reason for the slight slippage that you've been seeing routinely.

Mr. Strunk said do you foresee that continuing on or do you see potential adjustment in the target?
Mr. Abraham said I see an adjustment in the target. That we will be coming to you. We just haven't made the move yet because of COVID and because of ridership being down. We want to wait until we get back to somewhat normal, but yes, you will see an adjustment in our target. It will be somewhere in the mid-80s to high 80%.

Chair Brady said thank you. Any other questions for the Quarterly reports, item 6? All right. Very good.

**This item was presented for information.**

7. **Travel, Expenditures and Solicitations**

This item was presented for information.

8. **Future Agenda Items Request and Update on Current Events**

None.

9. **Next Meeting**

Chair Strunk said the next regularly scheduled TMC/RMC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 1, 2021 at 11:00 a.m.

With no further discussion the meeting adjourned at 11:36 a.m.
Information Summary

DATE
August 25, 2021

AGENDA ITEM 3B

SUBJECT
Network Hardware Maintenance Agreements

PURPOSE
To request authorization for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to continue procuring network hardware maintenance from Cisco SmartNET maintenance will be procured from HyeTech Network & Security Solutions, LLC.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the TMC/RMC forward to the Boards of Directors authorization for the CEO to continue procuring necessary network hardware maintenance Cisco SmartNET maintenance will be procured from HyeTech Network & Security Solutions, LLC. through the 1Government Procurement Alliance (1GPA) cooperative contract. The amount of the authorization is not to exceed $155,600.

BACKGROUND | DISCUSSION | CONSIDERATION
The backbone of the network connecting Valley Metro’s facilities and users is comprised of Cisco routers, switches, and firewalls. The IT department uses Cisco’s SmartNET maintenance to support that equipment. SmartNET provides:

- Ongoing operating system and security updates for the equipment
- Next business day hardware replacement if a component or device fails
- 24x7x365 access to the engineers in Cisco’s Technical Assistance Center (TAC)
- Access to the extensive Cisco.com online knowledgebase, resources, and tools

Valley Metro has been purchasing Cisco support for the last decade.

COST AND BUDGET
The funds for the software licensing and support outlined in this memo are already included in the adopted RPTA and VMR FY 2022 Operating and Capital Budget and the accompanying five-year budget projections. The currently requested authorization is not to exceed $155,600\(^1\). The RPTA portion is $77,800 and the VMR portion is $77,800.

\(^1\) The renewal cost in FY2021 was $128,025. The year-over-year increase is due to the network overhaul and renewal performed last fiscal year along with the addition of the South-Central Extension and North-West Phase II Extension field offices.
As IT goods and services are purchased by virtually all Arizona public entities, Valley Metro obtains the best volume discounts by utilizing statewide cooperative contracts. The Cisco SmartNET maintenance will be procured from HyeTech Network & Security Solutions, LLC. through the 1Government Procurement Alliance (1GPA) cooperative contract #16-11PV-09.

COMMITTEE ACTION
RTAG: August 17, 2021 for information
TMC/RMC: September 1, 2021 for action
Board of Directors: September 16, 2021 for action

CONTACT
Phil Ozlin
Chief Information Officer
(602)495.8253
pozlin@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
None
DATE
August 27, 2021

SUBJECT
Title VI Program Update

PURPOSE
To request approval of the 2021 Title VI Program Update.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the TMC/RMC forward to the Boards of Directors approval of the 2021 Title VI Program Update.

BACKGROUND | DISCUSSION | CONSIDERATION
Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin by recipients of federal financial assistance, including the denial of meaningful access for limited English proficient persons. The Federal Transit Administration requires that all recipients and sub-recipients of federal funds document their compliance by submitting a Title VI Program every three years. As a sub-recipient of federal funds, Valley Metro has updated its Title VI Program, in coordination with the City of Phoenix. The last update to the Title VI Program was approved in August 2018.

FTA Title VI Circular 4702.1B requires the plans, policies and items listed in the table below to be included in the Title VI Program and updated every three years as necessary. The table also identifies each item that Valley Metro staff has updated within its Program as part of this routine update to comply with new FTA requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan/Policy/Item</th>
<th>Updated Since 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title VI Notice to the Public</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VI Complaint Policy and Procedures</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Title VI Investigations, Complaints and Lawsuits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Public Participation Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Assistance Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System-wide Service Standards and Policies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Transit Services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Service Change and Equity Policy*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Equity Policy*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and/or Fare Change Analysis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A brief summary of proposed changes is included in the attached memorandum.

**COST AND BUDGET**
No cost. The cost to conduct the annual monitoring of the system-wide standards and policies and to update the Title VI Program every three years is accomplished in-house with the level of Valley Metro staff currently budgeted.

**COMMITTEE ACTION**
RTAG: August 17, 2021 for information
TMC/RMC: September 1, 2021 approved
Boards of Directors: September 16, 2021 for action

**CONTACT**
Henry Ikwut-Ukwa
Director, Capital Development
602-322-4420
hukwa@valleymetro.org

**ATTACHMENT**
Title VI Program Update – Summary of Changes

The Title VI Update Report is available upon request
To: Henry Ikwut-Ukwa, Director, Capital Development

From: Robert Forrest, Environmental Program Manager

Date: June 4, 2021

Re: Title VI Program Update – Summary of Changes

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requires all recipients and sub-recipients of federal funds to document their compliance under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by submitting a Title VI Program Update every three years. The Title VI Program consists of plans, policies and items that are required to be updated every three years as necessary. I have coordinated with the City of Phoenix and drafted necessary updates to the following plans, policies and items:

- **Title VI Compliant Policy and Procedures** – The procedures on how to file a Title VI complaint and how to investigate a Title VI complaint have been revised to address comments received from the FTA during a routine triennial review. The Complaint Form has also been updated to include the streetcar service.

- **List of Title VI Investigations, Complaints and Lawsuits** – This is a list of complaints filed in the last three years, which is required to be filed with the update.

- **Inclusive Public Participation Plan** – The plan has been updated to reflect current methodologies in reaching and communicating with the public and stakeholders.

- **Language Assistance Plan** – The plan is updated every three years to determine the population in our region considered “Limited English Proficient” (LEP). The demographic data on the languages spoken and the population size that speaks English less than “very well” has been updated. There are 12 languages and language groups (representing more than 50 different languages) that meet FTA’s definition of an LEP population. Valley Metro’s website has been updated with the ability to translate content into 53 languages. The Spanish population remains as the main LEP population and the one for which vital documents are translated.

- **Demographic Data** – This data is updated every three years based on the latest American Community Survey data.

- **System-wide Service Standards and Policies** – The standards have been updated to include a vehicle load factor for off-peak service per FTA’s guidance. The Tempe Streetcar service has been added to the standards and policies.

- **Monitoring Transit Service** – The system-wide service standards and policies are monitored every three years to document whether Valley Metro is in compliance. The updated report shows that Valley Metro is in compliance with our standards and policies.

- **Major Service Change and Equity Policy** – Per FTA guidance the disparate and disproportionate burden policies needed to clearly state that Valley Metro will compare the impacts between minority and non-minority riders/population and compare low-
income and non-low-income riders/population. The threshold for when a disparate and/or disproportionate burden impact would occur has been revised. The previous threshold was the margin of error in the dataset being used, generally between 3 and 4 percent. The revised threshold is 5 percent to provide more consistency in the analysis and align with peer agencies.

- **Fare Equity Policy** – The disparate and disproportionate burden policies have been revised to clearly state that Valley Metro will compare the impacts between minority and non-minority riders/population and between low-income and non-low-income riders/population. The threshold for when a disparate and/or disproportionate burden impact would occur has been revised. The previous threshold was 4 percent. The revised threshold is 5 percent to provide consistency with the Major Service Change and Equity Policy and to align with peer agencies. The analysis of fare changes process has also been revised to include proposed fare changes for all transit services and all fare media.

- **Service and/or Fare Change Analysis** – A Title VI analysis is performed for all proposed service changes that are considered “Major” and for all proposed fare changes. The 2021 Title VI Program Update includes all the Title VI Analyses that have been performed from January 2018 to April 2021.

- **Table Depicting the Non-Elected Planning Boards, Advisory Councils or Committees Memberships** – This table has been updated to reflect the current members of the boards and management committees.
Information Summary

DATE
August 25, 2021

AGENDA ITEM 3D

SUBJECT
Federal Government Relations Consulting Services – Cardinal Infrastructure, Inc. Change Order

PURPOSE
To request authorization for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute a contract change order to increase the contract authority by $224,000 for an overall not to exceed of $824,000.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the TMC/RMC forward to the Boards of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute a contract change order in the amount of $224,000.

BACKGROUND | DISCUSSION | CONSIDERATION
In November 2017 (FY2018), the Boards of Directors authorized the CEO to execute a contract with Cardinal Infrastructure to provide Federal Government Relations Consulting Services to Valley Metro effective January 1, 2018 for a total term of 5 years (2-year base contract plus 3 one-year renewal options). The contract award amount was $600,000.

With the assistance of our federal partners, Valley Metro has continued to provide critical transportation services and enhance public transit options for the Metro Phoenix region with a look towards the future. As illustrated during the past year, the federal role in system operations has taken on greater importance with the passage of COVID-19 related transit funding bills to provide a funding backstop for ongoing operations and pandemic-related expenses. With the likelihood of ongoing reductions in farebox revenue and potential future decreases in local sales tax collections, it will be critical that federal funding opportunities continue and offer maximum flexibility.

Through FY23, additional advocacy and lobbying work will be necessary to secure federal funding and keep capital projects on track, including the advancement of regional priorities through the reauthorization of the FAST Act. To capitalize on the Biden Administration’s transportation funding and infrastructure priorities this will require an increase in engagement with administration officials and new leadership at FTA, USDOT and other federal agencies.

Since 2017, Congress has had to take the lead in transit funding. In order to maintain authorized funding levels for transit and obtain funding for capital projects in development this required an increased reliance on contracted lobbyists to engage and
participate in deliberations and negotiations directly with multiple members of Congress, congressional committees and federal agency staff.

Since the start of this contract in January 2018, Cardinal Infrastructure has exceeded all requirements and expectations. Valley Metro has navigated obstacles and challenges with limited adverse impact on regional priorities due to Cardinal Infrastructure’s engagement, expertise and relationships within the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), Arizona’s congressional delegation, as well as congressional committee and federal agency staff.

They have successfully lobbied for Valley Metro RPTA priorities such as flexibility in allowing reimbursement for operating costs to maintain service; the utilization of the emergency docket to mitigate challenging FTA administrative and statutory requirements for bus, rail and paratransit operations; and they continue to pursue federal grant opportunities, such as the Bus and Bus Facilities Infrastructure Investment discretionary grant program, Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD) transportation grant program, Integrated Mobility Innovation program, Transit Oriented Development and other grants, as they become available. This includes the Low or No (LowNo) emission competitive grant program to lease or purchase electric buses and charging infrastructure which is a priority for RTPA member agencies.

Along with the federal obstacles posed by the previous Administration, in FY2019 and FY2020, Valley Metro increased Cardinal’s workload and expanded their responsibilities in order to respond to local challenges such as the one posed by the South Central Extension/Downtown Hub (SCE/DH) light rail project. Local opposition threatened to delay or kill the project, which culminated in the Phoenix City Council action that led to the referendum. This required substantial federal work to keep the project moving forward. Through additional meetings, strategic engagement and increased communications facilitated by the Cardinal team, Valley Metro was able to persuade the FTA to allow the project to advance despite push back within the USDOT advocating for pausing the project indefinitely.

Most recently, anticipating potential pandemic-related financial headwinds, Cardinal Infrastructure, working with Valley Metro staff, successfully formulated, advanced and secured Congressional approval of $81.3 million in additional funds for SCE/DH and $17.4 million in additional Small Starts relief funding for Tempe Streetcar. The purpose of this effort was to ensure Valley Metro projects did not have any interruption and would remain on time with no significant gaps in funding.

For comparison, similarly sized peer transit agencies expend the following for federal representation (source: U.S. Senate Lobbying Disclosure Database):

- Utah Transit Authority $300,000/year or $25,000/month
- Regional Transportation District in Denver $280,000/year or $23,000/month
- Houston Metro, $200,000/year or $16,666/month
- Sound Transit, $560,000/year or $46,666/month
- Dallas Area Rapid Transit, $240,000/year or $20,000/month
- DART Dallas Area Rapid Transit, $240,000/year or $20,000/month
• Metro Transit in Minneapolis-St. Paul, $198,000/year or $16,500/month
• Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority in Austin, TX $200,000/year or $16,666/month
• Valley Metro, $192,000/year or $16,000/month

COST AND BUDGET
The cost of the change order to the federal government relations consulting services contract with Cardinal Infrastructure over the remaining 14 months of the contract (November 2021 – December 2022) is an amount not to exceed $224,000. Approximately $128,000 is required in FY22 with the remainder for FY23.

The costs are evenly divided between RPTA and VMR. The source of RPTA funding comes from the Regional Area Road Fund and member city contributions for VMR. Costs for Fiscal Year 2022 are included in the RPTA and VMR Adopted FY2022 Operating and Capital Budgets. Contract obligations beyond FY2022 are incorporated into the RPTA and VMR Adopted Five-Year Operating Forecast and Capital Program.

COMMITTEE ACTION
RTAG: August 17, 2021 for information
TMC/RMC: September 1, 2021 for action
Boards of Directors: September 16, 2021 for action

CONTACT
Alexis Tameron Kinsey
Chief of Staff / Director, Government Relations
602-322-4450
atameronkinsey@valleymetro.org
Information Summary

DATE
August 25, 2021

SUBJECT
Travel, Expenditures and Solicitations

PURPOSE
The monthly travel, expenditures and solicitations are presented for information.

Non-essential travel has been suspended at this time.

At this time there is no travel to report.

BACKGROUND | DISCUSSION | CONSIDERATION
None

COST AND BUDGET
None

COMMITTEE PROCESS
None

RECOMMENDATION
This item is presented for information only.

CONTACT
Jim Hillyard
Acting Chief Financial Officer
602-262-7433
jhillyard@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENTS
Valley Metro Travel Report
Valley Metro RPTA and Valley Metro Rail Monthly Accounts Payable over $25,000
Active Requests for Proposals, Qualifications and Invitations for Bids
Valley Metro
Travel Reimbursement Report
For Travel Completion Dates
7/1/21 through 7/31/21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Purpose of Travel</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates Traveled</th>
<th>Total Travel Cost</th>
<th>Airfare</th>
<th>Other Transport</th>
<th>Lodging</th>
<th>Meals</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total this reporting period** $0.00

**Year to Date** $0.00

*Report reflects Out of State (AZ) Travel*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Transaction Description</th>
<th>Payment Date</th>
<th>Transaction Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51104</td>
<td>First Transit, Inc.</td>
<td>June 2021 Fixed Route Bus Service - Unification</td>
<td>7/22/2021</td>
<td>5,620,506.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51116</td>
<td>Transdev Services, Inc</td>
<td>June 2021 Transdev Services</td>
<td>7/22/2021</td>
<td>1,185,930.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000020</td>
<td>ADP, LLC</td>
<td>PPE 7-25-21 Wages Payable-Reverse Wire</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>922,281.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51119</td>
<td>City of Phoenix</td>
<td>PTF Expenditure Reimbursement Request #14</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>636,019.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000022</td>
<td>ASRS</td>
<td>PPE 7-25-21 ASRS Contributions Employee</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>250,809.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51100</td>
<td>Clean Energy</td>
<td>June 2021 CNG Fueling Equip Repair and Maintenance</td>
<td>7/22/2021</td>
<td>204,372.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51108</td>
<td>Medical Transportation Management, Inc.</td>
<td>June 2021 Eligibility Certification and Travel Training Costs</td>
<td>7/22/2021</td>
<td>97,702.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51103</td>
<td>DLT Solutions, LLC</td>
<td>Oracle HRIS</td>
<td>7/22/2021</td>
<td>87,486.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51100</td>
<td>Clean Energy</td>
<td>June 2021 CNG Fueling Equip Repair and Maintenance</td>
<td>7/22/2021</td>
<td>27,608.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51104</td>
<td>First Transit, Inc.</td>
<td>Coach 8073 MLOH Engine</td>
<td>7/22/2021</td>
<td>27,436.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9,060,153.10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Transaction Description</th>
<th>Payment Date</th>
<th>Transaction Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>041439</td>
<td>Kiewit Infrastructure West Co.</td>
<td>March 2021 S Central Extension Project</td>
<td>7/22/2021</td>
<td>15,162,745.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041435</td>
<td>Hensel Phelps Construction Co</td>
<td>June 2021 OMC Expansion Project</td>
<td>7/22/2021</td>
<td>1,202,881.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041436</td>
<td>Hill International, Inc.</td>
<td>April 2021 Program Management</td>
<td>7/22/2021</td>
<td>932,392.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041466</td>
<td>HDR Engineering, Inc.</td>
<td>May 2021 Planning and Community Relations</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>643,883.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041411</td>
<td>Allied Universal Security Services</td>
<td>May 2021 Fare Inspection and Security Services</td>
<td>7/22/2021</td>
<td>386,539.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041467</td>
<td>Jacobs Engineering</td>
<td>June 2021 NW Extension II</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>238,566.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041408</td>
<td>AECOM Technical Services, Inc.</td>
<td>April 2021 S Central Extension</td>
<td>7/22/2021</td>
<td>230,457.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041421</td>
<td>City of Phoenix</td>
<td>July 2020 thru June 2021 Advertising Revenue Distribution</td>
<td>7/22/2021</td>
<td>219,005.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041427</td>
<td>DMS - Facility Services, Inc.</td>
<td>June 2021 Facilities and LRV Cleaning</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>186,187.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041470</td>
<td>PGH Wong Engineering, Inc.</td>
<td>June 2021 S Central Extension Systems Design</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>164,100.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041450</td>
<td>Stacy and Witbeck, Inc.</td>
<td>April 2021 Tempe Streetcar Project</td>
<td>7/22/2021</td>
<td>161,307.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041460</td>
<td>ARCADIS</td>
<td>June 2021 Consulting Support Services</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>143,059.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041419</td>
<td>City of Mesa</td>
<td>July 2020 thru June 2021 Advertising Revenue Distribution</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>76,280.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041470</td>
<td>PGH Wong Engineering, Inc.</td>
<td>June 2021 NW Extension II</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>76,099.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041422</td>
<td>City of Tempe</td>
<td>July 2020 thru June 2021 Advertising Revenue Distribution</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>73,038.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041427</td>
<td>DMS - Facility Services, Inc.</td>
<td>May 2021 Facility Maintenance Services</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>70,092.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041450</td>
<td>DMS - Facility Services, Inc.</td>
<td>June 2021 Facility Maintenance Services</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>70,092.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041459</td>
<td>Ace Asphalt of Arizona, Inc.</td>
<td>Asphalt Repairs for Sycamore ParknRide</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>68,327.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041411</td>
<td>Allied Universal Security Services</td>
<td>May 2021 Fare Inspection and Security Services</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>66,663.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041421</td>
<td>City of Phoenix</td>
<td>July 2020 thru June 2021 Advertising Revenue Distribution</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>60,245.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041474</td>
<td>Salt River Project - Construction Fees</td>
<td>SCE.C.00030-0521-DS May 2021 S Central Extension</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>48,466.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041440</td>
<td>Knorr Brake Corporation (KBC)</td>
<td>LRV Friction Brake Overhaul</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>42,556.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041411</td>
<td>Allied Universal Security Services</td>
<td>May 2021 Fare Inspection and Security Services</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>40,424.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041457</td>
<td>URW, LLC</td>
<td>June 2021 Landscape Maintenance Services</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>37,181.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041411</td>
<td>Allied Universal Security Services</td>
<td>May 2021 Fare Inspection and Security Services</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>33,757.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041468</td>
<td>LTK Engineering Services</td>
<td>May 2021 Rail Rolling Stock Audit Services</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>33,606.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041468</td>
<td>LTK Engineering Services</td>
<td>June 2021 Rolling Stock Audit Services</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>33,606.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041447</td>
<td>Portable Air, LLC</td>
<td>Generator and Cooler Rentals during Chiller Repairs</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>30,986.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041457</td>
<td>URW, LLC</td>
<td>June 2021 Landscape Rentals during Chiller Repairs</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>29,163.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041411</td>
<td>Allied Universal Security Services</td>
<td>May 2021 Fare Inspection and Security Services</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>28,797.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041411</td>
<td>Allied Universal Security Services</td>
<td>May 2021 Fare Inspection and Security Services</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>25,160.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $20,615,673.85
Information Summary

DATE
August 25, 2021

AGENDA ITEM 5

SUBJECT
Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events

PURPOSE
Chair Brady will request future agenda items from members, and members may provide a report on current events.

COST AND BUDGET
None

RECOMMENDATION
This item is presented for information only.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
None

COMMITTEE PROCESS
None

CONTACT
Scott Smith
Chief Executive Officer
602-262-7433
ssmith@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
None.

Pending Items Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Requested</th>
<th>Date Requested</th>
<th>Planned Follow-up Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valley Metro I 101 N. 1st Ave. Phoenix, AZ 85003 602.262.7433
Agenda
August 25, 2021

Transit Management Committee
Wednesday, September 1, 2021
Boardroom/Webex
101 N. 1st Avenue, 10th Floor
11:00 a.m.

1. Public Comment

The public will be provided with an opportunity at this time to address the committees on **non-agenda items and all action agenda items**. Up to three minutes will be provided per speaker unless the Chair allows more at his/her discretion. A total of 15 minutes for all speakers will be provided.

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Minutes

Minutes from the August 7, 2021 TMC meeting are presented for approval.

2B. **Authorization to Issue a Competitive Solicitation for Contracted Transportation Services to Operate the Rural Connector Service**

Staff recommends that the TMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to issue a competitive solicitation under a joint procurement process with the RTA of Pima County for contracted transportation services to Operate Route 685 (Ajo/Gila Bend) Rural Connector Service and short trip bus service within the City of Buckeye.

Action Recommended

1. For Information

2A. For action

2B. For action
3. Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events

Chair Brady will request future agenda items from members, and members may provide a report on current events.

4. Next Meeting

The next TMC meeting is scheduled for **Wednesday, October 6, 2021 at 11:00 a.m.**

Qualified sign language interpreters are available with 72 hours notice. Materials in alternative formats (large print or flash drive) are available upon request. For further information, please call Valley Metro at 602-262-7433 or TTY at 602-251-2039. To attend this meeting via teleconference, contact the receptionist at 602-262-7433 for the dial-in-information. The supporting information for this agenda can be found on our website at [www.valleymetro.org](http://www.valleymetro.org)
DATE
August 25, 2021

SUBJECT
Public Comment

PURPOSE
The public will be provided with an opportunity at this time to address the committees on non-agenda items and all action agenda items. Up to three minutes will be provided per speaker unless the Chair allows more at his/her discretion. A total of 15 minutes for all speakers will be provided.

COST AND BUDGET
None

RECOMMENDATION
This item is presented for information.

BACKGROUND | DISCUSSION | CONSIDERATION
None

COMMITTEE PROCESS
None

CONTACT
Scott Smith
Chief Executive Officer
602-262-7433
ssmith@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
None
Transit Management Committee Participants
Chris Brady, City of Mesa, Chair (phone)
Mario Paniagua for Ed Zuercher, City of Phoenix, Vice Chair (phone)
Cherlene Penilla, City of Avondale (phone)
Josh Wright, City of Chandler (phone)
David Trimble for Grady Miller, Town of Fountain Hills (phone)
Mary Goodman, Town of Gilbert (phone)
Kevin Phelps, City of Glendale (phone)
Julie Karins, City of Goodyear (phone)
Cameron Doelling for Jacqueline Edwards, Maricopa County (phone)
Erik Strunk, City of Peoria (phone)
Bruce Gardner, Town of Queen Creek (phone)
Mark Melnychenko, City of Scottsdale (phone)
Mike Gent, City of Surprise (phone)
Steven Methvin, City of Tempe (phone)

Members Not Present
Roger Klingler, City of Buckeye
Crystal Dyches, City of El Mirage
Shatawn Reed, ADOT (phone)
City of Tolleson

Chair Brady called the meeting to order at 11:36 a.m.

1. Public Comment

My name is William Charles "Blue" Crowley, III and it's on the specifics of the items on your agenda of planning services, the professional development training, the e-software library, but because I'm limited on the amount of time I can talk, it's the service changes and also the RideChoice and stuff with Waymo of extending or putting out for bid another contract.

When the study session occurred and Waymo was to explain what they had gotten, what they were doing, and how it related to all of this, they said, we can't do that, we
don't have that information. We have to wait until June 30th to do it so that you guys can look and see and evaluate what we have gotten and done in that. And now, you're saying, hey, let's go out for competitive bid and we need to keep on doing this. Well, I still have an objective -- objection to the self-driving vehicles insofar as that adds just one more single occupant vehicle to the pollution situation. We have a high ozone situation here where it's been unhealthy for what, two months. And there's also the PM10 so even though they are electric vehicles, I believe they still contribute how much by each one of those tires as it deteriorates and turns into PM10s and 2.5s so.

That and will all of the changes that you've suggested instead of expanding or reducing that's not what this situation and system should be. We need to make the system 24/7 and use the whole grid thus everyone can use it and we can breathe a little better.

Have a pleasant day and the meeting is starting.

2. Minutes

Chair Brady said the minutes from the June 2, 2021 were presented for approval.

IT WAS MOVED BY MARIO PANIAGUA, SECONDED BY MARY GOODMAN AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE TMC MEETING MINUTES FROM JUNE 2, 2021.

3. Consent Agenda

Chair Brady said it looks like we have five items for approval. Any items that need to be withdrawn or pulled for separate discussion by the Board? Okay. At some point in the future, I would like to know about Franklin Covey. That's been around for a long time. It seems like -- I'd like to know about its efficacy in today's world, but we can talk about that later.

So, we need a motion and a second for approval of the Consent Agenda. Do I have a motion?

IT WAS MOVED STEVEN METHVIN, SECONDED BY JULIE KARINS AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA.

4. Recommended October Service Changes

Chair Brady said we are going to ask Jim Hillyard to give us a briefing on item 4.

Mr. Hillyard said thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will hand it off to Joe Gregory.

Mr. Gregory said thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Committee. I'm here to talk about the October 2021 recommended service changes which are currently planning to put into effect in October.
Mr. Gregory provided a presentation which included:

✓ Phoenix Changes
  o Route 0A
  o Route 7 – 7th Street
  o Route 8 – 7th Avenue
  o Route 52 – Roeser Road
✓ Proposed October Service Changes – Tempe
✓ Tempe Orbit Mercury
✓ Tempe Orbit Saturn
✓ Route 62 – Hardy Drive
✓ Route 65 – Mill Avenue/Kyrene
✓ Reorganization of Routes 62, 65, 66 and Orbit Saturn
✓ Proposed October Service Changes (Mesa)
✓ Route 156 – Chandler Blvd.
✓ Route 514 – Fountain Hills/Scottsdale Express
✓ Fountain Hills/Mesa Connector
✓ Peoria on the Go (POGO)

Chair Brady said all right. Thank you. Some of you guys have been really, busy. So, is there any questions on this item? Item number 4.

Mr. Methvin said I just wanted to take an opportunity to thank our partners at Valley Metro and our bordering cities for some of the changes that we had to make in Tempe. I know it wasn't always easy, but we do appreciate the teamwork and the partnership on making those changes. And I think we can address some of this in the future with -- if we can ever get to a point where we have some predictable growth rates in how we -- at least for us, how we have to make those changes because when we have unexpected costs and we have a fixed revenue source, it typically means that we have to readjust our routes and our frequencies. And we hate doing that as much as anybody else, but I just want to take a quick moment to say thank you to Valley Metro and to you in Mesa and Phoenix for working with us on some of those changes. Thank you.

Chair Brady said all right. Thank you, Steven. Anyone else? All right. Well, Steven, it seems like you need to make a motion on this item.

IT WAS MOVED BY STEVEN METHVIN, SECONDED BY MARIO PANIAGUA AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO FORWARD TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CEO TO AMEND MEMBER AGENCY FY22 IGAS AS NECESSARY, AND TO EXECUTE CHANGE ORDERS TO THE FIRST TRANSIT AND TOTAL TRANSIT FIXED ROUTE CONTRACTS TO ACCOMMODATE THE RECOMMENDED OCTOBER 2021 SERVICE CHANGES.
5. Authorization to Issue a Competitive Solicitation for Autonomous Vehicle Pilot Program

Chair Brady said Jim, are you going to have someone make a presentation on this? Or are you going to do this one?

Mr. Hillyard said yes, Mr. Chairman, we will have Angie DeVore from our team speak to it. Angie’s presentation will have two components. One will be presenting the request for approval of a solicitation, but in addition to that, at the RTAG meeting, it was suggested that we provide some context for autonomous vehicle pilots around the country to give you and the Board some sense of what’s being done elsewhere and why there may be benefit in our continuing to learn in our own region. So, with that, Angie, please take it away.

Ms. DeVore provided a presentation which included the following:

- Project Types
  - Driver Assistance
  - Rural Fixed Route
- FTA Funded Transit Automation Projects by Project Type
- FTA Funded Transit Automation Projects by Funding Amount
- FTA Funded Transit Automation Projects (2 slides)

Chair Brady said okay. Thank you very much. Do we need to keep going? Should we just keep going or? Any questions? Okay. So, we have -- this is for action; correct?

Ms. Karins said so, when we talk about the location for the second pilot, you talked about a general component of region. Can you, specifically, state will the RFP be for a certain area of the region? Or how is that going to be defined?

Mr. Hillyard said yes, thanks for that question. I should have made that clear. So, one of the challenges with these on demand providers is they typically have a service area that they're interested in utilizing their vehicles. So, as you're aware Waymo, is one on demand provider. Their service area over the last year and a half, two years has been limited to kind of the southeast Valley.

And so, our RFP will simply ask where can you provide service? And what types of pilots, you know, would you be willing to engage with us on at what cost? So, this is not a case -- we do not believe this is a case where we can dictate the service area because we're asking, you know, them to use sort of their vehicles that are already in production and testing. So, we'll be curious to see where -- what areas are proposed by the AV vehicle providers.
Ms. Karins said so, just a follow-up comment on that. I guess, my concern is that that leads me to believe it's not going to be the southwest Valley and when you talk about the need for micro-transit and the transit islands, it seems like it might be helpful if we did include in the RFP, specifically, where we would like to see them focus their efforts. Thank you.

Mr. Hillyard said Mr. Chairman, we could certainly include in the RFP areas that we would prefer to try to encourage a broader geography to be served. We would love to see that. We think it would be a better pilot.

Chair Brady said yeah. Maybe that's the point; right? The idea is to find someone who's willing to give the broadest level scope of service in the area as possible. I think that makes sense. So, okay. Any other questions?

Mr. Paniagua said I would just -- I want to thank Angie for the presentation and the information. Appreciate the need to look at this further. My question is more about the timing based on just where the organization is right now with all of the impacts from COVID and the need to focus on getting more riders back, you know, when we can, to the bus and rail system. I -- my question is really just about the timing of this effort. Is now really the right time to be moving forward with this? And just whether this would be a distraction to the greater focus, right now? Maybe that's more of a question for Jim.

Mr. Hillyard said absolutely. Thanks for that question. We don't think that it would in any way distract us from our focus on the recovery from the pandemic and our planning for Prop 400 Extension going forward. In fact, we really think that this works sort of hand in glove with both of those.

You know, we know that autonomous vehicles are in all of our future and as Angie mentioned, the companies that are developing these systems are typically, and we're talking especially about those on demand providers like the, you know, Waymo's and Uber's and Tesla's of the world. You know, they're developing their products with the mass market in mind, not the transit in mind. And so, you know, we think it's important to sort of get ahead of this a bit to understand how they can facilitate greater transit ridership so that, you know, we're able to lead that target and use them where they're going to be effective.

We're not concerned that this, for example, would detract from the use of transit more broadly. At $50,000 a year, you're not going to see thousands and thousands and thousands of people being able to access these services without regard to what part of the Valley they're serving, but we do think that the buzz that working with autonomous vehicle providers has already created and would continue to create, you know, can kind of help people have transit more front of mind to realize that we're looking to move with the times and encourage ridership both now and in the future.
Mr. Paniagua said Jim, I appreciate your response. Thanks.

Mr. Strunk said Angie you indicated that the one that closed out was FTA funded and if this would move forward, this would be operating -- your operating budget; correct?

Mr. Hillyard said yes. I'm sorry.

Mr. Strunk said yeah. The question I have is, you know, that kind of comes out of the PTF and I know there's been some sensitivity to -- if -- this would -- it might be at the expense of something else down the line and I know we've had some conversation on the -- and everything that's factored into it. It isn't a large amount, but it is an amount over a period of time. Any thoughts on that perspective?

Mr. Hillyard said yes. Thank you for that question. You're right, you know, a dollar is a dollar. And so, this would be committing $50,000 a year over the five years of the pilot to help us sort of better understand, you know, how we could use autonomous vehicles as part of a larger transit mix. We don't think that's -- we don't think that's a concern in terms of addressing sort of larger priorities, but a dollar is a dollar.

Ms. DeVore said the other thing to note too is this does not preclude us also from looking for additional grant funding in order to either expand on the project or to fund the project. This is merely to get us moving forward, get a partner in place, determine the parameters around the project, and start moving forward.

Mr. Hillyard said and actually, Angie, that's a great point. That's absolutely the case. And obviously, the ultimate contract that would emerge from this RFP would come back to this body and to the Board for approval before implementation.

Chair Brady said so just a follow-up to -- I think I heard you mention a potential for a partnership or a funding source? Or no?

Mr. Hillyard said we are always looking for opportunities to leverage, you know, federal funding in these projects. There isn't a grant we're aware of at the moment, but we continue to scan the horizon. The other thing that we'll be seeking in the RFP is the degree to which the AV provider is willing to sort of partner and help defray costs.

Mr. Strunk said all right. Thank you.

Chair Brady said just some perspective here. Maybe it's going a different direction. I think it's a great idea. I think the technologies headed our way. I think this is a good time to kind of experiment with it. I don't know maybe depending on the kind of responses you get from the industry kind of going to Julie's perspective, I would be fine with the idea that if we need to motivate, incentivize some of these autonomous vehicles to go in areas that are underserved. I think that's a great idea. I think $250,000, $50,000 a year for this region is actually kind of very low. I think we could be
a lot more committed. I think we need to put our toe in the water, but I think down the line, I think this is a great opportunity to extend services to connect people to transit and I think by the time we go through all of the testing and bringing someone on, hopefully, transit is back in play and it becomes popular.

I certainly wouldn't have any problem that if you have the opportunity -- you saw really good proposals from multiple vendors that would be willing to kind of spread out across the region, I would -- I would be willing to go more than the $250,000 if could get a variety so we -- the pilot program is to test the concept; right? And maybe the shuttles look more appealing or maybe it's single ridership. I don't know, but I think we need to keep our eyes open to the future. Some of these other cities have committed more. They're kind of known as the push the envelope, entrepreneur cities and I don't think we need to fall behind.

So, I would just be interested -- hopefully, the way the RFP is written we can really try to attract a lot of companies who may be willing to spread out across the Valley. I don't want this to be just -- one just concentrated in one area, but if we have to do something to kind of help motivate them for that we need to look at this when this comes back around, but this is -- I think this is kind of interesting and something that is worth our time and effort to look into so thank you very much for that.

Ms. Karins said you know, I would love to see if there was a way to maybe include in the RFP a way for individual cities to partner. So, say, for example, that they don't have any inherent interest in coming out my way, but with a, you know, contribution by my city, you know, that we could actually, you know, play with that. I think that we would be really open to at least having that conversation as to if there's a local match of some kind to allow us to play. I think it's our answer, honestly.

Chair Brady said I love that. I think it's great. Any maybe we want more than $50,000 worth or our portion of $50,000. I mean, maybe the idea is to find qualified vendors out there who have the capacity and willing to commit. I feel that's what the RFP kind of lends itself to and then we can kind of manage it from there so. That's a great idea, Julie.

IT WAS MOVED BY MIKE GENT, SECONDED BY DAVID TRIMBLE AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO FORWARD TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CEO TO ISSUE COMPETITIVE SOLICITATION FOR AN AUTONOMOUS VEHICLE PILOT. THE PERIOD OF SERVICE WILL COVER FY22 THROUGH FY26 IN THE AMOUNT OF $50,000 PER YEAR FOR A TOTAL COST OF $250,000. THIS AMOUNT IS CONTINGENT UPON ANNUAL BUDGET APPROVAL.

6. Paratransit Administrative Reservations and Scheduling Facility Lease

Mr. Hillyard said yes, Mr. Chairman. Let me introduce the topic and then I'll hand it off to Mr. Tom Young, our Accessible Transit Manager. So, this item is the first in at least
two of RFP requests that you'll be seeing in the coming months that are part of a larger project approved by the Board at its September meeting to re-solicit components of the paratransit and RideChoice programs to help them integrate better.

As you may know, paratransit -- the RideChoice program is an adjunct to paratransit that provides on demand trips to seniors and those with disabilities in areas not served by paratransit and on a more real time basis and at a lower cost to cities. And so, one of the things that we've seen in the success of that program is that there was a lack of coordination between paratransit and RideChoice and a duplication of some of the administrative functions of both of those programs.

And so, Mr. Young initiated a work group made up of your city staff to revisit the business model for both of those and to look at how we could improve that coordination and improve the efficiency of both programs. And so, Tom will start out with a presentation describing the process to develop those RFP's, the involvement of your staff and then the ultimate recommendations that your staff came to. And then he will move into the presentation of this particular memo which is sort of the first step in that -- in the process of implementing those recommendations. So, with that, Tom, please take it away.

Mr. Young provided a presentation which included the following:

- Background
- Brainstorming Sessions
- Brainstorming Session Attendees
- Focus Group Brainstorming Topics Discussed
- Focus Group Brainstorming (reaching Consensus – 2 slides)
- Focus Group Brainstorming – 10/6/2020 (High Level Responsibilities)
- Scope of Work Development Committee(s) (2 slides)
- Next Steps

Mr. Hillyard said oh, thank you, Mr. Chairman. We know that was a lengthy presentation, but as Mr. Brady noted, when giving us approval back in September to embark on this integration on paratransit and RideChoice, this is a super important service to those both to those vulnerable individuals that depend on it and to our region given its cost and visibility. Therefore, before we proceeded with the release of the RFP's and asked you to consider item number 6 on the agenda today, we wanted to make sure you had the context of how we sort of got to the recommendations that we're making and what the path forward looked like.

Chair Brady said all right. Thank you. Again, my only comment I think you've heard it from the staff. We see this as a call center. We want to be careful that it doesn't get skewed too much toward the intention of we keep using the reference of paratransit. RideChoice is our preference to try to encourage as much of that service as possible. So, it may be mostly just in the subtleties of the presentation, but we want to just be
cautious how we present this to the -- at least set this up so the idea is really try to
continue to encourage that RideChoice option. I think that's at least economically
beneficial for us and we would like to keep us that emphasis out there and not let it get
lost in the reference to paratransit reservations. And I think I saw it throughout your
presentation, just a continued emphasis that making sure that both options are, you
know, treated so that they -- we don't over -- we don't fall back in to the paratransit as
being the kind of the only option, again, because that is not a very viable financially for
continuing those services so.

Mr. Hillyard said yup. Couldn't agree more, Mr. Chairman.

Chair Brady said I think with that it's kind of the observation. I appreciate the depth of
the conversation on the Committee, but I don't know if there's a thought about maybe
adding another city representative who may have some of those same thoughts and
maybe an East Valley city. I think there's been some discussion. I didn't know if there
was anybody who felt the same way and wanted to make the offering of their
volunteering to be part of that too.

Mr. Methvin said we were thinking the same thought over here and I'd be happy to
volunteer our city to serve on that Committee.

Chair Brady said okay. Thank you. Any other comments? All right.

Mr. Hillyard said yes, Mr. Chairman and I think the next item would be for Tom then to
get into the discussion of the leasing of the facility that will be used for RideChoice and
paratransit reservations and scheduling.

Chair Brady said okay. Then, Jim, do you want to do a motion for both of them at the
same time then?

Mr. Hillyard said actually, Sir, this entire discussion was focused on Item number 6 so
we can -- I'll have Tom briefly highlight that, see if there's any questions and then we
can move on to Item number 7.

Mr. Chair said okay. Fair enough. Thank you.

Mr. Young said okay. Thank you, again, Jim. As you just heard in my earlier
presentation, there's several benefits offered when public agencies provide the facility
and major capital equipment for their contractors to utilize. On a high level, some of
those benefits include reduced cost, excuse me, reduced cost in contract startup and
throughout the term of the contract by eliminating private sector administrative overhead
markup. It offers improved contact oversight and monitoring of the contractor and the
potential for increased competition from smaller, disadvantaged businesses that
otherwise could not participate due to the large capital outlay needed upfront when they
have to provide everything.
So, in addition, providing facilities help minimize future barriers during changes due to contract expiration or the necessity to change due to poor performance and reduces the mobilization time necessary to implement services.

The joint call and control center for RideChoice and ADA paratransit program will be the heartbeat of those operations. It's where all reservations will be made by customers. Education on the customers on the best service or trip to be taken whether that be RideChoice or paratransit and the efficient routing and scheduling of the trips on the dedicated paratransit vehicles.

This reservation and scheduling function will be the focal point for future budget management and in an environment with growing demands. Because of that Valley Metro believes having the operation in close proximity to the ATS oversight team is of utmost importance to ensure the goal set out by the brainstorming sessions and all local jurisdictions come to fruit and direct control of the service contractor can be best maintained.

Based on current TransDev and American Logistics operations and expected call volumes for both programs, we determined approximately 5,000 square feet of space would be needed. While we initially looked at five different facilities over this past year, out regionally customer service department has developed a streamline business model that makes it possible for both the regional call center and the new reservation and scheduling contractor to share the call center's existing 4,900 square foot space lease.

This co-location will allow customer service call center and reservation and scheduling to share the workstations, furniture, phone system, networking, and software with the addition of just 1,600 square feet. Fortunately, the 1,600 square foot space is currently available in the Mobility Center. The total cost of the lease for this additional 1,600 square feet is $168,502 through December 2025 when the lease expires. We believe the cost of this addition will be offset many times over by reducing the lease and startup cost of the new contract and will significantly improve our ability to oversee the work of the contractor.

As a result, we ask today that you approve bringing forward to the full Board this recommendation to lease 1,600 square foot space necessary for the regional customer service call center and a new reservation scheduling contractor to co-locate at the Mobility Center maximizing the use of Valley Metro’s current facilities. I can answer any questions at this time.

Chair Brady said okay. Any questions on this item? So, we're making the decision to go ahead and procure the real estate in anticipation of finding a vendor for this combined call center. Is that right?

Mr. Hillyard said that's correct.
Chair Brady said so we're jumping off the cliff, right now. Okay. Anybody else have any questions? We're all good with this? All right. So this is Item 6 for the lease of this space. Do I have a motion?

IT WAS MOVED BY ERIK STRUNK, SECONDED BY JULIE KARINS AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO FORWARD TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER (CEO) TO NEGOTIATE AND EXECUTE A LEASE AGREEMENT WITH COPPERPOINT MUTUAL FOR APPROXIMATELY 1,600 SQUARE FEET OF OFFICE SPACE TO ALLOW PARATRANsit RESERVATIONS AND SCHEDULING TO BE CO-LOCATED WITH THE REGIONAL CUSTOMER SERVICE CALL CENTER (CSCC) AT 4600 EAST WASHINGTON; TERM TO CO-TERMINATE WITH THE EXISTING LEASE DECEMBER 31, 2025.

7. RideChoice Brokerage Services Contract Award

Chair Brady said so do we have a presentation on Item 7?

Mr. Hillyard said yes, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Young will touch on this issue. It's related to continuing our current RideChoice program until the new RFPs that Mr. Young just described are able to be implemented and -- Tom, please describe the issue.

Mr. Young said yes, thank you, again, Jim. Chairman Brady, members. 2018 Valley Metro entered into a contract with American Logistics to broker the RideChoice program. The term of this contract was for a three-year base term with three-year option to extend services. The base term actually ends November 30th of this year 2021.

Approximately, 14 months prior to the end of the base year, we met with American Logistics and informed them of the Board action in September 2020 to re-solicit the contract creating a combined administrative function for the RideChoice and paratransit program and discussed the need for a one-year extension to make that happen. American Logistics responded positively to the extension and communicated their excitement in proposing on the new work.

Towards the end of February 2021, American Logistics communicated to Valley Metro leadership the need for some relief of some of the technology requirements in the contract, specifically, the mobile and web app for customers to make reservations without making a phone call. Approximately, three weeks later, we received a written request to increase rates. A couple weeks after that, we received a second request to increase rates even more overall per trip rate by 41.5% implying the need was for the increase directly related to the impacts of COVID.

After eight meetings over the next several months, American Logistics admitted the need for the increase was not related to COVID, but in fact, they just underbid the
contract. In retrospect, I think part of their strategy was to run the clock out leaving us with no other option but to give them the requested increase, especially knowing the complexity of the transition and the time it would take to contract with 14 providers and implement new software to manage the program.

About a month into the meetings, I began to get concerned over American Logistics stall tactics and the lack of information they would give us to justify their claim so I reached out to our procurement office to see what other options we had available to ensure RideChoice services to our vulnerable population continued if American Logistics would not justify their request for an increase. Given the fact that I knew a change in brokers for RideChoice would require a four-to-five-month transition period and our procurement includes about a six week on the front end and six week on the back end just to receive Board approvals, we did not have sufficient time to put an RFP on the street.

Our procurement office went back to the competitive procurement we conducted in 2018 and reviewed the proposals that were considered competitive and each proposer that was asked to submit a best and final offer. MJM was one of the finalists with American Logistics, therefore, procurement reached out to them to seek their interest in performing brokerage services from December 1, 2021, through November 20, 2022, while we completed the competitive process for the joint call and control center. MJM communicated their interest and communicated they would honor the pricing that they submitted in their 2018 competitive proposal.

Today, I'm bringing this action before you so we can enter into a non-competitive contract with MJM because we need to move forward now on the transition to ensure we have a provider December 1, 2021. The cost associated to the one-year contract with MJM is $364,589 more than what American Logistics current rate is, however, it's $281,791 less than the demand American Logistics had made to continue through November 20, 2022.

We're continuing to work collaboratively with the City of Phoenix in providing them the proper documentation to support the continued use of federal funds on this contract. Once we conclude this work with the City of Phoenix, we will reach out through the ATS partners and the Financial Working Group members with the conclusion.

I can answer any questions on this item now.

Chair Brady said any questions on this item? If now, we'll look for a motion to approve moving forward with the RideChoice broker services for MJM Innovations. Do I have a motion?

IT WAS MOVED BY ERIK STRUNK SECONDED BY JULIE KARINS AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO FORWARD TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CEO TO EXECUTE A 15-MONTH EMERGENCY, NON-
COMPETITIVE, CONTRACT WITH MJM INNOVATIONS FOR THE BROKERAGE OF RIDECHOICE SERVICES.

8. Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events

None.

With no further discussion the meeting adjourned at 12:46 p.m.
DATE
August 25, 2021

AGENDA ITEM 2B

SUBJECT
Authorization to Issue a Competitive Solicitation for Contracted Transportation Services to Operate the Rural Connector Service

PURPOSE
To request Board authorization for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to issue a competitive solicitation under a joint procurement process with the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) of Pima County for contracted transportation services to operate Route 685 (Ajo/Gila Bend) Rural Connector Service and short trip bus service within the City of Buckeye.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the TMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to issue a competitive solicitation under a joint procurement process with the RTA of Pima County for contracted transportation services to Operate Route 685 (Ajo/Gila Bend) Rural Connector Service and short trip bus service within the City of Buckeye.

BACKGROUND | DISCUSSION | CONSIDERATION
The Route 685 Ajo/Gila Bend Regional Connector operates along State Highway 85 and provides bus service to the communities of Ajo, Gila Bend, Buckeye, Goodyear, Avondale, Tolleson and Phoenix. Route 685 offers five round-trips each weekday and two round trips on Saturdays. Also, four short trips are provided each weekday in the City of Buckeye. AJO Transportation is the third-party contractor operating the service on behalf of Valley Metro. RTA of Pima County also contracts for connecting service between Tucson and Ajo using the same contractor.

The AJO Transportation (aka Second-Generation Inc.) contract with Valley Metro for Route 685 will end on October 31, 2022, as will its contract with the RTA of Pima County. Both Valley Metro and the RTA of Pima County seek the economies of scale and competition that a joint procurement between the two agencies can provide.

Valley Metro staff is seeking permission to participate in and to issue a federally compliant RFP with the RTA of Pima County for rural connector services between Ajo, Gila Bend, Phoenix and Tucson for both Valley Metro and RTA of Pima County under a five-year contract term with one three-year extension option. The resulting contract is expected to take effect November 1, 2022.
The award to a contractor will consist of two separate contracts, one with Valley Metro and the other with RTA of Pima County. Valley Metro will oversee and manage its contract and portion of the service.

COST AND BUDGET
A five-year cost estimate for Valley Metro's portion of the service is $5,000,000. For the current federal fiscal year, the funding is as follows:

- Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5311 (Rural Transit) and CARES funding administered by ADOT provides approximately 56 percent
- The remaining 44 percent is funded from Public Transportation Funds (PTF) allocated to Maricopa County, City of Buckeye funds and RTA funding.

Future funding is anticipated to approximate current year allocation.

COMMITTEE PROCESS
RTAG: August 17, 2021 for information
TMC: September 1, 2021 for action
Board of Directors: September 16, 2021 for action

CONTACT
Ray Abraham
Chief Operations Officer
602-652-5054
rabraham@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
None
AGENDA ITEM 3

DATE
August 25, 2021

SUBJECT
Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events

PURPOSE
Chair Brady will request future agenda items from members, and members may provide a report on current events.

COST AND BUDGET
None

RECOMMENDATION
This item is presented for information only.

BACKGROUND | DISCUSSION | CONSIDERATION
None

STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT
None

COMMITTEE PROCESS
None

CONTACT
Scott Smith
Chief Executive Officer
602-262-7433
ssmith@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
None

Pending Items Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Requested</th>
<th>Date Requested</th>
<th>Planned Follow-up Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Valley Metro | 101 N. 1st Ave. Phoenix, AZ 85003 | 602.262.7433 |
Agenda

August 25, 2021

Rail Management Committee
Wednesday, September 1, 2021
Boardroom/Webex
101 N. 1st Avenue, 10th Floor
11:00 a.m.

Action Recommended
1. For Information

1. Public Comment

The public will be provided with an opportunity at this time to address the committees on non-agenda items and all action agenda items. Up to three minutes will be provided per speaker unless the Chair allows more at his/her discretion. A total of 15 minutes for all speakers will be provided.

CONSENT AGENDA

2A. Minutes

Minutes from the August 4, 2021 RMC meeting are presented for approval.

2B. Ethernet Switches to Support New Fare Collection System Contract Award

Staff recommends that the RMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute a contract with CDW-G to purchase ethernet switches and cables to support the new Vix fare collection system in an amount not to exceed $366,000.
3. Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events

Chair Brady will request future RMC agenda items from members and members may provide a report on current events.

4. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the RMC is scheduled for Wednesday, October 6, 2021 at 11:00 a.m.

Qualified sign language interpreters are available with 72 hours notice. Materials in alternative formats (large print or flash drive) are available upon request. For further information, please call Valley Metro at 602-262-7433 or TTY at 602-251-2039. To attend this meeting via teleconference, contact the receptionist at 602-262-7433 for the dial-in-information. The supporting information for this agenda can be found on our web site at www.valleymetro.org
DATE
August 25, 2021

SUBJECT
Public Comment

PURPOSE
Public comment is being taken in written format and will be entered into the official minutes of the meeting.

COST AND BUDGET
None

RECOMMENDATION
This item is presented for information only.

BACKGROUND | DISCUSSION | CONSIDERATION
None

COMMITTEE PROCESS
None

CONTACT
Scott Smith
Chief Executive Officer
602-262-7433
ssmith@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
None
Rail Management Committee
Wednesday, August 4, 2021
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)
Eric Iwerson, City of Tempe (phone)

Chair Brady called the meeting to order at 12:47 p.m.

1. Public Comment

For today's meeting, public comments are being taken in a written format and will be entered into the official minutes of the meeting.

No public comment has been received.

2. Minutes

Chair Brady said minutes from the June 2, 2021 RMC meeting are presented for approval. Do you have a motion and a second?

IT WAS MOVED BY MARIO PANIAGUA, SECONDED BY ERIC IWERSON AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE JUNE 2, 2021 RMC MEETING MINUTES.

3. Consent Agenda

Chair Brady said items on the consent agenda are being presented for approval.

IT WAS MOVED BY MARIO PANIAGUA, SECONDED BY ERIC IWERSON AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA.
4. Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events

Chair Brady said are there future agenda items? Is there any requests by members for future agenda items? Anybody else? All right.

5. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the RMC is scheduled for Wednesday, September 1, 2021 at 11:00 a.m.

With no further discussion the meeting adjourned at 12:49 p.m.
Information Summary

DATE
Agusut 25, 2021

AGENDA ITEM 2B

SUBJECT
Ethernet Switches to Support New Fare Collection System Contract Award

PURPOSE
To request authorization for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute a contract with CDW-G to purchase ethernet switches and cables to support the new Vix fare collection system in an amount not to exceed $366,000.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the RMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute a contract with CDW-G to purchase ethernet switches and cables to support the new Vix fare collection system in an amount not to exceed $366,000.

BACKGROUND | DISCUSSION | CONSIDERATION
The stations along the original 20-mile alignment, the Central Mesa Extension, and the Northwest Extension are currently using switches that are not Power Over Ethernet (POE) compatible. The new switches which are POE compatible are required to support the new Vix Fare Collection System that will begin to be implemented late this fall. These 49 switches, cables, and licenses will provide the POE and the improved security features we need to be able to support the connection between our platforms and the “cloud” based fare collection system. Additionally, the stations along the original 20-mile alignment are using switches that are roughly 15 years old and are beyond the manufacturer’s recommended useful life.

This purchase is to keep the equipment in a state of good repair and to maintain safe and reliable operation. This is consistent with the approved Transit Asset Management (TAM) Plan.

The switches will be purchased through a cooperative contract with National IPA Technology Solutions (2018011-01). Valley Metro’s Maintenance of Way (MOW) staff will be responsible for installing the new switches along the alignment.

COST AND BUDGET
The cost for the switches, cables, and licenses is in an amount not to exceed $366,000. The cost for the switches are included in the Valley Metro Rail Adopted FY2022 Operating and Capital Budget. Contract obligations beyond FY2022 are incorporated into the Valley Metro Rail Five-Year Operating Forecast and Capital Program (FY2022 thru FY2026).
An independent cost estimate including a cost comparison and price analysis have been completed. The proposed price has been deemed fair and reasonable based on the price analysis.

The source of funding is from Prop 400.

**COMMITTEE PROCESS**
RTAG: August 17, 2021 for information
RMC: September 1, 2021 for action
Board of Directors: September 16, 2021 for action

**CONTACT**
Ray Abraham
Chief Operations Officer
602-652-5054
rabraham@valleymetro.org

**ATTACHMENT**
None
Information Summary

DATE
August 25, 2021

SUBJECT
Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events

PURPOSE
Chair Brady will request future agenda items from members, and members may provide a report on current events.

COST AND BUDGET
None

RECOMMENDATION
This item is presented for information only.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
None

COMMITTEE ACTION
None

CONTACT
Scott Smith
Chief Executive Officer
602-262-7433
ssmith@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
None

Pending Items Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Requested</th>
<th>Date Requested</th>
<th>Planned Follow-up Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>