

Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the Mayor and Council Transit Task Force and to the general public that the Mayor and Council Transit Task Force will hold the following meeting which will be open to the public on:

MEETING NOTICE

MAYOR AND COUNCIL TRANSIT TASK FORCE MONDAY, JULY 1, 2019 AT 3:00 P.M. 4TH FLOOR LARGE CONFERENCE ROOM 201 N. STONE AVE., TUCSON, AZ 85701

AGENDA

TOPICS	TIMATED TRATION
1. Call to Order/Roll Call	5 min.
2. Approval of Minutes – June 3, 2019	3 min.
3. Call to the Audience (First) This is the time for the public to comment. Please note: Members may not discuss items that are not specifically identified on the agenda.	5 min.
4. Transit Updates, Announcements, and Chair's Report for Discussion This is a standing agenda item to inform committee members of relevant transit information within the City of Tucson and around the region.	10 min.
5. Complete Streets Program and Complete Streets Coordinating Council Discussion.	20 min.
6. Draft Letter to Mayor and Council, City Manager, and TDOT Director Regarding the Status of the Transit Task Force	30 min.
7. RATP Dev Contract Performance Incentives/Disincentives	30 min.
8. Call to the Audience (Second) This is the time for the public to comment. Please note: Members may not discuss items that are not specifically identified on the agenda.	5 min.
9. Next Meeting Date – August 5, 2019	2 min.
10. Future Agenda Items	5 min.
11. Adjournment	

Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the Transit Services Division at (520) 791-5409. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.



Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the Mayor and Council Transit Task Force and to the general public that the Mayor and Council Transit Task Force will hold the following meeting which will be open to the public on:

MAYOR AND COUNCIL TRANSIT TASK FORCE MONDAY, JUNE 3, 2019 AT 3:00 P.M. 4TH FLOOR LARGE CONFERENCE ROOM 201 N. STONE AVE., TUCSON, AZ 85701

MEETING MINUTES

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. A quorum was established.

Members Present

Alex Jimenez, Ward 1 – Arrived at 3:08 p.m. B.J. Cordova, City Manager's Office Brian Flagg, Ward 2 Colby Henley, Ward 3 Dale R. Calvert, City Manager's Office – Arrived at 4:05 p.m. Eric Hahn, Ward 5 Lisa Shipek, Mayor's Office Margot Garcia, Ward 6 Nicole Feldt, City Manager's Office James McGinnis (Advisory Member), PAG/RTA

Staff and Others Present Ana Marrufo, City Clerk's Office Suzanne Mesich, City Clerk's Office Laura Bond, TDOT Chris Blue, TDOT Pat Richter, Sun Tran/Sun Van/Sun Link John Zukas, TDOT Patrick Hartley, TDOT Davita Mueller, Sun Tran Steve Spade, Sun Tran/Sun Van/Sun Link Bob McGee, Sun Tran Allen Benz, Tucson Bus Riders' Union Jim Sayre, University of Arizona Matt Kopec, Ward 3 Suzanne Schafer, Citizen

2. Approval of Minutes – May 6, 2019

Motion to approve minutes of May 6, 2019, with corrections, was passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.

3. Call to the Audience (First) None.

Transit Task Force June 3, 2019 Meeting Minutes Approved on July 1, 2019

4. Update on Transit/Announcements/Chair's Report

An update in regards to the position Sam Credio previously held, as Administrator to Transit Services, was given by Chris Blue. Phone screens and oral boards are being held.

Patrick Hartley, Complete Streets Program Coordinator, gave an overview of the Complete Streets program and the Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC), which is being developed. Mr. Hartley explained that the Mayor and Council have given TDOT direction to look into possibly consolidating several BCCs into the CSCC to encourage better coordination and ensure that modal discussions are not happening in a vacuum. TDOT staff will present on the CSCC at the July 9 Mayor and Council study session. Discussion ensued.

Margot Garcia pointed out that her appointing City Council Member, Steve Kozachik, is not in favor of dissolving the TTF. Furthermore, a letter was sent to the Mayor and City Council Members by former TTF Chairpersons stating that they are also opposed to the potential dissolution. This was not a committee-wide decision and the chairpersons acted independently.

Lisa Shipek asked which committees are being considered for dissolution. Mr. Hartley responded that all of the transportation BCCs are being considered and that nothing is certain at this point.

Alex Jimenez asked what the thought was behind the BCCs being eliminated and replaced. Mr. Hartley responded that some BCCs operate in silos and are not communicating well in the current structure. The CSCC would help ensure that within the overall context of transportation decisions are made collectively across all modes.

Brian Flagg asked where this idea came from. Mr. Hartley did not know. Mr. Henley stated that this idea has been bounced around for a while.

Ms. Garcia gave a brief historical overview of the TTF and a past, similar effort to create a large oversight committee composed of the chairpersons of the existing BCCs.

Mr. Henley asked the group if they would like to discuss this topic before the July Mayor and Council meeting.

Ms. Garcia asked how the vacancy for the CSCC transit representative would be filled after the Chair's tenure is finished. Mr. Hartley responded that it would be selected by the CSCC. Ms. Garcia commented that it would then become a self-selecting committee.

Mr. Hartley shared that the Request for Qualifications for the Mobility Master Plan has been issued. He is also currently developing Complete Streets Design Guidelines.

Mr. Henley asked about how people will apply to sit on the CSCC and the timeline for its formation. Mr. Hartley explained that they are awaiting the enabling legislation from the Mayor and Council. The assumed timeline for consolidation of existing transportation BCCs

would be 6 months after the convening of the CSCC. But this is dependent on what the existing sunset date is for each BCC.

Steve Spade, General Manager of Sun Tran/Sun Van/Sun Link, gave an update on the Universal Access Program. They are currently working on identifying three or more pilot projects as part of the Mayor and Council initiative. So far, they've secured agreement with Marist Apartments, an 85-unit complex, which will purchase annual passes for residents and employees. Mr. Spade has also had discussions with the Tucson Unified School District to offer the program through Santa Rita, Catalina, and Cholla High Schools. The proposal is going to the school board on June 18 and will be voted on June 25. Discussion ensued.

Lisa Shipek asked Mr. Spade to share more about how the school program works. Mr. Spade gave an example of Santa Rita High School, where some students don't have access to the school bus. In this case, a Sun Tran bus would be deviated to pick up the students. The students would use their discounted passes to pay for their fares. He added that at Catalina High School, all students would receive an annual pass. At Cholla High School, an analysis was performed to see where students live. Students living within ¹/₄ mile of a bus route will receive annual pass.

Alex Jimenez asked how each school's demographics are factored in. Mr. Spade responded that they engaged TUSD to find out what their challenges are: Catalina High School has a hard time providing school bus service; Cholla High School will be able to reduce costs.

Colby Henley asked when data from the program would become available. Mr. Spade said after a few months they should have a sense of what's going on.

Brian Flagg if they plan on taking it to other schools/apartments. Mr. Spade said yes, that's the idea. They'll be reaching out to Sunnyside School District and various apartment complexes and businesses in the future.

Ms. Shipek, using Catalina High School as an example, asked if the students can use the pass outside of school hours. Mr. Spade said yes, the idea is they can use it for extracurricular activities, weekend travel, teaching a life skill, and it shows them how to use the transit system.

Mr. Flagg asked how the program will affect Sun Tran financially. Mr. Spade responded that they will probably not see a loss in revenue; in fact, they should see a significant increase in ridership.

Ms. Shipek asked if there is any kind of orientation program. Mr. Spade said yes, they're working with the district and schools. They will also be holding meetings with parents and kids. In situations where parents are concerned, they will provide passes to allow parents to ride the buses with kids.

Margot Garcia asked how much the passes will be worth on the black market. Mr. Spade responded that, unfortunately, some of that always goes on, but he'd like to think it's a small percentage.

Transit Task Force June 3, 2019 Meeting Minutes Approved on July 1, 2019 Mr. Spade shared that last month they submitted a grant application to help address human trafficking. Mr. Spade proceeded to give an overview of the grant application.

James McGinnis with PAG/RTA said they will be having a Transit Working Group meeting next week. He added that the PAG Long-Range Regional Transit Plan consultant is still working on the draft plan.

5. Arizona Open Meeting Law Presentation by City Clerk's Office

Ana Marrufo, City Clerk Management Assistant, and Suzanne Mesich, Assistant City Clerk, gave an overview of Arizona Open Meeting Law. Discussion ensued.

Margot Garcia asked if the room size requirements apply to Mayor and Council. She explained that there are times when they are unable to accommodate all of the people. Ms. Garcia said she has been excluded in the past due to the room being too full. Ms. Marrufo said that there is an overflow room with a television to address these situations.

Lisa Shipek asked what was meant by reports being allowed for statements, but not for discussion. Colby Henley offered the Chair's Report as an example. Suzanne Mesich responded that if there is a discussion, it needs to be noted on the agenda.

Ms. Garcia requested clarification regarding communication between members outside of the scheduled meeting regarding topics that are not on the agenda. Ms. Mesich responded that they are cautioning, not prohibiting, the members from discussions or team-building activities outside of the meetings.

Chris Blue asked if TTF members can communicate with the audience/citizens after the meeting has been called to order. Ms. Marrufo responded that this is up to the Chair and members to regulate. They have the ability to set rules for the meeting. It is not okay to be disruptive during the meeting.

6. Coordinated Efforts to Increase Ridership Discussion (taken out of order)

This item was taken out of order by Chair Colby Henley. Mr. Henley introduced the topic and gave an overview of the existing efforts to increase ridership and reduce auto travel as well as economic development efforts that incentivize driving. He explained that he'd like to get the various stakeholders together in an effort to better coordinate and not be at cross purposes.

Margot Garcia commented that part of this issue is the political will and part is staffing. She offered an historical example. She added that at the staff level recommendations are being made to leadership with the understanding that they have researched the topic and are knowledgeable, which isn't always the case.

Ms. Garcia gave the example of the Broadway Volvo Planned Area Development Zone, which did not include mention of the Frequent Transit Network. This demonstrates that City departments are not interacting as they could.

Steve Spade commented that Complete Streets and mobility planning, as envisioned by the TDOT Director, Diana W. Alarcon, will help with the silos. The idea of having an overall commission will also help. He added that there are already discussions with Rio Nuevo and business leaders about how we can work collaboratively together.

Dale Calvert said he had a conversation with Ms. Alarcon, and she is concerned about the silo issue. Mr. Calvert hopes the City is not building any more parking structures. He gave the example of a new downtown development with no parking. As a former restaurateur, he spoke of the importance of bringing people to businesses beyond the transit system. He believes there needs to be a balance of both parking and transit and this is an ongoing discussion.

Brian Flagg asked Dale Calvert how the new development can have no parking. Mr. Calvert responded that everywhere but in the central business district, there has been an exception in place for many years that exempts or reduces the parking requirements. One of the biggest issues is the silo issue.

Mr. Flagg asked Mr. Calvert if there is enough parking downtown; Mr. Calvert thinks so.

Mr. Henley would like to see some of the incentives offered by Rio Nuevo to be transit, not just free parking.

Mr. Calvert discussed the composition of the Rio Nuevo Board. He commented that these items are not necessarily high priority items for the legislature, which controls the Board.

Ms. Garcia commented that what is getting built is influenced at the staffing level. The Mayor and Council has some control over them. She added that citizens should be asking the mayoral candidates questions to let them know citizens are interested in this topic.

Mr. Henley asked the group if going through the process of developing the Mobility Master Plan is enough to address this, or is there merit to push stakeholders for further discussion on the topic?

Mr. Spade commented that it's multilayered and is "a tough nut to crack." It must be addressed on multiple levels.

Mr. Flagg said the TTF needs to pursue this because it makes their work credible and gets at the real issues. Brian gave an example of the Barrio Initiative.

Mr. Calvert commented that if we want the issue to be out there we need to be proactive and talk to candidates. You also have to be realistic about the options and how things will fit together.

Alex Jimenez asked which department provides transit information to developers and if they're doing outreach to developers looking to build parking spaces. Mr. Henley responded that this is handled by Planning and Development Services. Lisa Shipek added that businesses are required to build parking spaces, but there are no transit requirements. She gave the example of her non-profit that provides transit passes to its employees.

Mr. Spade stated that as part of the recent transit-oriented development discussions, Mayor and Council is looking into adding transit requirements to development agreements.

Mr. Flagg would like to pursue this further and come up with positions. Ms. Jimenez asked if this would be a letter to Mayor and Council. Mr. Henley responded that could be one initial step.

7. Sun Tran Marketing Plan Presentation (taken out of order)

Pat Richter, Director of Marketing for Sun Tran/Sun Van/Sun Link, gave an overview of the FY 2020–2021 Marketing Plan and the associated marketing and communications strategies to be implemented. Discussion ensued.

Margot Garcia requested that the marketing staff look into "gimmicky" activities, like a Ride to Work with the Mayor event.

Eric Hahn asked if there are any wearable marketing items, like t-shirts, that could be distributed with annual passes. Mr. Richter said there are not at this time. Ms. Garcia thinking of airports, they might give you a t-shirt if you sign up for a credit card.

Lisa Shipek asked if there are there additional budget funds or resources to work on this initiative. Mr. Richter responded that they have applied for some grant monies. But they do need to be strategic about how money is spent.

8. Call to the Audience (Second)

Allen Benz said he noticed some damage at a bus stop in front of Park Place Mall. Called it in, shortly thereafter it had been repaired.

Suzanne Schafer, a long-time bus rider, remarked that she thought a wearable button with route number would be a great idea. She also stated that there is a need for real-time information available to riders. She's been told it's very expensive and costs a lot of money and that having schedules at all stops would cost a lot of money. She pointed out that the Sun Tran app isn't the best solution for a variety of reasons, such as customers not having internet/data on their devices or even owning smart phones. She suggested riders be surveyed where they get their information and if they have access to the internet while commuting. She also suggested a system where people could text/call to find out when the next bus is coming.

9. Next Meeting Date – July 1, 2019

10. Future Agenda Items

11. Adjournment – 5:05 p.m.

Transit Task Force June 3, 2019 Meeting Minutes Approved on July 1, 2019



July 1, 2019

Items 3 and 8: Calls to the Audience

<u>Issue</u> – This is a standing agenda item allowing for the public to comment. Please note: Members may not discuss items that are not specifically identified on the agenda.

<u>Staff Recommendation</u> – None at this time. This is an information item.

<u>Background</u> – The memo accompanying these agenda items is intended to provide follow up information to the TTF regarding the public inquiries during the call to the audience agenda items from the previous meeting.

<u>Present Consideration</u> – Staff responses from the questions during the previous meeting's Call to the Audience agenda items are provided below:

 1^{st} Call to the Audience – None.

2nd Call to the Audience – None.

Financial Considerations – None at this time.

<u>Attachment(s)</u> – None at this time.



July 1, 2019

Item 4: Update on Transit/Announcements/Chair's Report

<u>Issue</u> – This is a standing agenda item to inform committee members of relevant transit information within the City of Tucson and around the region.

<u>Staff Recommendation</u> – None at this time; this is an information item.

<u>Background</u> – There are several city departments, interest groups, and committees that are discussing various aspects of public transportation. Committee members as well as staff will have the opportunity to share information with the group and give updates on relevant projects.

<u>Present Consideration</u> – A list of projects, committees and stakeholders is provided below for a possible update to task force members.

City of Tucson Updates: Transit Administrator Position Recruitment

Sun Tran, Sun Link and Sun Van Updates:

Route 15 Service to GEICO – Employer Outreach and Training Lost and Found Program

Regional Updates: None at this time

None at this time.

Committee Updates: None at this time.

Stakeholder Group Updates:

Broadway Coalition Bus Riders Union Bus Friends Forever Friends of the Streetcar Living Streets Alliance Old Pueblo Trolley

Southern Arizona Transit Advocates Boards, Committees, and Commissions Stakeholders Transit Connections Focus Group PAG/RTA Citizens Advisory Committee

<u>Financial Considerations</u> – None at this time.

Attachments – None at this time.



July 1, 2019

Item 5: Complete Streets Program and Complete Streets Coordinating Council Discussion

<u>Issue</u> – Staff from the Department of Transportation will be in attendance to discuss the Complete Streets Program and Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC).

<u>Staff Recommendation</u> – None at this time.

<u>Background</u> – At the June 3, 2019 TTF meeting, staff provided an update on the Complete Streets Program and CSCC. TTF members expressed interest in continuing this conversation and subsequently added this item to the July 1, 2019 TTF agenda.

Present Consideration – None at this time.

Financial Considerations – None at this time.

Attachments – None at this time.



July 1, 2019

Item 6: Draft Letter to Mayor and Council, City Manager, and TDOT Director Regarding the Status of the Transit Task Force

<u>Issue</u> – With the pending formation of the Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC), questions remain regarding the future status of several transportation-focused BCCs, including the TTF.

Time was requested to discuss a draft letter addressing the status of the TTF, which was prepared by Chair Colby Henley and disseminated to TTF members by staff on June 25, 2019.

<u>Staff Recommendation</u> – None at this time.

<u>Background</u> – At the June 3, 2019 TTF meeting, staff from the Complete Streets Program provided a brief update on the formation of the Program and the yet-to-be formed CSCC. Several TTF members expressed concerns over how the CSCC could potentially impact the TTF.

On June 25, 2019, staff disseminated a letter to TTF members, prepared by and at the request of Chair Colby Henley, for review prior to the July 1, 2019 TTF meeting. The letter addresses the abovementioned concerns.

Present Consideration – See attached draft letter.

Financial Considerations – None at this time.

<u>Attachments</u> – Draft Letter to Mayor and Council, City Manager, and TDOT Director Regarding the Status of the Transit Task Force

July 3, 2019

Honorable Mayor and City Council Members, City Manager, and Director of Tucson Department of Transportation

RE: Status of Transit Task Force

We, the Transit Task Force (TTF), are aware that the Tucson Department of Transportation is considering the elimination of some or all of the transportation related Boards, Commissions, and Committees (BCC), as well as the TTF, in conjunction with the creation of the new Complete Streets Coordinating Council (CSCC).

We appreciate the Department's desire to reduce redundancies and inefficiencies in the City's public input bodies and we are encouraged to see and support the inclusion of a transit representative on the CSCC. The CSCC will provide a critical opportunity to examine the role public transit can and should play in the overall mobility of our city and region. However, we are greatly concerned that if the TTF is eliminated, the broader mission and goals of the CSCC will not allow the time needed for the detailed analysis and review of many transit-specific issues.

The TTF has a history of providing thoughtful and considered input on a wide range of topics, including rate structures, route modifications, the adoption and expansion of the Frequent Transit Network, budgets, marketing, user experiences, connectivity to other modes, transit center amenities and policies, and more. The TTF also serves as a critical interface with transit customers who are able to share their personal experiences as users of the system and bring often unrecognized issues to light.

We envision the TTF continuing its important work of advising on many of the transit-specific topics listed above, while also working collaboratively with the CSCC, through a representative to that body, in order to elevate those issues that would warrant consideration in a broader mobility context. We would eagerly work with the Department to explore and test what division of responsibilities would be most effective and efficient.

Therefore, we request that the TTF not be eliminated and request that the TTF be transitioned from a task force into a formal advisory BCC with Bylaws reflecting these responsibilities.

[Approved (unanimously?) by the Transit Task Force on July 3, 2019.]

Respectfully submitted,



July 1, 2019

Item 7: RATP Dev Contract Performance Indicators/Incentives-Disincentives

<u>Issue</u> – At the request of the TTF Chair, the purpose of this agenda item is to provide the TTF with a brief overview of the Transit System Management Services contract performance indicators/incentives-disincentives.

<u>Staff Recommendation</u> – None at this time.

<u>Background</u> – In May of this year, after a competitive selection process, the City entered into a contract with RATP Dev, the incumbent transit management company, to manage the fixed route (Sun Tran), paratransit (Sun Van), and streetcar (Sun Link) systems.

The contract contains various monthly performance indicators/incentives-disincentives, which are as follows:

- 1. On-time Performance
- 2. Passenger Complaints
- 3. Total Preventable Accidents (*metric to be determined)
- 4. Revenue Miles between Road Calls
- 5. Preventative Maintenance Plans
- 6. Traffic Citations (*metric to be determined)
- 7. Mean Distance Between Failures
- 8. Sun Tran & Sun Link Annual Ridership

If the contractor exceeds the goals established for these metrics, a monetary incentive will be applied to the monthly invoice. If the contractor fails to meet these metrics, there will be a reduction in the monthly fee.

The contract also includes an annual ridership incentive whereby the contractor receives an incentive for each 1% increase in ridership annually (10% maximum). This has been included as a way to incentivize the contractor to grow ridership on an annual basis.

Present Consideration – None at this time.

Financial Considerations – None at this time.

<u>Attachments</u> – Attachment B "PERFORMANCE INDICATORS/Incentives-Disincentives" from RFP No. 181849 – Transit System Management Services

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO. 181849 PAGE 20 OF 54 CONTRACT OFFICER: Dan Longanecker PH: (520) 837-4125. / FAX: (520) 791-4735

III. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS/Incentives-Disincentives

All performance indicators and incentives-disincentives will be strictly enforced. Performance indicators are metrics developed by the City to measure Contractor's performance. City representatives may, without prior notice, ride in Contractor-operated vehicles to ensure compliance with the Scope of Work. All performance specifications will be strictly adhered to in order to provide the highest level of quality service possible. City reserves the right to monitor Contractor in its performance of the Agreement to ensure adherence to all performance specifications. City also reserves the right to annually negotiate the performance requirements in this section both as to the criteria and as to the number of indicators to facilitate continuous improvement.

Overall, contract performance indicators will be established and tracked using the following guidelines:

- The Contractor should have the ability to largely control the performance indicator.
- The indicator should be easily tracked and analyzed.
- Performance goals for each indicator should be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timebound (SMART).
- Performance indicators will include incentives for exceeding performance goals and disincentives for not achieving performance goals.

The City or an independent third party will periodically verify the contractor's performance source data to ensure the integrity of the process.

Definitions relating to incentives/disincentives, for each mode, are included at the end of this section.

Sun Tran:

1. On-time Performance:

The Incentive/Disincentive will be offered on a monthly basis at time of invoicing:

On-time Performance %	Incentive	Disincentive
>96.00%	+\$500	N/A
94.00% - 95.99%	+250	N/A
92.00% - 93.99%	Goal	Goal
91.00% - 91.99%	N/A	-\$250
88.00% - 90.99%	N/A	-\$500

2. Passenger Complaints per 100,000 Boardings (Sun Tran and Sun Link Combined):

This metric will be measured monthly per 100,000 passenger boardings and is to include Sun Tran and Sun Link complaints. The City will ultimately decide the validity of complaints in its review of the customer service database. The Incentive/Disincentive will be offered on a monthly basis at time of invoicing:

Passenger Complaints per 100,000 Passenger Boardings	Incentive	Disincentive
<2.50	+\$500	N/A
2.50 - 3.99	+\$250	N/A
4.00 - 4.50	Goal	Goal
4.51 - 6.00	N/A	-\$250
>6.00	N/A	-\$500

3. Total Preventable Accidents/Incidents:

Preventable accidents shall be recorded by month and the Incentive/Disincentive will be offered on a monthly basis at time of invoicing:

	AC id m-Rate		Dincentive
0		+\$500	N/A
1		N/A	-\$1,000
2 and above		N/A	-\$2,000

4. Revenue Miles between Road Calls:

Revenue Miles between Road Calls shall be recorded by month and the Incentive/Disincentive will be offered on a monthly basis at time of invoicing:

Revenue Miles Between Road Calls	Incentive	Disincentive
>15,000	+\$500	N/A
13,000 – 14,999	+\$250	N/A
11,000 – 12,999	Goal	Goal
10,000 – 10,999	N/A	-\$250
<10,000	N/A	-\$500

5. <u>Preventive Maintenance Plans:</u>

Sun Tran shall have an adopted preventive maintenance plans that meet Section IV. Fleet Maintenance Plans of the RFP. The Contractor must meet a goal of at least 90% on-time performance regarding all preventive maintenance within those adopted plans on a monthly basis. If Contractor has not met at least 90% on-time performance regarding all preventive maintenance, an immediate corrective action plan must be submitted prior to the next month's reporting and the Contractor will be subjected to the monthly disincentives described in the table below. If the preventative maintenance goal is exceeded, the contractor will receive a monthly incentive also described below. The designated monthly incentive/disincentive will be applied to the monthly invoice:

On-time Performance %	Incentive	Disincentive
100% (not to exceed 105%)	+\$500	N/A
95.01% - 99.99%	+\$250	N/A
90.00% - 95.00%	Goal	Goal
85.00% - 89.99%	N/A	-\$250
<85.00%	N/A	-\$500

6. Traffic Citations:

For all citations received by any Contractor employee while operating a City-owned vehicle (i.e. Sun Tran, and Sun Van revenue and/or non revenue vehicle), payment reductions of \$750.00 for each occur ence will be deducted from the point report. After a traffic each on sective to any Control of mole e, neither a misdemean r componies in the components, of the action of after chool with grounds to dismiss the citation nor dismiss the payment reduction of \$750.00 per occurrence.

7. Annual Ridership:

The Contractor will receive a \$10,000 incentive for each 1% increase over the baseline ridership forecast included in the annual budget with a 10% maximum. There will be no disincentive for not reaching this goal.

Increase Ridership	Incentive	Disincentive
For each 1% increase above Goal (10% Maximum)	\$10,000	N/A
Baseline ridership	Goal	Goal

8. Sun Tran Incentive/ Summary:

Excluding the disincentive for Traffic Citations, the following table summarizes the monthly incentive/disincentives for the aforementioned performance indicators:

Performance Indicator	Maximum Incentive	Maximum Disincentive
On-Time Performance	+\$500	-\$500
Complaints Per 100,000 Boardings	+\$500	-\$500
Total preventable accidents/incidents	+\$500	-\$2,000
Revenue Miles Between Road Calls	+\$500	-\$500
On-Time Performance (Preventative Maintenance)	+\$500	-\$500
Sun Tran Monthly Maximum Total Possible:	+\$2,500	-\$4,000

Sun Van

1. On-time Performance:

The Incentive/Disincentive will be offered on a monthly basis at time of invoicing:

On-time Performance %	Incentive	Disincentive
>96.00%	+\$500	N/A
95.00% - 95.99%	+250	N/A
94.00% - 94.99%	Goal	Goal
91.00% - 93.99%	N/A	-\$250
88.00% - 90.99%	N/A	-\$500

2. Passenger Complaints per 1,000 Passenger Trips:

This metric will be measured monthly per 1,000 passenger trips. The City will ultimately decide the validity of complaints in its review of the customer service database. The designated percentage of the monthly billing will be calculated for payment reduction:

Passenger Complaints per 1,000 Passenger Trips	Incentive	Disincentive
<0.20	+\$500	N/A
0.20 - 0.29	+\$250	N/A
0.30 – 0.40	Goal	Goal
0.41 – 0.50	N/A	-\$250
>0.50	N/A	-\$500

3. Total Preventable Accidents/Incidents:

Preventable accidents shall be recorded by month and the Incentive/Disincentive will be offered on a monthly basis at time of invoicing:

	ler F 🗠	c nt e	L sincentive
		+\$500	N/A
1		N/A	-\$1,000
2 and above		N/A	-\$2,000

4. Traffic Citations:

For all citations received by any Contractor employee while operating a City-owned vehicle (i.e. Sun Tran, and Sun Van revenue and/or nor revenue vehicle, payment reductions of \$750.00 for each occur ence will be deducted firm the point van operation. After a traffic enation of equiver to any Cantri contractor molosee, neither a misdemeanar componies that the components, of the accordance of haff cachool with the grounds to dismiss the citation nor dismiss the payment reduction of \$750.00 per occurrence.

5. Sun Van Incentive/ Summary:

Excluding the disincentive for Traffic Citations, the following table summarizes the monthly incentive/disincentives for the aforementioned performance indicators:

Performance Indicator	Maximum Incentive	Maximum Disincentive
On-Time Performance	+\$500	-\$500
Passenger Complaints Per 1,000 Passenger Trips	+\$500	-\$500
Total Preventable Accidents/Incidents	+\$500	-\$2,000
Sun Van Monthly Maximum Total Possible:	+\$1,500	-\$3,000

Sun Link

1. Total Preventable Accidents/Incidents Per Month:

Preventable accidents shall be recorded by month and the Incentive/Disincentive will be offered on a monthly basis at time of invoicing:

		con le 🕒 ite	Jei	nc n ve	Dis ncentive
0				+\$500	N/A
1				N/A	-\$1,000
2 and abov	'e			N/A	-\$2,000

2. Mean Distance Between Failures (MDBF):

- a. Mean distance between failures shall be recorded by month and the Incentive/Disincentive will be offered on a monthly basis at time of invoicing.
- b. Within the Sun Link definitions relating to incentives/disincentives includes in Table 1 which shows the various minimum times between failures for the listed nine (9) systems. "Failure" is defined as a streetcar that has been removed from or cannot enter revenue service after being cleared for revenue service use, or if a train arrives at a destination station more than 10 minutes later than its scheduled time, excluding delay factors outside the Contractor's control.
- c. The most restrictive system requirement within Table 1 is 2,000 hours, which is equivalent to 20,000 miles based on an average speed of 10 mph. The approximate miles traveled per streetcar, per month is 2,500. The table below shows the incentive/disincentive. Failures attributable to vehicle warranty issues or fleet defect items will not be charged against this measure.

d. If City inspection of the maintenance records reveals that the fleet is being neglected or preventative maintenance is not be adhered to, per the streetcar manufacturer's inspection and maintenance manuals, an immediate corrective action plan must be submitted prior to the next month's reporting.

MDBF (all streetcars)	Incentive	Disincentive
>20,000	+\$500	N/A
17,500 – 19,999	+\$250	N/A
15,000 – 17,499	Goal	Goal
12,500 – 14,999	N/A	-\$250
<12,500	N/A	-\$500

3. Preventive Maintenance Plans:

Sun Link shall have an adopted preventive maintenance plans that meet Section IV. Fleet Maintenance Plans of the RFP. The Contractor must meet a goal of at least 90% on-time performance regarding all preventive maintenance within those adopted plans on a monthly basis. If Contractor has not met at least 90% on-time performance regarding all preventive maintenance, an immediate corrective action plan must be submitted prior to the next month's reporting and the Contractor will be subjected to the monthly disincentives described in the table below. If the preventative maintenance goal is exceeded, the contractor will receive a monthly incentive also described below. The designated monthly incentive/disincentive will be applied to the monthly invoice:

On-time Performance %	Incentive	Disincentive
100% (not to exceed 105%)	+\$500	N/A
95.01% - 99.99%	+\$250	N/A
90.00% - 95.00%	Goal	Goal
85.00% - 89.99%	N/A	-\$250
<85.00%	N/A	-\$500

4. Traffic Citations:

For all citations received by any Contractor employee while operating a City-owned vehicle (i.e. Sun Tran, and our Van received and/or remevenue tehicle), payment reductions of \$750,00 for each occurrence will be deduced from the min divisivo (e). After a fracting calor dis inceived by any Contractor employee, neither a disdet ection componence, civil traffic compression of the attendance of traffic school will be grounds to dismiss the citation nor dismiss the payment reduction of \$750.00 per occurrence.

5. Annual Ridership:

The Contractor will receive a \$1,000 incentive for each 1% increase over the baseline ridership forecast included in the annual budget with a 10% maximum. There will be no disincentive for not reaching this goal.

Increase Ridership	Incentive	Disincentive
For each 1% increase above Goal (10% Maximum)	\$1,000	N/A
Baseline Ridership	Goal	Goal

6. Sun Link Incentive/ Summary:

Excluding the disincentive for Traffic Citations, the following table summarizes the monthly incentive/disincentives for the aforementioned performance indicators:

Performance Indicator	Maximum Incentive	Maximum Disincentive
Total Preventable Accidents/Incidents	+\$500	-\$2,000
Mean Distance Between Failure	+\$500	-\$500
Preventive Maintenance Plans	+\$500	-\$500
Sun Link Monthly Maximum Total Possible:	+\$1,500	-\$3,000

System Summary: Excluding the disincentive for Traffic Citations, the following table summarizes the monthly incentive/disincentives for the aforementioned performance indicators:

Transit System	Monthly Maximum Incentive	Monthly Maximum Disincentive
Sun Tran	+\$2,500	-\$4,000
Sun Van	+\$1,500	-\$3,000
Sun Link	+\$1,500	-\$3,000
System <u>Monthly</u> Maximum Total:	+\$5,500	-\$10,000
System <u>Annual</u> Maximum Total:	+\$66,000	-\$120,000

Transit System	Annual Ridership Maximum Incentive
Sun Tran	+\$100,000
Sun Link	+\$10,000
Ridership <u>Annual</u> Maximum Incentive Total:	+\$110,000

Transit System	Monthly Maximum Incentive	Monthly Maximum Disincentive
Total System <u>Annual</u> Maximum Incentive/Disincentive	+\$176,000	-\$120,000

Definitions Relating to Incentives/Disincentives:

Sun Tran:

- **On-Time Performance:** a Sun Tran revenue service vehicle may be up to 5 minutes later than the scheduled time point or less than five minutes early than the scheduled time point and be considered "on-time". On a continual basis, this would be determined through reports using Sun Tran's software system and their coordinating GPS system as it relates to the associated time points as included in the Sun Tran route schedule.
- Passenger Complaints: A valid passenger complaint is a complaint received in the customer service database in which the Contractor or its employee is alleged to have failed to perform the required service appropriately (including complaints of missed trip, late bus, operator rudeness, etc.).
- **Preventable Accident/Incident:** an accident/incident occurring on transit property or otherwise affecting revenue service that results in one or more of the following occurrences:
 - A fatality confirmed within 30 days of the accident and/or

- An injury requiring immediate transport away from the scene for medical attention (1 or more persons) and/or
- o Estimated property damage equal to or exceeding \$25,000 and/or
- Collisions that:
 - Meet an injury, fatality, property damage, or evacuation threshold and/or
 - Involve transit revenue roadway vehicles and the towing away of any vehicles (transit or nontransit) from the scene
- An evacuation for life safety reasons

AND;

Is considered preventable based on the following:

- Vehicle operator/employee was not operating vehicle at a speed suitable for the existing conditions of road/rail, with weather, traffic and/or
- Vehicle operator/employee failed to control speed so that he/she could stop within assured clear distance and/or
- o Vehicle operator/employee misjudged available clearance and/or
- o Vehicle operator/employee failed to yield right-of-way to avoid an accident and/or
- o Vehicle operator/employee failed to accurately observe existing conditions and/or
- Vehicle operator/employee was in violation of company operating rules or special instructions, the regulation of any Federal or State regulatory agency, or any applicable traffic laws or ordinances.
- **Road Call:** a mechanical failure of a vehicle in revenue service that causes a delay to service, and which necessitates removing the bus from service until repairs are made.

Definitions Relating to Incentives/Disincentives:

Sun Van:

- On-Time Performance: a Sun Van revenue service vehicle is considered on-time when the revenue service vehicle arrives between 15 minutes before or 15 minutes after the requested pickup time. On a continual basis, this would be determined through reports using Sun Van's software system and their coordinating GPS system as it relates to Sun Van passengers requests.
- **Passenger Complaints:** A valid passenger complaint is a complaint received in the customer service database in which the Contractor or its employee is alleged to have failed to perform the required service appropriately (including complaints of missed trip, late bus, operator rudeness, etc.).
- **Preventable Accident/Incident:** an accident/incident occurring on transit property or otherwise affecting revenue service that results in one or more of the following occurrences:
 - A fatality confirmed within 30 days of the accident and/or
 - An injury requiring immediate transport away from the scene for medical attention (1 or more persons) and/or
 - Estimated property damage equal to or exceeding \$25,000 and/or
 - Collisions that :
 - Meet an injury, fatality, property damage, or evacuation threshold and/or
 - Involve transit revenue roadway vehicles and the towing away of any vehicles (transit or nontransit) from the scene
 - An evacuation for life safety reasons

AND;

Is considered preventable based on the following:

- Vehicle operator/employee was not operating vehicle at a speed suitable for the existing conditions of road/rail, with weather, traffic and/or
- Vehicle operator/employee failed to control speed so that he/she could stop within assured clear distance and/or
- o Vehicle operator/employee misjudged available clearance and/or
- Vehicle operator/employee failed to yield right-of-way to avoid an accident and/or
- Vehicle operator/employee failed to accurately observe existing conditions and/or
- Vehicle operator/employee was in violation of company operating rules or special instructions, the regulation of any Federal or State regulatory agency, or any applicable traffic laws or ordinances.
- Road Call: a mechanical failure of a vehicle in revenue service that causes a delay to service, and which necessitates removing the bus from service until repairs are made. Sun Van management will monitor road calls and work with respective maintenance contractor to mitigate the number of road calls per the terms of the contract.

Definitions Relating to Incentives/Disincentives:

Sun Link:

• Mean Distance Between Failures (MTBF): is the predicted elapsed distance between inherent <u>failures</u> of a mechanical or electronic system, during normal system operation. "Failure" is defined as a streetcar that has been removed from or cannot enter revenue service after being cleared for revenue service use, or if a train arrives at a destination station more than 10 minutes later than its scheduled time, excluding delay factors outside the Contractor's control.

Т	able	e 1
	abit	

Modern Streetcar Systems	MTBF (hours per car)
Carbody & Appointments, including seating, windows, cab equipment	4,000
Propulsion, Dynamic Brake & Controls including gear case	4,000
Friction Braking, including track brake and sanders, and load leveling controls (if provided)	3,500
Communications and passenger information	7,500
Passenger Doors & Controls, including bridgeplates	2,500
Lighting	20,000
Electrical, including the vehicle network and cab controls, and apparatus not included in other systems. Excludes equipment internal to other systems.	5,000
HVAC	6,000
Trucks & Suspension including load leveling suspension elements	10,000

- **On-Time Performance:** a Sun Link revenue service vehicle may be up to 5 minutes later than the scheduled time point but less than five minutes early than the scheduled time point and be considered "on-time". On a continual basis, this would be determined through reports using Sun Link's software system and their coordinating GPS system as it relates to the associated time points as included in the Sun Link's headway schedule.
- **Passenger Complaints:** A valid passenger complaint is a complaint received in the customer service database in which the Contractor or its employee is alleged to have failed to perform the required service appropriately (including complaints of missed trip, late bus, operator rudeness, etc.).
- **Preventable Accident/Incident:** an accident/incident occurring on transit property or otherwise affecting revenue service that results in one or more of the following occurrences:
 - A fatality confirmed within 30 days of the accident and/or
 - o Injuries:
 - (non-serious injuries) that require immediate transport away from the scene for medical attention (1 or more persons) requiring immediate transport away from the scene for medical attention (1 or more persons),
 - (serious injuries) whether or not the person is transported away from the scene for medical attention (1 or more), but that
 - require hospitalization for more than 48 hours, commencing within 7 days from the date of the event;
 - result in a fracture of any bone (except simple fractures of fingers, toes, or nose);
 - cause severe hemorrhages, nerve muscle, or tendon damage;
 - involve an internal organ; or

- involve second or third-degree burns affecting more than five percent of the body surface and/or
- Substantial damage: damage to any involved vehicles, facilities, equipment, rolling stock, or infrastructure that disrupts the operations of the rail transit agency and adversely affects the structural strength, performance, or operating characteristics of the vehicle, facility, equipment, rolling stock, or infrastructure, requiring towing, rescue, on-site maintenance, or immediate removal prior to safe operation and/or
 Collisions that :
 - Meet an injury, fatality, substantial damage, or evacuation threshold and/or
 - Occur at a rail grade crossing and/or
 - Involve an individual in the right-of-way and/or
 - Involve a rail transit vehicle and a second rail transit vehicle and/or
- o Derailments: Both mainline and yard derailments and non-revenue vehicle derailments and/or
- Runaway Train: Events involving a runaway train with or without the operator on board. These include movement of a rail transit vehicle on the mainline, yard, or shop that is uncommanded, uncontrolled, or unmanned due to an incapacitated, sleeping, or absent operator, or the failure of a rail transit vehicle's electrical, mechanical, or software system or subsystem.

AND;

Is considered preventable based on the following:

- Vehicle operator/employee was not operating vehicle at a speed suitable for the existing conditions of road/rail, with weather, traffic and/or
- Vehicle operator/employee failed to control speed so that he/she could stop within assured clear distance and/or
- o Vehicle operator/employee misjudged available clearance and/or
- Vehicle operator/employee failed to yield right-of-way to avoid an accident and/or
- Vehicle operator/employee failed to accurately observe existing conditions and/or
- Vehicle operator/employee was in violation of company operating rules or special instructions, the regulation of any Federal or State regulatory agency, or any applicable traffic laws or ordinances.