One Gateway Plaza Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

213.922. metro.n





OPERATIONS COMMITTEE APRIL 20, 2006

# SUBJECT: METRO BLUE AND ORANGE LINE PHOTO ENFORCEMENT

# ACTION: APPROVE AMENDMENT AND PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE EXTENSION WITH AFFILIATED COMPUTER SERVICES FOR PHOTO ENFORCEMENT MAINTENANCE AND CITATION PROCESSING SERVICES

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Authorize the Chief Executive Officer to:

- A. Execute Amendment No. 3 to Contract No.SP035 with Affiliated Computer Services to provide maintenance and citation processing services on the Metro Blue and Orange Lines for a period of five years, inclusive of two one-year options, in the amount not to exceed \$6,072,000.
- B. Increase the Total Contract Value from \$3,497,960 to \$9,569,960.

#### RATIONALE

Since 2000, Metro has contracted with Affiliated Computer Services (formerly Lockheed Martin IMS) to provide photo enforcement maintenance and citation processing services on the Metro Blue Line.

After the Metro Orange Line commenced operation in October 2005, Metro experienced a few accidents due to motorists violating traffic signals. Mayor Villaraigosa directed Metro, the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD), the Los Angeles Sheriffs Department (LASD), and the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) to partner in an effort to evaluate the efficacy of the existing safety measures and determine if additional mitigation is needed.

The ad-hoc task force focused on three areas for possible enhancement: Engineering, Education, and Enforcement. One of the enforcement elements recommended by the task force was the implementation of photo enforcement technology that would automatically capture violators resulting in citations being issued and mailed to the offenders. Based on the frequency of occurrence of red light violations, the task force recommended the installation of photo enforcement cameras at twelve intersections on an expedited basis to prevent further accidents.

Since Metro already has an existing contract with ACS for the Metro Blue Line, the task force recommended possibly expanding the scope of the contract to provide additional cameras for the Metro Orange Line. Affiliated Computer Services (ACS) responded favorably and extended Metro a proposal that would not only result in no equipment costs to be borne by Metro, but also agreed to extend a maintenance and processing discount of \$550 per month per camera, including the existing cameras on the Metro Blue Line, yielding a total savings of \$2.7 million to Metro over a period of five years in capital and operating costs. The work to be performed consists of operations and Field Maintenance of photo enforcement equipment and citation processing services

The distribution on red light camera violations is governed by Penal Code Section 1463.11. Attached is a letter (Attachment B) from the Superior Court that provides information on the distribution of red light camera revenue and the overall process in distributing revenue by the courts. The existing 16 cameras on the Metro Blue Line generated \$683,985 in violation revenue for Metro in 2004 and \$388,027 in 2005 (or an average of \$33,500 per camera over a two-year period). With the procurement of four additional cameras on the Metro Blue Line and twenty on the Metro Orange Line, Metro could potentially generate additional annual revenue of \$938,000.

# **IMPACTS TO OTHER CONTRACTS**

This recommendation has no impact on other Metro contracts

# **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The current funding of \$550,000 for the Metro Blue Line enforcement system is included in the FY06 budget in cost center 6810, Corporate Safety under project 300022, Metro Blue Line, Line 50316 (Professional Services), and Task 2.4. In FY05, \$547,200 was expended on this line item.

Future funding for the Orange Line Photo Enforcement service will be included in the proposed San Fernando Valley Service Sector FY07 Budget in Cost Center 3363, the Orange Line Project #301012, Task 06.001, Line 50316 Professional Services.

# **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

One alternative is not to authorize the amendment and period of performance extension. This is not recommended as the utilization of photo enforcement equipment at intersections has proven to be an effective deterrent for motorists who violate the traffic laws.

A second alternative would be to compete this procurement. This action is not recommended due to the urgent need for immediate enforcement on the Metro Orange

Line. Should Metro elect to re-procure this service, it would significantly delay the Orange Line camera installations by approximately 15-18 months.

A third alternative is to contract with another vendor for maintenance and citation processing services. This is not recommended as Affiliated Computer Services has an exclusive licensing agreement with GATSO Export, the manufacturer of the cameras used currently on our Metro Blue Line, and Metro's contract with Affiliated Computer Services is valid and in force. Staff would like to maintain uniformity in equipment between the Metro orange Line and the Metro Blue Line.

# **ATTACHMENTS**

- A. Procurement Summary
- A-1. Procurement History
- A-2. List of Subcontractors
- B. Superior Court letter

Prepared by: Abdul Zohbi, Systems Safety Manager

John B. Catoe, Jr. Deputy Chief Executive Officer

 $\mathcal{D}$ 

Roger Snoble // Chief Executive Officer

# BOARD REPORT ATTACHMENT A PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

# METRO PHOTO ENFORCEMENT CONTRACT AMENDMENT

1.	Contract Number: SP035, Amendment No. 3							
2.	Recommended Vendor: ACS Government Solutions							
3.	Cost/Price Analysis Information:							
	A. Bid/Proposed Price:			Recommend	ed P	rice:		
	\$6,072,000			\$6,072,000				
	B. Details of Significant V	ariances a	re ii	n Attachment	A-1.]	D		
4.	Contract Type: Firm Fixe							
5.								
	A. Issued: N/A							
	B. Advertised: N/A C. Pre-proposal Conference: N/A D. Proposals Due: February 9, 2006							
	E. Pre-Qualification Completed: N/A							
	F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics:							
6.	Small Business Participat	ion:		······································				
	A. Bid/Proposal Goal:			Date Small Business Evaluation				
	0%		Completed:					
	N/A							
	B. Small Business Commitment: N/A							
7.	Invitation for Bid/Reques							
	Notifications Sent:	Bids/Pro	pos	Rece		Bids/Proposals Received:		
		up:	_					
	1		1		1			
8.	Evaluation Information:							
	A. Bidders/Proposers Nat	mes:		<u>Bid/Proposal</u>		Best and Final		
				Amount:		Offer Amount:		
	ACS Government Solutions			072,000		\$6,072,000		
	B. Evaluation Methodology: Selection of lowest responsive, responsible bidder.							
Details are in Attachment A-1.C						, responsible biudel,		
9.	Protest Information:					······		
<u> </u>	A. Protest Period End Date: N/A							
	B. Protest Receipt Date: N/A							
	C. Disposition of Protest							
10.	Contract Administrator:		Telephone Number:					
	Mark Lu			213-922-4689				
11.			Te	Telephone Number:				
	Abdul Zohbi			213-922-2114				

#### BOARD REPORT ATTACHMENT A-1 PROCUREMENT HISTORY

#### METRO PHOTO ENFORCEMENT CONTRACT AMENDMENT

## A. Background on Contractor

ACS State & Local Solutions, Inc. is based in Washington, DC and has been in business since 1963. It started as Datacom Systems Corporation, and over the following forty plus years the corporation name was changed several times as results of merger or change of ownership in a parent corporation.

ACS is a provider of business process outsourcing information technology outsourcing and systems integration services to state and local governments. It provides technologybased services with a focus on transaction processing and program management services such as child support payment processing, electronic toll collection, welfare and community services, and traffic violations processing. It also designs, develops, implements, and operates large-scale information technology solutions that support those programs.

ACS is the current service provider for the Metro Blue Line Photo Enforcement contract. It is also the service provider for LA County and City of Montebello Red Light Photo Enforcement contract.

#### B. Procurement Background

On January 27, 2000, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) awarded contract SP035 to Lockheed/Martin IMS to provide system operation and field maintenance services for the Metro Blue Line photo enforcement program. On October 29, 2001 Modification No. 1 was issued to the Contractor to change their name from Lockheed/Martin IMS to ACS State & Local Solutions, Inc. as a result of company acquisition. On December 9, 2004 Modification No. 2 was issued to extend the contract from January 31, 2005 to January 31, 2007 at no additional cost.

Metro staff conducted extensive market surveys and cost benefit analysis in search of potential competitors who would be able to maintain, augment and/or replace the photo enforcement equipment currently in use on the Metro Blue Line. Staff concluded that would need 18 months to research, evaluate, test and competitively purchase a new photo enforcement system to be used on Metro Orange Line. Due to the urgency nature of public safety, it is the recommendation of Metro Staff to procure from a single source the same photo enforcement system used in Metro Blue Line onto Metro Orange Line since the system has demonstrated its effectiveness during the past ten years.

Metro staff has concluded that it would be in Metro's best interest to amend the current single source firm fixed price contract to cover the photo enforcement system operation and maintenance on both Metro Blue Line and Metro Orange Line.

The Diversity & Economic Opportunity Department (DEOD) did not recommend a DBE goal for this procurement. Based on industry practice, the Prime (ACS) is expected to complete the entire scope with its own workforce. However, pursuant to the DBE program, if ACS Government Solution utilizes the services of subcontractors, they are expected to afford maximum opportunities to DBE firms in all subcontracting and supply services areas throughout the life of the contract.

#### C. Evaluation of Proposals

The proposal from ACS Government Solution was found in full compliance with the technical specifications.

#### D. Cost/Price Analysis Explanation of Variances

The recommended price has been determined to be fair and reasonable based upon price analysis. Staff has negotiated the monthly services fee per camera from currently \$2,850 to \$2,300, a 19% saving. If this Modification can be awarded by May 2006, Metro will realize a \$79,200 saving on Blue Line over the remaining term of the current contract:

					Savings	
	Cameras	Current Price	Negotiated Price	Percentage	From (	5/06 -
Blue Line	16	\$2,850	\$2,300	19%	\$	79,200
Blue Line						
(additional)	4		\$2,300			
Orange		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Line	24		\$2,300			

In addition, staff negotiated to have ACS provide the 24 cameras and camera housing needed for Metro Orange Line Photo Enforcement free of charge during the five-year contract amendment period, a saving of \$1,296,000.

## BOARD REPORT ATTACHMENT A-2 LIST OF SUBCONTRACTORS

# METRO PHOTO ENFORCEMENT CONTRACT AMENDMENT

PRIME CONTRACTOR - ACS State & Local Solutions, Inc.

**Small Business Commitment** 

Other Subcontractors

N/A

N/A

Total Commitment 0.0%

# The Superior Court

JOHN A. CLARKE EXECUTIVE OFFICER/CLERK TE NORTH HILL STREET & LOS ANGELES & CALIFORNIA 90012

February 11, 2004

Abdul Zohbi Los Angeles County MTA Transportation Authority One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 20-2-1 Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mr. Zohbi:

#### SUBJECT: RED LIGHT CAMERA REVENUE

This letter serves to provide information on the distribution of red light camera revenue, the overall process in distributing revenue received by the courts, and the report available to assist you in accounting for red light camera revenue.

The distribution on red light camera violations is governed by Penal Code Section 1463.11 (see Attachment I). Depending on whether traffic school is involved or not, your city's revenue would result from either a regular (non-traffic school) red light camera payment or a traffic school payment. We have provided the city portion distributed from the base bail/fine amount and penalty assessment amount for both types of payments (see Attachment 2).

Payments of red light camera violations are made to the Court in any of the following methods: 1) over-the-counter, 2) sent in by mail, 3) paid by telephone through the court's Traffic Interactive Payment System (TIPS – a telephone callin payment system), or 4) via the Internet. This money is further combined with <u>all</u> other collections (i.e., other traffic tickets, criminal collections, etc.) and then distributed at the end of the month. Each city will receive two checks per month depending on how the customer paid. One check represents collections made to the local court (1 & 2 above). The other check represents telephone and Internet payments (3 & 4 above).

While we understand your need for further citation payment information, the Court's cashiering system is designed around compliance with the revenue distribution statutes. Accordingly, the Court's cashiering system is not designed to produce a listing of the revenue distributed on a case-by-case basis, nor a listing of citations paid for each check sent to the City, nor a breakdown of red light camera revenue only.

However, there is one report available from the Court's case management system (see Attachment 3) that your vendor may reference to help support the amount paid on red light camera tickets. Please note that the amounts on this report will not reconcile to the check(s) due to timing differences, NSF checks, refunds, etc. that are not posted on the case management system.

Any future decisions to enhance and/or modify the Court's cashiering system will be made based on available Court resources and funding.

Sincerely,

Alf Schonbach, Administrator Central Finance Office

AS:dsh

C: District Administrators Trial Court Administrators

Manual of Accounting and Audit Guidelines for Trial Courts - Revision 15

Appendix C

_	
1	
£	
<u>.</u>	
g	
Tab	

Special Distribution of Fines and Forfeitures Preceding PC 1463.001 Distribution

1.00

.

1.00 A

To QUART STATE	trict attorney, county counsel, or To neimbure actual costs incurned policiatie prosecuting attorney. by a prosecuting spancy in auccessfully opposing a motion to vegating the force of another and vegating the summary judgement mainder: General distribution See FC 1433.001 (Table 1).	untibution present to 1001 1001 1001 1001 1001 1001	Marrier to County I Not specified I Fund I Fund arrest to City General Not specified I A City General Not specified I A City General Not specified I A City General I A City General I A City General I A City City and City Force (Table 5).	the offense occurred in an area where the transit cherical or an area commission providear related or chereical or related to railroad grade commission providear related or transportation, to transit district or transportation commission on the construct or transportation, to county deneral conserings transportation, to county deneral transportation, to county deneral transportation to the transportation transportation to the transportation transportation to the transportation transportation to the transportation to the transportation to the transportation to the transportation transportation to the transportation transportation to the transportation to the transportation to the transportation to the transportation transportation to the transportation transportation to the transportation transportation to the transportation to the transportation transportatio	ment to
**	Clatific atoms application application application Remainder O	General Gentburbon parament to PC 1483.001 Octover Settlevilon parament to PC 1483.001 PC 1483.001	If a County arreat, to County General Fund If a City arreat, to City Genera Fund Put 1483, 001, PC 1484, and PC 1483, 001, PC 1484, and OC 75000	If the offense occurred in an area where the transit cherkof or commission provides rail transportation, to transit disktot transportation commission If the offense did not occur in an area where the transit disktot or commission provides rail transportation, to County Gene Fund	Distributions pursuant to PC 1465.001, PC 1484, and GC 75000
Cosmercion	Actual costs of opposing a motion to vacate a forfeiture and in vacate a forfeiture and in udgement from forfeited ball prior to PC (1483.001 distribution to PC (1483.001 distribution	50% of PC 1483.001 moneys collected for PC 1483.001 moneys preceding month i i Remaining 50% of PC 1483.001 moneys collected for PC 1483.9 during the preceding month	30% of PC 1485.001, PC 1484, GC 76000, and GC 70372 monays Batance of PC 1485.001, PC 1464, and GC 76000 monays	30% of PC 1483.001. PC 1484. CC 76000, and GC 70372 moneys	Belance of PC 1483.001, PC 1484, and GC 75000 moneys
volkmon	Forfelted bail, when a proseculing agency incurs casts in successfully opposing a motion to vacate the forfelting and in collecting on the summary judgement	Any of the following: HES 13002 PC 374.3 VC 23111, 23112, 23113(a)	Arry of the following: VC 21453(a) and (c) VC 21457(a)	Any of the following: VC 21752(c) ImoOving raiload prade crossings VC 22452 VC 22452	
CODE SECTION	PC 1305.3 — Recovery of Costs by Prosecuting Agency for Opposing Motion to Vacate Forfeiture	PC 1453.0 — Litter Fines		<b>Coaing</b>	

Y

ATTACHMENT

Steve Westly • California State Controller C-9

Revised 1/03

# EXAMPLES OF RED LIGHT CAMERA REVENUE CITY SHARE

#### Red Light Camera Ticket (Non-Traffic School):

Base Bail/Fine Portion (\$100):

- 2% Automation Fund
- 98% 30% City General Fund\*
  - 70% 89% (varies per 1463.002 PC) City Traffic Fund\*

يماريا الريدم فتحرج محارية فمحا تصريحه يحا

11% (varies per 1463.002 PC) County

Penalty Assessment Portion (\$200):

- 2% Automation Fund
- 98% 30% City General Fund\*
  - 70% Penalty Assessment distribution to various funds

# Red Light Camera Ticket (Traffic School):

Base Bail/Fine Portion: (\$100):

- 30% City General Fund\*
- 70% 2% Emergency Medical Services Fund
  - 98% 89% (varies per 1463.002 PC) City Traffic Fund\* 11% (varies per 1463.002 PC) County

Penalty Assessment Portion (\$200):

- 30% City General Fund\*
- 70% County Funds

\* This revenue is distributed to the City.

ATTACHMENT 2

BTPPR090 12/28/03

#### RED LIGHT TRAFFIC PROJECT DISPOSITION LIST SUPERIOR COURT, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

PAGE 1

LOS ANGELES-MET

CITATION LEA	CASE STATUE	anocht Paid	noitisogsid Egos	Disposition Date	NUMBER OF DAXS Past 60 daxs	JUDGENEUT
AX033392 7657	PR	271.00		12/04/2003	0495	. <b>B</b>
AX037787 7657	PR.	271,00	4	12/15/2003	0000	c
AX048758 7657	PR.	306.00	•	05/15/2003	0975	c
AX051003 7657	DH	350.00	trace con a sub- €	11/19/2003	0218	٨T
AX053565 7657	<b>71</b>	350.00	4	09/25/2003	6114	C
AX054279 7657	PR .	461.00	4	12/04/2003	6172	¢
AK054441 7657	DM	350.00	· .	12/11/2003	0173	٨r
X055093 7657	PR	516.00		10/30/2003	0121	c
AX055525 7657	DM	350.00	ć	09/04/2003	0059	A.F
AX055540 7657	DM	350.00	3	09/23/2003	0078	A.F
AX055617 7657	<b>PR</b>	586.00	2	12/08/2003	0145	8
AX055879 7657	DH	0.00	3	12/01/2003	0139	A
AX056231 7657	<b>ZM</b>	321.00	3	10/16/2003	0082	٨T
AX056819 7657	DH	350.00	t	10/30/2003	0087	<b>A</b> 7
AX057154 7657	DH	350.00	•	11/26/2003	0108	λF
<b>AX057391 7657</b>	PR	350.00	2	12/05/2003	0112	8
AX057410 7657	DH	350.00	ŧ	11/25/2003	0103	<b>N7</b>
AX057573 7687	PR	350.00	2	12/12/2003	9116	J
AX057617 7657	DH	350.00		12/08/2003	0112	<b>N</b> 7
AX054037 7657	DH	350,00	•	12/04/2003	0101	٨J
AX058194 7657	PR	321.00	2	11/24/2003	0091	B
AX058446 7657	<b>P</b> R	321.00	2	12/04/2003	0052	B
AX059040 7657	204	0.00	3	12/08/2003	0090	х
AX059169 7657	DM	350.00	۵	12/18/2003	0097	<b>л</b> р
AX059248 7657	Die	350.00		12/05/2003	0082	A7
AX059262 7657	DM	350.00	6	12/23/2003	0100	AF