## 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 Affiliated Computer Services (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 (Attachment C) and $\$ 388,027$ in 2005 (partial year) for an average of $\$ 33,500$ per cameraver a year period). With the procurement of four additional cameras on the Metro Blue Line and twenty-four on the Metro Orange Line, Metro could potentially generate additional annual revenue of $\$ 938,000$ approximately $\$ 1,200,000$.

## 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
C. 2004 and 2005 Photo Enforcement Revenue

Prepared by: Abdul Zohbi, Systems Safety Manager


John B. Catoe, Jr.
Deputy 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: $\$ 6,072,000$ | Recommended Price:$\$ 6,072,000$ |  |
|  | B. Details of Significant Variances are in Attachment A-1.D |  |  |
| 4. | Contract Type: Firm Fixed Price |  |  |
| 5. | Procurement Dates: January 5, 2006 |  |  |
|  | 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 Participation: |  |  |
|  | A. Bid/Proposal Goal: 0\% | Date Small Business Evaluation Completed: <br> N/A |  |
|  | B. Small Business Commitment: N/A |  |  |
| 7. | Invitation for Bid/Request for Proposal Data: |  |  |
|  | Notifications Sent: Bids/Proposals Picked Bids/Proposals <br> Received: <br> 1 up: 1 1 |  |  |
| 8. | Evaluation Information: |  |  |
|  | A. Bidders/Proposers Names: <br> ACS Government Solutions | Bid/Proposal Amount: \$6,072,000 | Best and Final Offer Amount: \$6,072,000 |
|  | B. Evaluation Methodology: Selection of lowest responsive, responsible bidder. Details are in Attachment A-1.C |  |  |
| 9. | Protest Information: |  |  |
|  | A. Protest Period End Date: N/A |  |  |
|  | B. Protest Receipt Date: N/A |  |  |
|  | C. Disposition of Protest Date: N/A |  |  |
| 10. | Contract Administrator: Mark Lu | Telephone Number: 213-922-4689 |  |
| 11. | Project Manager: Abdul Zohbi | Telephone Number: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:

|  | Cameras | Current Price | Negotiated Price |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sarings. } \\ & \text { From } 05 / 06 \\ & 01 / 07 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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
N/A
Other Subcontractors
N/A
Total Commitment ..... 0.0\%

## The $\mathscr{S u p e r i a r} \mathbb{C}$ aurt

February 11, 2004

Abdul Zohbi<br>Los Angeles County MTA Transportation Authority One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 20-2-1<br>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 all 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 Is
Table \#2-1
Special Distribution of Fines and Forfeitures Preceding PC 1463.001 Distribution

| CODE SECTION |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PC 1305.3 - Recoviry of Coste by Prosecuting Agency for Opposing Motion to Vacate Forfehure | Forfolled bali, whol it proseculing agency incurs comets in succestululy opposing a motion to vaceta the forfolure and in eollecting on the summary fudgmint | Actult conts of oppoting e motion to vacmle a forfoture and in collecting on the surmmary Hedoment from tortered boll prior to PC 1483.001 datribution | Diotulat tilioney, county countel, applitiniop propecuting stiome | To relmburas sctual conts incurred by a proeeculing sigency in ucceetetily oppoetny a motion to vacofie the forfolure and in collocing the suminery hadrament |
|  |  | Yis |  | See PC 1463.001 (Tatio 1) |
| PC 1468.8 - Luter Fines | $+5$ |  | eonerthinturtion pumant to | Linor cimmup acthme |
|  | PC 374.3 VC 23111. 23112,23113(1) |  | PC 14ente01 | SenPC 1463.001 (Tat 1). ${ }^{\text {a }}$, |
| 1463.11 - Fed Liphi Violationt | Any of the followne: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Ha Cry minet, to Cly Omme Fund | Not aperined |
|  |  | Entance Of PC 1463.001. PC 148 nd CC 7600 moners. | Dintilethone pursuant to Fe tret.00t, PC 1484, ad CC 7evo | See PC 1483.001 (TBWia 1), PC 1484, and GC 76000 (Tebil 6). |
| PC 1483.12-Ralinoud Crossing | Any of the following: <br> Ve $21752(c)$ moiving rallonal grade crossinge <br> VC 22451 <br> VC 22452 | $30 \%$ of PC 1463.001, PC 1484. CC 70000, and CC 70872 monay |  | Onty for pubtic safoty and public. eduction related to raliroed gride crovelings $\qquad$ |
|  |  |  |  | for publice a moty mod public lucilion related to rallioud grede minge I $\square$ |
|  |  |  | Distroutiona pursuant to PC 1433.001, PC 1404, min CC 70000 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (Tabla 1). } \\ & 3 C 70000 \text { (Tatate } 6) . \end{aligned}$ |

## EXAMPLES OF RED LIGHT CAMERA REVENUE CITY SHARE

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

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

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
2 \% & \text { Automation Fund } \\
98 \% & 30 \% \text { City General Fund* } \\
& 70 \% \quad 89 \% \text { (varies per 1463.002 PC) City Traffic Fund* } \\
& \\
& 11 \% \text { (varies per 1463.002 PC) County }
\end{array}
$$

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):

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
30 \% & \text { City } & \text { General Fund } \\
70 \% & 2 \% & \text { Emergency Medical Services Fund } \\
& 98 \% & 89 \% \text { (varies per 1463.002 PC) City Traffic Fund* } \\
& & 11 \% \text { (varies per 1463.002 PC) County }
\end{array}
$$

Penalty Assessment Portion (\$200):
30\% City General Fund*
70\% County Funds

* This revenue is distributed to the City.

$8,533.53$
$54,500.12$
$5,294.27$
$54,183.10$
$6,744.82$
$56,082.76$
$5,184.75$
$56,236.69$
$4,342.40$
$40,461.34$
$4,296.99$
$43,094.28$
$2,924.12$
$46,147.98$
Payments（Compton Municipal Court） Period： $1 / 1 / 04$ to 12／31／04
As of $10 / 3 / 05$
$\infty$
$\stackrel{0}{\sim}$
N
in

| FCV－FINES \＆ | $9,517.38$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $4,569.65$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $6,276.12$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $13,412.44$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $6,233.83$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $9,973.08$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $34,233.46$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $3,117.26$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $52,772.19$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $6,333.44$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $5,858.92$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $60,969.97$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $7,750.84$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $68,108.02$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆I | $57,104.49$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $8,274.42$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $9,351.59$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $68,450.76$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $10,539.35$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $70,099.78$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $51,602.19$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $6,482.15$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $7,112.11$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $48,005.48$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $6,858.20$ |
| FCV－FINES \＆ | $50,977.38$ |
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