POMONA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, September 9, 2026
5:00 P.M.
Alexander Hughes Community Center
1700 Danbury Rd, Claremont, CA 91711

ATT. NO.		SUGGESTED DISPOSITION
1.	Call to Order	
2.	Oral - members of the public may address the Board on items of interest during this time ***Public Comment Time Limit 3 minutes, 1 comment per person**	
3.	Consent Calendar A. Minutes (August 12th, 2026) B. FY 27 Fare Analysis	Action 3A 3B
4.	Feasibility Study Summary - **(Nicole Carranza PVTA CEO,** **Derek FretheimAgape Mobility Consulting)**	Information
5.	Financial Forecast **(Erika Jacquez PVTA Sr. Program Manager)**	Information
6.	Authorization to Release FY28 Request for Proposals (RFP) for Transportation Operations Services **(Nicole Carranza, PVTA CEO)**	Action
7.	Approval of scope of work and contract amendment with Agape consulting to add Transition Support Services for FY28 Operations contract implementation. Under Shawn Chavirra and Derek Freitham. **(Nicole Carranza PVTA CEO)**	Action
8.	New Business	
9.	Adjourn to next meeting October 14th, 2026 **(Tentative if needed)**	

AGENDA
ITEM #3A

POMONA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

WEDNESDAY, August 12, 2026

REGULAR BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING MINUTES

Present:

Claremont
Corey Calaycay, Councilmember
Jeremy Swan, Community Services Director

La Verne
JR Ranells, Assistant City Manager
Rick Crosby, Councilmember
Danny Wu, Public Works

Pomona
Nora Garcia, Councilmember
Sylvia Gonzales, Management Analyst
Meg Mcwade, Public Works

San Dimas
Emmett Badar, Mayor
Travis Sais, Assistant City Manager

PVTA
Nicole Carranza, CEO
Erika Jacquez, Senior Program Manager
Vanessa Nalbandian, Admin Manager
Diana Mendez, Mobility Manager

1. **Call to Order**
   Board Chair Rick Crosby called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM.

2. **Oral - Members of the public may address the Board on items of interest during this time**
   No members of the public were present

3. **Consent Calendar**

A. Minutes(June 10, 2026)	3A
B. Financial Statements	3B
C. Check Register	3C
D. Administrative Report	3D
E.Title VI	3E

   Action: The Board unanimously approved the consent calendar on a **MOTION** by Corey Calaycay, **SECONDED** by Rick Crosby, with a correction to the attendance list: Corey Calaycay was listed as Mayor

4. **Operations Report**
   Erika Jacquez Presenting:
   Get About served approximately 42,000 passengers this year, which is slightly lower than last year due to the reduction in service. Trips decreased from approximately 76,000 last year to 39,000 this year. Despite the reduction in trips, the program remained below the 15,000 revenue-hour threshold, which helped keep the service within budget. Since this approach has been successful, staff plan to continue monitoring the program in the same manner this year.

   Ready Now experienced an increase in ridership, from approximately 7,500 trips last year to 9,900 trips this year. This increase was expected as a result of reducing Get About service. The increase is manageable because approximately 50% of the Ready Now program is funded through the 5310 grant. Staff will continue to monitor ridership and costs to ensure the program remains within budget.

   Claremont also experienced significant ridership growth, increasing from approximately 21,000 to 33,000 trips. Much of this growth was attributed to the college population. Staff have implemented measures to help manage the increased demand and keep the program within budget. Summer ridership numbers are not considered representative because many students are on break; staff expect ridership to increase again in August and September and will have additional data to evaluate at that time.

   San Dimas saw a substantial increase in ridership, from approximately 5,000 to 9,000 trips. Staff monitored the service throughout the summer to determine whether the increase was temporary or represented a new normal. July ridership remained consistent with the higher level, indicating that the increase is likely to continue. As a result, staff plan to implement modest monthly trip caps to prevent further growth while maintaining the current level of service. These caps would manage demand rather than constitute a service change, so Council approval would not be required.

   Finally, Pomona Group remained under budget after service was reduced at the beginning of the year. The program provided approximately 114 trips serving 1,100 passengers, compared with approximately 2,500 trips last year. Although ridership was lower than the previous year, the reduced service allowed the program to remain within its allocated budget.

   Overall, the service reductions and ongoing monitoring have been effective in keeping the programs within budget. Staff will continue to monitor ridership and revenue hours each month and make targeted adjustments, such as trip caps, when necessary to prevent costs from exceeding the available budget.

   NOTE: A fare analysis printout was presented to the Board members, who collectively agreed to postpone presentation and discussion of the item until the next Board meeting.

5. **<u>Feasibility Study</u>**
Derek Fretheim, Agape Mobility presenting:
The presentation examines the current operations, funding, ridership, and service structure of the Pomona Valley Transportation Authority (PVTA), with the primary goal of identifying ways to make the system more flexible, efficient, transparent, and cost effective. The review considered other public transit providers in the Pomona Valley, including LA Metro, Foothill Transit, Metrolink, Access Services, and Access for All, as well as how PVTA's member cities share costs and funding. The current funding and reporting structure was found to be difficult to reconcile and lacking transparency, although efforts are underway to improve reporting. The analysis also considered external factors affecting operations, including economic conditions, inflation, fuel and insurance costs, labor and contracting issues, funding availability, and changing ridership patterns.

A significant finding was that PVTA's services do not duplicate Access Services, despite serving some of the same populations. Access Services is federally mandated to provide comparable paratransit within three-quarters of a mile of fixed-route transit and has strict eligibility requirements, while PVTA provides broader service. Access Services primarily provides curb-to-curb transportation, whereas PVTA provides door-to-door service and serves seniors, visually impaired individuals, economically disadvantaged residents, and other members of the general public who may not qualify for Access Services. Approximately 72% of PVTA riders do not report having a disability, while approximately 28% do report some form of disability. Historically, PVTA did not have adequate technology to determine how many of those riders also qualified for Access Services, but newer technology and staff procedures now allow PVTA to capture and track that information more effectively.

PVTA currently operates primarily through a single-contract model, involving a dedicated transportation provider and a non-dedicated provider such as Uber. Under the existing structure, the contractor manages much of the operational technology, dispatching, staffing, vehicle maintenance, call center, driver assignments, and day-to-day operations, while PVTA maintains oversight of regulatory compliance, reporting, eligibility, fare collection, travel training, mobility management, and regional transit administration. The analysis found that this arrangement is relatively easy to oversee because there is one primary contractor, but it can limit PVTA's ability to directly control technology, fleet utilization, and service assignment. In particular, the contractor's configuration of the technology may prioritize the contractor's operational needs rather than PVTA's goal of maximizing efficiency and minimizing costs.

The study also identified inefficiencies caused by service blocks and driver assignments. Drivers and vehicles are often assigned to specific services rather than being available across the entire PVTA network. This means that even when another trip could easily be combined with an existing trip, the system may not assign it because the vehicle or driver is already restricted to a particular service. The result is less ride pooling and commingling, lower fleet productivity, and higher operating costs. The analysis also found that late-night ridership demand does not justify maintaining dedicated service during those periods and that the non-dedicated contractor is currently used primarily for Dial-a-Ride and Claremont services.

Ridership and demographic analysis showed substantial changes in how people use PVTA. The study examined fiscal years 2021 through 2025, along with part of the 2026 school year, allowing the consultants to compare pre-COVID, COVID, and post-COVID conditions. Ridership increased from approximately 47,000 rides to 134,000 rides, representing roughly 183% growth. At the same time, the purposes and destinations of trips have changed, suggesting that riders are using PVTA differently than they did earlier in the study period. An especially important finding was that 84% of riders travel outside their city of residence, demonstrating that transportation needs are regional rather than confined to individual cities. The data therefore supports treating the PVTA service area as an interconnected transportation network rather than as a collection of separate city-based systems.

The demographic analysis also identified an aging population, particularly in Claremont, La Verne, and San Dimas, where people ages 55 - 74 represent a substantial share of the population. This supports the conclusion that “aging in place” is prevalent in the Pomona Valley, with many residents remaining in their communities as they age. The analysis also identified concentrations of younger adults and zero-vehicle households around areas such as the Claremont Colleges and Mt. SAC. These findings demonstrate that PVTA serves a diverse population with different transportation needs, and that service planning must account for geography, age, vehicle availability, employment, and proximity to transit rather than relying solely on city boundaries.

The consultants recommend moving away from the current closed or service blocked fleet model toward an “open fleet” model. Under an open fleet, vehicles would not be permanently assigned to individual services. Instead, vehicles could respond to any eligible trip across the PVTA network, allowing the system to use available capacity more efficiently. The recommended model would combine dedicated vehicles, non-dedicated transportation network companies such as Uber or Lyft, and potential overflow providers within a single technology platform. The platform would manage trip requests, eligibility, rider information, funding sources, vehicle and driver assignments, scheduling, billing, quality control, and reconciliation. Automated algorithms could then determine the most efficient provider and vehicle for each trip while also maximizing ride pooling and commingling.

A major component of the recommendation is a broker model, in which PVTA, not the primary contractor, would hold and manage multiple provider contracts. Instead of having one contractor hire and control other transportation providers, PVTA would directly manage the provider network and use a common technology platform to assign trips. The consultants believe this would provide greater flexibility, stronger oversight, tighter operational controls, better fleet utilization, and greater cost efficiency. It would also allow PVTA to configure the technology according to its own business objectives rather than relying on a contractor to determine how the system operates. Importantly, the consultants emphasized that a broker model is not experimental or unusual; it is increasingly being used by transit agencies to combine paratransit, Dial-a-Ride, on-demand transportation, microtransit, and other services in a more integrated and cost-effective system.

The recommended operating philosophy is essentially “more with less” through greater network elasticity. PVTA should be able to increase transportation capacity during peak periods without maintaining the same level of dedicated resources throughout the entire day. The appropriate vehicle should be matched to the type of trip, rider eligibility, trip purpose, and demand at a particular time. The consultants also recommend using smaller and less expensive vehicles where appropriate, particularly as the fleet ages. For individual trips and pooled service, some trips may be handled with minivans or smaller wheelchair-accessible vehicles instead of larger cutaway vehicles, thereby reducing operating and capital costs. Group transportation would remain a separate consideration.

The presentation also recommends that PVTA develop a five year strategic plan through a workshop involving board members and staff. The workshop would allow PVTA to review the findings, establish priorities, determine which recommendations should be implemented first, and create a phased implementation strategy. The plan should also account for the potential fiscal cliff and changing funding conditions. PVTA’s growing regional role may create opportunities for additional funding because of its connections to Metrolink and the expanding Metro rail network, including the A Line extension. The presentation uses Go Monrovia as an example of an agency that successfully sought additional funding after demonstrating that first-mile/last-mile services associated with new rail service had exceeded its original capacity. The consultants believe PVTA has a strong case for seeking additional regional funding because of its location, connectivity, and role in serving the broader community.

Other recommendations include creating a student rider category so student transportation can be distinguished from general public ridership, improving data collection, and better aligning the fleet with actual demand. The consultants also recommend examining each member city’s individual requirements while maintaining a common regional operating structure. Although cities may have different eligibility rules or service requirements, the underlying technology and transportation network could remain integrated. This would preserve local flexibility while allowing PVTA to gain the efficiencies of a unified regional system.

Overall, the presentation concludes that PVTA has experienced significant ridership growth and provides an important regional transportation function, but its existing operating and contracting structure limits its ability to respond efficiently to that growth. The central recommendation is to transition toward a more flexible, open-fleet, broker-based operating model controlled directly by PVTA, supported by a common technology platform that can automatically match trips with the most appropriate and economical transportation resource. The consultants recommend implementing this change gradually rather than treating it as an “all or nothing” decision. A phased approach could begin with immediate operational improvements, continue through new contracting arrangements and technology changes, and ultimately develop into a five-year strategy tied to funding, fleet replacement, regional connectivity, and measurable performance goals. The overall objective is to make PVTA easier to manage, improve reporting and accountability, reduce unnecessary costs, increase productivity, provide riders with simpler and more understandable services, and ensure that PVTA can adapt to changing transportation demand and funding conditions.

6. **<u>New Business</u>**
   No new business

7. **Adjourn at 6:47 PM to the regular meeting:**
   September 9, 2026

Pomona Valley Transportation Authority

2120 FOOTHILL BLVD. SUITE 116, LA VERNE, CALIFORNIA 91750
PH: 909.596.7664 – FAX: 909.596.7399
PVTRANS.ORG

A PARTNERSHIP OF THE CITIES OF CLAREMONT, LA VERNE, POMONA AND SAN DIMAS

AGENDA
ITEM #3B

September 9, 2026

MEMORANDUM

To: Pomona Valley Transportation Authority

From: Erika Jacquez, Senior Program Manager

Subject: **Get About Fare Comparison Non-ADA Dial-A-Ride Programs Across Los Angeles County**

Summary

In FY26, PVTA raised the one-way fare for its Get About senior and disabled transportation program from $1.00 to $2.75 for trips within the regular service area, and $3.75 for extended-area trips.The new rate was set to align with Access Services, the Los Angeles County-wide ADA paratransit provider, which charges an identical $2.75 base fare.

To give the Board context for where this places PVTA relative to the broader county, staff compared the new Get About fare against fifteen non-ADA senior and disability dial-a-ride programs operated by other cities across Los Angeles County. Among the programs with a published, flat one-way fare, PVTA's new $2.75 rate is now the highest in the group, every other city program charges less for a comparable in-city trip, and most fall between $0.25 and $2.00. PVTA's fare does, however, match the countywide ADA paratransit benchmark exactly, and its $3.75 extended-area fare is in line with what several other programs charge once a trip crosses city lines or serves a medical destination.

Key Takeaways

- PVTA's new $2.75 Get About fare matches exactly the $2.75 base fare charged by Access Services, the countywide ADA paratransit provider PVTA used as its reference point.
- Of the twelve peer programs surveyed with a published flat one-way fare, none charges more than $2.00 for an in-city trip, PVTA's new base fare is now the highest of the group.
- Most peer programs cluster between $0.25 and $1.50 for in-city trips; PVTA's $2.75 fare is well above the countywide median for this type of service.
- PVTA's $3.75 extended-area fare is comparable to what several peer programs charge once a trip leaves city limits or serves a medical destination. For example, Covina's $4.00 fare to Kaiser Baldwin Park and Long Beach's $4.00 round-trip Dial-A-Lift fare.

Fare Revenue: FY25 vs. FY26

Get About's total fare revenue slightly declined from $58,150.00 in FY25 to $51,104.75 in FY26, a decrease of about 12%. That modest decline, rather than a much steeper one, is only because of the fare increase. FY26 was also the year PVTA held Get About service within a new annual cap of 15,000 revenue hours, which cut total trips from 76,265 to 39,481, a decline of roughly 48%. Ridership fell by nearly half, and it was the higher per-trip fare that kept fare revenue from falling anywhere close to that amount.

Countywide Fare Comparison

Programs are listed by published one-way fare, lowest to highest. Get About and the Access Services benchmark are highlighted.

Program / Operator	Service Area	One-Way Fare	Notes
Go West Covina Microtransit	City of West Covina	Free (while grant funding is available)	On-demand, app-based service operated with Via; general public 13+.
Manhattan Beach Dial-A-Ride	Manhattan Beach (+ Hermosa Beach/Redondo Beach/Torrance medical trips)	\$0.25 in-city / \$0.50 to neighboring cities	Residents 55+ or disabled (any age).
Covina Dial-A-Ride	City of Covina	\$0.25 in-city; \$2.00 medical (within 3 mi); \$4.00 to Kaiser Baldwin Park / City of Hope	Curb-to-curb; free trips to city facilities; registration required, no fee.
Downey Dial-A-Ride	City of Downey (+ Kaiser Bellflower)	\$0.50	Residents 65+ or physician-certified disability.
Culver City Dial-A-Ride	City of Culver City	\$0.50 suggested donation	Residents with documented medical necessity; donation, not a required fare.
Pasadena Dial-A-Ride	Pasadena, San Marino, Altadena & nearby unincorporated LA County	\$0.75	Residents 60+ or disabled with Reduced Fare TAP card.
Torrance Senior / Dial-A-Taxi	City of Torrance	\$1.00–\$5.00 per credit (income-based); each credit covers up to \$13.00 of taxi fare	Sliding-scale subsidy model, not a flat per-ride fare; max 12 credits/month.
Walnut Dial-A-Cab	City of Walnut	Flat \$1.00	Seniors/disabled only; up to 30 one-way trips/month.
Burbank Senior & Disabled Transit	City of Burbank	\$1.00	Residents 60+ or certified disability; income-based subsidy available.
Santa Monica MODE (Lyft partnership)	City of Santa Monica	\$1.00 low-income / \$2.00 regular	Residents 65+ or 18+ with documented disability; 30 trips/month.
Glendale Dial-A-Ride	Glendale, Montrose, La Crescenta, La Cañada Flintridge	\$1.50	Residents 65+ or disabled (any age, with certification).
Long Beach Dial-A-Lift	Long Beach, Lakewood, Signal Hill, Paramount	\$2.00 (\$4.00 round trip)	Requires active Access Services membership; \$2.00 one-time card fee.
Access Services (ADA benchmark)	**Los Angeles County — countywide (regional ADA paratransit JPA)**	**\$2.75 (under 20 mi) / \$3.50 (20+ mi) / \$2.00 (Antelope Valley & Santa Clarita)**	**Effective 2/1/2025. The countywide ADA-mandated fare PVTA aligned Get About to.**
Get About (PVTA)	**Claremont, La Verne, Pomona, San Dimas**	**\$2.75 in-area / \$3.75 extended area**	**New fare effective 7/1/2025; unchanged at \$1.00 since 1985 prior to this increase.**

Pomona Valley Transportation Authority

2120 FOOTHILL BLVD. SUITE 116, LA VERNE, CALIFORNIA 91750
PH: 909.596.7664 – FAX: 909.596.7399
PVTRANS.ORG

A PARTNERSHIP OF THE CITIES OF CLAREMONT, LA VERNE, POMONA AND SAN DIMAS

AGENDA ITEM #4

September 9, 2026

MEMORANDUM

To: Pomona Valley Transportation Authority

From: Nicole Carranza, CEO

Subject: **PVTA Feasibility Study Board Summary**

Why this study happened

- Ridership hasn't just recovered from COVID, it's grown every year since. FY2021 (47,530 trips) was the pandemic low point, when systemwide ridership had fallen roughly 50% from pre-pandemic (FY2019) levels. Since then, trips have climbed every single year through FY2025 (134,680 trips), up 183% overall.
- At the same time, rising labor, fuel, and contractor costs already forced real cuts in July 2025: fewer Get About service hours (25,000 to 15,000 revenue hours/year), a fare increase, and the end of one program.
- PVTA's current operations contract expires June 2027, the reason this RFP is moving now.

What the study recommends

Operation Recommendations For FY28 RFP

- Contracting: PVTA will hold the technology (software) contract directly and move to a brokerage-style structure. A dedicated contract, likely more than one non-dedicated (on-demand) contract including WAV (wheelchair-accessible vehicle) contracts, and a separately structured maintenance contract, instead of one contractor controlling everything and having all of these costs under one fixed cost. This is exactly what the September RFP puts into action.
- This structure gives PVTA more direct cost control and visibility than today's single-contractor setup, at the cost of more active contract management from staff.

Service Model Recommendations for future consideration

- Rider-facing service: a separate, later decision: replace today's separate city-branded programs (Claremont Dial-a-Ride, San Dimas Dial-a-Cab, Get About, etc.) with one branded PVTA service, while cities keep setting their own rules and budgets for their own residents. This option scored highest on 6 of 7 study criteria against two alternatives. Timing is separate from the September RFP and not yet set. This will be a discussion for future board workshops.

What the board needs to decide — and when

1. September 9, 2026 (regular board meeting): approve releasing the operations RFP described above with the contracting change. This returns PVTA to the split-contract structure used before July 2020, when a single-contractor model was adopted and, per PVTA staff, proved difficult to manage.
2. November 2026 Board workshop (date TBD): JPA bylaws, the five-year financial plan, and longer-horizon operational planning. This workshop does not revisit the September RFP decision.
3. Future Board Workshops: the rider-facing single-brand decision above, and related policy questions (rail-station access, a "student" rider category).

4. Any JPA agreement or city MOU changes need legal review before anything is finalized.

Implementation Timeline

When	What Changes	Board's Role
September 2026 — regular meeting	Board approves releasing the operations RFP: splits today's single contract into a dedicated Get About/Group Services contract, non-dedicated (on-demand) contract including WAV operators and TNC, and a separately structured maintenance subcontract at pass through cost. Returns PVTA to a split structure last used before the July 2020 switch to a single contractor.	Approve RFP release — the next required board action.
Fall 2026 – Spring 2027 procurement	RFP proposals reviewed; contractors evaluated and selected; new contract(s) awarded ahead of the June 2027 expiration.	Likely approves contract award(s) at a future regular meeting (date TBD).
November 2026 board workshop (date TBD)	JPA bylaws/governance, five-year financial plan, and longer-horizon operational planning. Separate from, and does not revisit, the September RFP decision.	Give direction on governance, financial strategy, and multi-year vision.
June 2027	New split contract structure takes effect as the current contract expires.	Oversight during transition (already approved in September).
Mid-term FY 2027–2030	Vehicle replacement under hybrid lease/own model; student-transportation partnerships explored; first/last-mile rail pilot; possible talks with neighboring cities; Access for All program participation.	Annual direction-setting at each yearly workshop.
Longer-term FY 2031+	Continue annual workshop cadence; refine the 5-year plan; revisit the rider-facing single-brand decision if not yet made.	Ongoing oversight.

KEY DATES

September 2026 — Board approves RFP release (the next required action). June 2027 — new contract structure takes effect as the current contract expires.

Pomona Valley Transportation Authority

2120 FOOTHILL BLVD. SUITE 116, LA VERNE, CALIFORNIA 91750
PH: 909.596.7664 – FAX: 909.596.7399
PVTRANS.ORG

A PARTNERSHIP OF THE CITIES OF CLAREMONT, LA VERNE, POMONA AND SAN DIMAS

AGENDA ITEM #5

September 9, 2026

MEMORANDUM

From: Vanessa Nalbandian, Administrative Manager

Subject: GET ABOUT 5-Year Financial Forecast

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board receive and file the five year financial forecast for the Get About program.

BACKGROUND

At the direction of the Board, PVTA staff was instructed to do a five year financial forecast of estimated costs and future projections given the new operations model. Given the changing service model going into effect in FY2028, it is important to consider the costs and financial projections of the future.

Get About is funded from several sources — passenger fares, subregional incentive funds from LA Metro, interest earnings, federal operating assistance, occasional contributions from PVTA cash reserves, and Prop A Local Return contributed by the member cities of Claremont, La Verne, Pomona, and San Dimas.

These sources of funds are not equal in character. Most are set by formula, by grant award, or by market conditions, and the agency has little influence over them in any given year. The member city contribution is different: it is the source that adjusts to close whatever gap the others leave. The Get About budget therefore always balances, and the useful question for planning purposes is not whether the program runs a deficit, but how large a contribution the cities must make to prevent one.

That framing shapes the entire report. Every table that follows leads to the same figure — the Prop A Local Return required from the member cities in each year — because that is where cost growth and revenue changes ultimately land.

This forecast is built from the FY2026-27 proposed Get About operating budget, the LA Metro subregional award projection, and a documented set of assumptions about cost escalation. It does not draw its figures from the recently completed transit feasibility study; that study informs the agency's service direction and will affect future costs, but the numbers here reflect current service levels and existing commitments.

Additional Notes

At the baseline level with the new service model, we are estimated to save around $200,000-$500,000 of our operating expenses just in overhead costs. Things such as dispatching staff and other unnecessary administrative staff factor into that cost. For example, Currently there are 8 dispatchers roughly $70,000 for salary + fringe benefits. Reducing to 5 dispatchers should decrease cost by $200,000.

Forecast Assumptions

Every projection utilizes the assumption values below.

Assumption	Value	Basis / Source
PVTA Administration	+2.4% / yr	Observed FY25→FY26 (+2.30%) and FY26→FY27 (+2.46%) in the adopted budget
Marketing	$24,000	Held at $24,000 in the past 3 year budgets
Contractor Cost	+3.5% / yr	ASSUMPTION — We assume contractor cost increases 3%-5% annually for inflation.
TNC Charges	+3.5% / yr	ASSUMPTION — We assume TNC trips to increase 3%-5% annually as a conservative estimate.
Fuel	+3.0% / yr	ASSUMPTION — FY27 budgets $150,000 at $8.00/gallon.
Fares	$95,000	Conservative estimate taken from FY26 fare revenues. History is also volatile: $115,000 / $50,000 / $95,000.
Metro Subregional Funding	Per LA Metro estimate	$925,000 (FY28), $962,000 (FY29), $1,000,000 (FY30), $1,040,000 (FY31), per the subregional award projection estimates off of FY26.
PVTA Reserve Contribution	$0 from FY28	Per Board direction: reserves are a discretionary contribution and are not assumed unless necessary. FY27 budget programs $64,700 from reserve.
Interest	$90,000	Budgeted flat in past 3 year budgets.
FTA Operations Revenue	$130,000 flat	ASSUMPTION — FTA grant revenues are not guaranteed. History is volatile: $95,000 / $200,000 / $130,000. Grant-dependent.
Prop A City Shares	FY27 shares held	Claremont 11.05%, La Verne 17.57%, Pomona 63.29%, San Dimas 8.09% (implied by FY27 dollar allocations). Based on ridership by city.

OPERATING COST PROJECTION

Expenditure	FY2026-27	FY2027-28	FY2028-29	FY2029-30	FY2030-31
PVTA Administration	$737,296	$754,991	$773,111	$791,666	$810,666
Marketing	$24,000	$24,000	$24,000	$24,000	$24,000
Contractor Cost	$3,400,000	$3,519,000	$3,642,165	$3,769,641	$3,901,578
TNC Charges	$320,000	$331,200	$342,792	$354,790	$367,207
Fuel (3% on $8.00/gallon)	$150,000	$154,500	$159,135	$163,909	$168,826
Total Expenses	**$4,631,296**	**$4,783,691**	**$4,941,203**	**$5,104,005**	**$5,272,277**

Contractor Cost and TNC Charges together represent $3,720,000 of the FY2026-27 budget — 80% of all expenditures — and account for $548,785 of the $640,981 five-year increase. Administration grows a modest $73,370 over the same period, and Marketing is held flat throughout.

REVENUE PROJECTION

Revenue Source	FY2026-27	FY2027-28	FY2028-29	FY2029-30	FY2030-31
Fares	$95,000	$95,000	$95,000	$95,000	$95,000
Subregional Incentive	$1,040,000	$925,000	$962,000	$1,000,000	$1,040,000
PVTA Reserve Contribution	$64,700	$0	$0	$0	$0
Interest	$90,000	$90,000	$90,000	$90,000	$90,000
FTA Operations Revenue	$130,000	$130,000	$130,000	$130,000	$130,000
Subtotal, PVTA Revenues	**$1,419,700**	**$1,240,000**	**$1,277,000**	**$1,315,000**	**$1,355,000**
City Contribution (Prop A)	**$3,211,596**	**$3,543,691**	**$3,664,203**	**$3,789,005**	**$3,917,277**
Total Revenue	**$4,631,296**	**$4,783,691**	**$4,941,203**	**$5,104,005**	**$5,272,277**

The meaningful question for the Board is not whether Get About runs a deficit, but how large a member city contribution is required to prevent one.

Reserves Contribution

The $64,700 shown in FY2026-27 is a discretionary contribution from PVTA cash reserves, applied specifically to reduce the member city contribution in that year. Consistent with Board direction, this forecast assumes no reserve contribution in FY2027-28 or beyond. The figures above therefore represent the unsubsidized member city obligation. Any future reserve contribution would reduce the city ask and is a decision that can be made by the Board if needed.

Scenario Comparison

Each scenario shows the Prop A Local Return required from member cities. All three use the same LA Metro award projection and assume no reserve contribution from FY2027-28. They differ only in contractor and cab escalation: 3.5% baseline, 5.0% high, and 2.0% low — the last matching the +1.92% actually observed between FY2025-26 and FY2026-27.

Scenario	FY2026-27	FY2027-28	FY2028-29	FY2029-30	FY2030-31
A. Baseline (3.5% escalation)	$3,211,596	$3,543,691	$3,664,203	$3,789,005	$3,917,277
B. High cost (5.0% escalation)	$3,211,596	$3,599,491	$3,780,546	$3,970,940	$4,170,175
C. Low cost (2.0% escalation)	$3,211,596	$3,487,891	$3,549,534	$3,612,268	$3,675,139

MEMBER CITY IMPACT: PROP A FUNDS

Applying FY2026-27 cost-sharing percentages to the Scenario A baseline (3.5% escalation), the additional annual contribution required from each city through FY2031 is as follows (include cost sharing percentages in table)

City	City Share	FY2026-27	FY2027-28	FY2028-29	FY2029-30	FY2030-31
Claremont	11.1%	$354,976	$391,683	$405,003	$418,797	$432,975
La Verne	17.6%	$564,365	$622,724	$643,901	$665,832	$688,373
Pomona	63.3%	$2,032,552	$2,242,728	$2,318,997	$2,397,982	$2,479,163
San Dimas	8.1%	$259,702	$286,557	$296,302	$306,394	$316,767
Total	**100%**	**$3,211,596**	**$3,543,691**	**$3,664,203**	**$3,789,005**	**$3,917,277**

**This assumes the current cost-sharing formula is unchanged through FY2030-31.These percentages can shift defending on ridership by city on a yearly basis.*

RISKS AND SENSITIVITIES

- Contractor escalation is the dominant long-run risk. At 80% of expenditures, each additional percentage point adds roughly $150,000 to FY31 costs.
- FTA Grant Operations Revenue is volatile and grant-dependent — Holding it flat at $130,000 is an assumption. Full loss would add $130,000 per year to the member city requirement.
- Additional service reductions carry a delayed risk of future subregional funding levels.
- Fare policy is immaterial to the overall picture and should not be relied upon to close financial gaps.
- Metro’s future fiscal climate. Actively monitoring their financial climate. PVTA is part of Metro’s Local Transit Systems Subcommittee (LTSS), Bus Operator Subcommittee (BOS), and other alliances for local transit operators. City Prop A local return funds however, should remain untouched and safe.

Pomona Valley Transportation Authority
2120 FOOTHILL BLVD. SUITE 116, LA VERNE, CALIFORNIA 91750
PH: 909.596.7664 – FAX: 909.596.7399
PVTRANS.ORG
A PARTNERSHIP OF THE CITIES OF CLAREMONT, LA VERNE, POMONA AND SAN DIMAS

AGENDA
ITEM #6

September 9, 2026

MEMORANDUM

To: Pomona Valley Transportation Authority

From: Nicole Carranza, CEO

Subject: Authorization to Release the FY28 Request for Proposals for Transportation Operations and Maintenance Services

1. Recommended Action

That the Board of Directors authorize the CEO to release the Request for Proposals (RFP) for PVTA transportation operations and maintenance services, and to conduct the associated procurement in accordance with the schedule described in this memorandum and PVTA's adopted procurement policies.

2. Purpose and Background

PVTA is committed to providing safe, high-quality transportation services to the residents of the Pomona Valley across its four services: Get About, Claremont Dial-a-Ride (including Claremont Group), Pomona Group Service, and San Dimas Dial-a-Cab. PVTA's current transportation services agreement is expiring at the end of FY27(June 2027), and staff is bringing forward a new RFP that restructures how these services are delivered and managed. The primary objective of this procurement is to continue existing service levels while restructuring the delivery model to contain cost. Where the new model may produce cost savings, PVTA intends to reinvest those savings into possible increasing service capacity.

3. What Is Changing- The New Delivery Model

Unlike PVTA's prior solicitation, this RFP does not rely on a single turnkey prime contractor responsible for all operations including: management, maintenance, and facilities. Instead, PVTA is moving back to adopting a hybrid model in which responsibilities are separated and, in several cases, retained directly by PVTA or provided as a pass through cost by the contractor. This provides PVTA more direct control, clearer cost transparency, and the flexibility to competitively price only the elements that should be subject to competition. The key elements of the procurement are:

- **A dedicated operations contractor** that provides drivers, call takers and light dispatching and day-to-day operational supervision, operating ADA-accessible vehicles supplied by PVTA. This contractor supplies an operations manager versus a GM. The Ops Manager will be responsible for overseeing the driving operation and ensuring all drivers are fully trained and qualified to safely operate the PVTA-provided accessible vehicles.
- **One or more non-dedicated / on-demand providers** under a separate contract for overflow and same-day, on-demand service, using their own accessible vehicles and drivers available in the service area. Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) such as Uber and Lyft are eligible to compete under the same non-dedicated solicitation.
- **Vehicle maintenance delivered as a pass-through cost to PVTA**, preferably through a maintenance subcontract billed to PVTA at actual cost (not marked up and not subject to price competition), with PVTA retaining direct inspection, record-access, and corrective-action authority. To ensure tighter control cost transparency, the Vehicle Maintenance subcontract will be a three-party agreement between the subcontractor, Dedicated provider and PVTA.
- **A PVTA-ContractedTransition Support-** retained directly by PVTA to oversee the maintenance contract and reporting, safety reporting, vehicle parking logistics. Executive-level program management therefore rests with PVTA rather than the dedicated operations contractor. Based on the cost received and final contract PVTA will be able to determine the level of additional contracted administrative support it would need.
- **PVTA-provided vehicles and parking.** PVTA and the City of Claremont supply the dedicated fleet (currently 21 vehicles — 18 cutaways, 1 promaster, 2 accessible minivans), and PVTA will provide accessible parking lots or other suitable options for driver vehicle check-out and return; the contractor is not required to secure or operate a maintenance/storage facility however they may propose alternative solutions. This preference is to reduce cost, but the RFP remains flexible based on responses and pricings presented in the proposal.
- **Technology/Dispatch software** - PVTA will be assuming the dispatch software, and contracting directly with the SaaS provider (currently Spare).

4. Procurement Goals

The priorities for this procurement are to (1) maintain current service levels with no degradation during the transition; (2) achieve cost containment through the disaggregated structure; (3) reinvest any realized savings into possible increased capacity (4) ensure driver quality and safety on PVTA-supplied ADA-accessible vehicles; (5) improve on-time performance, increased shared rides to achieve higher passenger per vehicle hour, and reduce wait times; (6) improve dedicated-vehicle productivity; (7) reduce the number of individual ride times exceeding one hour; and (8) raise customer service while maintaining or reducing dispatch and call-taking staff through technology such as AI-enabled phone attendants, automated ride booking services, and passenger call-back options.

5. Key Contract Terms for the Board's Awareness

The RFP contemplates two distinct, directly-held contracts - Dedicated and Non-Dedicated. Respondents may bid on one or both roles, with separate technical and pricing responses for each.

Element	Dedicated Operations Contract	Non-Dedicated / On-Demand Contract
Scope	Drivers, day-to-day operational supervision, and fleet operation for Get About dedicated service and Claremont / Pomona Group services, using PVTA/City of Claremont-supplied ADA-accessible vehicles.	Overflow and same-day, on-demand trips (Get About Overflow, Ready Now, Claremont Dial-a-Ride, San Dimas Dial-a-Cab, using the provider's own accessible vehicles and drivers. Open to TNCs.
Estimated service level (FY26 basis)	Get About dedicated: 13,750 VRH; Claremont Group: 250 VRH; Pomona Group: 100 VRH.	Ready Now: 10,000 trips; Claremont Dial-a-Ride: 17,000 trips; San Dimas Dial-a-Cab: 9,200 trips; plus Get About Overflow.
Compensation structure	Fixed Monthly Rate plus a Fixed Hourly Rate per Vehicle Revenue Hour, itemized so PVTA sees each cost element.	On Demand WAV operators Per-passenger-trip rate. TNC costs reimbursed as a straight pass-through at cost.
Maintenance	Pass-through to PVTA at actual cost (preferably via a maintenance subcontract), not marked up and not price-competed, with PVTA retaining direct oversight and inspection authority.	

Contract term: Dedicated and Non-dedicated service: A base term plus up to three (3) years with two (2) one-year option periods. With annual price adjustments tied to a published inflation index (PCEPILFE).

Vehicles: PVTA and the City of Claremont provide the dedicated fleet (18 cutaways, 1 promaster and 2 accessible minivans).

Federal compliance: The procurement includes FTA-funded (FTA Sections 5310 LA Metro) and carries a Race-Conscious Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (RC-DBE) goals, along with all applicable FTA, Title VI, ADA, and drug-and-alcohol testing requirements.

6. Procurement Schedule

The tentative schedule for this procurement is below. All times are Pacific.

Date	Event
September 10th, 2026	PVTA issues RFP
September 15th, 2026	11:00 a.m. Voluntary Pre-Proposal Conference
September 24th, 2026	3:00 p.m. Deadline for submitting written questions to PVTA
October 4th, 2026	Final Addenda and Answered Issued
November 3rd, 2026	3:00 p.m. Proposals due
November 3rd - 16th, 2026	Panel evaluates proposals
November 17th, 2026	11:00 a.m. Panelist meeting
November 30th, 2026	Interviews (if needed)
December 7th, 2026	Negotiations/Best and Final Offers
December 16th, 2026	Award of contract PVTA Board approval
December 16th, 2026	Initiation of services under contract

These dates are tentative and subject to change at the sole discretion of PVTA. This schedule will allow PVTA to have about a 6 month transition period before the start of the new contract July, 1st, 2027.

7. Fiscal Impact

Costs will be determined through the competitive proposals received and will be funded through PVTA's operating budget including applicable FTA 5310 funds passed through LA Metro. The new model is expected to improve cost transparency and create opportunities for savings by competitively pricing operations while passing through maintenance and TNC costs at actual cost. Specific contract values will be presented to the Board with the award recommendation. A cost savings model presentation is in progress and will be provided at the board meeting or sooner. This modeling will show what positions and overhead cost will be eliminated and reduced. For example, PVTA estimates that reducing dispatch staff from 8-5 will reduce cost by $200,000.

8. Requested Action

Staff respectfully requests that the Board of Directors authorize the CEO to release the FY28 RFP for transportation operations and maintenance services and to proceed with the procurement as described above, returning to the Board with a recommendation for contract award.

Pomona Valley Transportation Authority

2120 FOOTHILL BLVD. SUITE 116, LA VERNE, CALIFORNIA 91750
PH: 909.596.7664 – FAX: 909.596.7399
PVTRANS.ORG

A PARTNERSHIP OF THE CITIES OF CLAREMONT, LA VERNE, POMONA AND SAN DIMAS

AGENDA ITEM #7

September 9, 2026

MEMORANDUM

To: Pomona Valley Transportation Authority
From: Nicole Carranza, CEO

Subject: Proposed amendment to Agape Consulting agreement
Transit Operations Contract Transition & Performance Management Support

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommend that the Board authorize PVTA to execute an amendment to PVTA's existing consulting agreement with Agape, adding the scope summarized below to support PVTA's RFP process to split its single operating contract into separate dedicated and non-dedicated service provider contracts, and the related effort to bring scheduling/dispatch software in-house and oversight of vehicle maintenance contract. The added scope runs twelve (12) months at a cost not to exceed $90,000, funded within PVTA's Board-adopted FY27 consulting budget, no new appropriation is requested.

BACKGROUND

PVTA has been operating under a single turnkey operating contract, with one contractor responsible for all service delivery. PVTA is currently in the RFP process to restructure that model with an emphasis on cost containment. Rather than continuing to pay for each contractor's fully turnkey package, staff are evaluating consolidating shared functions under PVTA's direct management (scheduling/dispatch software and associated reporting, and closer oversight of vehicle maintenance). The RFP focuses on replacing the single contract with two (or more) separate contracts, one for a dedicated provider and others for non-dedicated providers. Because historically PVTA has only held turnkey contracts, PVTA staff have limited in-house experience directly operating these functions. Staff needs consulting support to get through the RFP process, to define how responsibilities split between PVTA and each contractor under this less turnkey structure, and to stand up the technology and reporting systems PVTA would take on directly.

Agape is currently providing PVTA with RFP consulting services under an existing agreement; rather than a new procurement, staff propose adding this scope to that agreement.

OVERVIEW

This action extends an existing consulting relationship. It is not the creation of a new position, and the Consultant is not being hired onto PVTA staff.

- Independent contractor / advisor role this is not a PVTA employee. No FTE, position, or benefits are created.
- The Consultant works alongside existing PVTA staff, plus the incumbent and incoming operating contractors , it does not replace either contractor's responsibilities, and it does not replace or supervise PVTA staff.
- Bounded, 12-month, deliverable-based scope added to the existing consulting contract, it is not a new procurement, and not an ongoing or open-ended arrangement.
- An explicit goal of the engagement is to train PVTA staff to independently administer the new operating contract once the consulting term ends.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK

Purpose: Support PVTA staff through the procurement, transition, implementation, and performance oversight of the new operations contract, while building PVTA's internal capability to manage that contract going forward.

Term: Twelve (12) months from Notice to Proceed, with increased Consultant involvement expected during procurement finalization, contractor mobilization, and the first 90 days of the new operating contract.

Phase	Timeframe	Focus
I — Assessment & Procurement Support	Months 1–3	Baseline operations assessment; RFP/contract review and gap analysis; KPI framework; transition governance structure
II — Mobilization & Transition	Months 3–6	Monitor incoming contractor staffing/technology mobilization; coordinate asset & data transfer; manage incumbent contractor closeout
III — Cutover & Stabilization	Months 6–9	On-site support at service commencement; Transition Command Center; 30/60/90-day contractor performance reviews
IV — Optimization & Create SOP	Months 9–12	Refine KPIs/dashboards; finalize contract-administration tools; develop SOP with PVTA staff; final 12-month performance report

Key deliverables include:

- Transition Management Plan, master schedule, and a formal governance / risk-tracking structure
- Operational Gap Assessment Report — a baseline review of operations, maintenance, safety, customer service, and technology ahead of the contractor change
- KPI Dictionary and executive / departmental performance dashboards (service delivery, safety, maintenance, workforce, and contract compliance)
- Incumbent contractor closeout plan and incoming contractor mobilization / readiness tracking

- Cutover Plan and on-site “Transition Command Center” support at service commencement
- 30/60/90-day contractor performance reviews and stabilization reports
- Contract Administration Manual and ongoing compliance tools (invoice verification, KPI validation, corrective-action tracking)
- Develop SOP for PVTA staff on contract administration, dashboard use, and performance management, plus a final One-Year Contract Implementation & Performance Assessment report