

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Orange County Transportation Authority

1 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: So that wraps our
2 consent calendar. We move on now to Item Number
3 16.

4 KIRK AVILA: Good morning, Mr. Chairman
5 and members of the Board. I'm Kirk Avila,
6 general manager of OCTA's Express Lanes programs.

7 I'm here this morning to go over the
8 recommendations for the 405 Express Lanes back-
9 office system and customer service center
10 operations procurement.

11 Next slide, please. Before I discuss
12 the recommendations, I wanted to provide the
13 Board with some background and details on the
14 types of services we are procuring.

15 About a year ago in June 2020, the
16 Board approved the evaluation criteria and
17 waiting's for the procurement, and authorized the
18 release of the request for proposals for the
19 back-office system and customer service center
20 operation services for the 405 Express Lanes.

21 The 405 Express Lanes are being built
22 as part of the larger 405 improvement project
23 that began construction back in 2017. This
24 procurement and many other services being
25 procured are similar to the recently completed

1 back-office system and customer service center
2 operations procurement for the 91 Express Lanes.
3 The 91 Express Lanes procurement was completed in
4 2019.

5 In developing the scope and the
6 procurement documents for the 405 Express Lane,
7 the OCTA worked with HNTB, who serves as the
8 project management consultant for the 405, and
9 used the 91 Express Lanes document as a starting
10 point for the development.

11 A couple of difference between the 405
12 and 91 procurements include the 405 as a
13 federalized project and therefore has a
14 (indiscernible), and the 91 procurement was a
15 joint procurement with RCTC, which we will be
16 splitting the costs with them for the 91.

17 The 405 Express Lanes are projected to
18 open in the fall of 2023, providing a two-year
19 period for the selected contractor to design and
20 implement the new system. This is a typical
21 period of time provided to contractors prior to
22 an opening or transition of services.

23 Next slide please. For this next
24 slide, I wanted to take a moment and highlight
25 the major procurements we have completed and

1 still need to complete for the 405 Express Lanes.

2 I mentioned the 405 Express Lanes as
3 part of the 405-improvement project, the design-
4 build team of OC 405 partners was selected and
5 approved by the Board in November of 2016. In
6 2018, the Board took action and selected Kapsch
7 TrafficCom USA to provide the in-lane system,
8 electronic signage, cameras, and traffic
9 operations, and our staffing for the 405
10 corridor.

11 The procurement we're discussing today
12 is highlighted here in yellow, and I'll get into
13 the details of these services on the next slide.

14 Lastly, we'll be requesting the Board
15 release the procurement for the roadway services
16 in spring of 2022. These services include
17 providing roadside assistance to our customers,
18 which include fixing flat tires, providing gas,
19 and escorting vehicles to a safe area.

20 Next slide please. This next slide
21 highlights some of the major areas of this
22 procurement, and I'll highlight some of them.

23 The procurement includes the design,
24 development, implementation, and maintenance of
25 the back-office system. The back-office system

1 is a core function of the 405 Express Lanes, and
2 its functions are many. It retrieves data from
3 the in-lane system and charges the appropriate
4 toll fee to the customer's account or establishes
5 a violation for the trip, if applicable.

6 The back-office system also has the
7 ability to interact with the 405 Express Lanes
8 website; inventory system for the transponders,
9 the phones, interactive voice response system
10 component; and interfaces with the credit card
11 processing agencies and collection agencies. The
12 procurement includes the hardware and software to
13 support the systems provided.

14 Customer service includes providing
15 staffing for the walk -- the call and the walkup
16 center where customers can address account or
17 violation issues.

18 Violation processing and collections
19 involve dealing with the users of the facility
20 who don't have an active account, issuing
21 notices, and transmitting files to a collection
22 agency.

23 Revenue collections and transaction
24 processing includes ensuring that transactions
25 are properly posted to customer accounts, and

1 revenues are deposited in our bank account.

2 The selected vendor will also be
3 responsible for providing and supporting the
4 telephone system which includes the hardware and
5 software system associated with the IVR system
6 and the contact center system, which allows for
7 calls to be distributed to agents based upon the
8 (indiscernible) or violation.

9 Next slide please. This next slide
10 provides information on the results of the
11 procurement. The RFP was released in early
12 December of 2020, and a preproposal conference
13 was held in early January 2021. Responses were
14 submitted in late March 2021, and an evaluation
15 committee was created that includes staff members
16 from other tolling entities plus representatives
17 from OCTA's Express Lanes program.

18 In total, we had four different
19 agencies represented with tolling experience on
20 the evaluation committee. These subject matter
21 experts only evaluated the technical component of
22 the proposal, everything but the cost. The cost
23 was added to the evaluation scoring after the
24 review was completed.

25 Three proposals were received, and two

1 firms were interviewed. The firms were Cofiroute
2 USA and WSP USA Services. The evaluation
3 committee recommends the selection of WSP USA
4 Services after reviewing the written proposals,
5 the interview process, and the best and final
6 offer submission.

7 The WSP bid was not the lowest price,
8 and I'll go over costs on the slide in the next
9 couple of minutes. Despite the higher cost, the
10 evaluation team recommends award of the contract
11 to WSP for the following reasons.

12 WSP has teamed up with electronic
13 transaction consultants or ETC with ETC providing
14 the back-office system, and TTEC Government
15 Solutions providing the Omni channel
16 communications platform.

17 WSP team has a large and diversified
18 portfolio of back-office systems, tolling
19 deployment, and customer service center
20 operations. These include clients in Colorado,
21 Minnesota, Washington, Texas, Louisiana, Georgia,
22 and Utah. The WSP team proposed staff that are
23 highly qualified and have direct relevant
24 experience with the project's (indiscernible).

25 The project manager assigned to the 405

1 has 15 years of tolling experience working in San
2 Diego on the I-15 Express Lanes. In addition,
3 this person has also worked on OCTA's 91 Express
4 Lanes project and on the 405 in-lane toll system
5 implementation.

6 The tolling software technology manner
7 for -- technology manager for the back-office
8 system has delivered 11 major tolling projects
9 around the country. The customer service center
10 manager has experience working at LA Metro at
11 their call center where they were responsible for
12 a staff of over 130 people.

13 All proposed key personnel for WSP have
14 at least 10 years tolling experience, and key
15 personnel at ETC have 17 years' experience. The
16 majority of WSP's key personnel show 100 percent
17 availability and commitment to the 405 project.

18 WSP's team highlighted their integrated
19 back-office system solution and their experience
20 deploying cloud-based solutions. Their back-
21 office systems integrated with the interactive
22 voice response system, the website, and other
23 platforms such as chat, e-mail, social media.

24 WSP's team emphasized innovation and
25 robustness of back-office solutions by providing

1 an extensive library of prebuilt and ad hoc
2 report templates, and the proposal included
3 additional safeguards around customer data.

4 WSP's back-office system and customer
5 service center approach is customer-centric,
6 emphasizing optimization of the customer
7 experience and satisfaction with the diversified
8 workforce and an emphasis on securing customer
9 data.

10 Next slide please. The proposed cost
11 for the shortlisted firms is provided on this
12 next slide along with the comparison to the
13 independent cost estimate. This slide drills
14 down on the differences between pricing by each
15 of the firms.

16 Line 1 indicates -- or Line 1 includes
17 the next two years of implementation for the
18 back-office system. There's a 1.6 million cost
19 differential between the firms.

20 Lines 2 and 3 cover the operations and
21 maintenance period after the opening of the 405
22 Express Lanes, separated by back-office operation
23 and maintenance on Line 2, and customer service
24 center operations and maintenance on Line 3.

25 If you combine the amounts on Line 2

1 and 3 for each of the firms, there is about a 5.5
2 million differential between the firms.

3 You can see from the table that there's
4 large differentials in the pricing for each
5 category for each of the firms. The gap is due
6 to the different approaches the proposers use in
7 building their respective pricing proposals. It
8 appears that one firm priced by function, the
9 back-office system activities versus customer
10 service center activities, whereas the other firm
11 priced by company.

12 What we can see from the proposals is
13 that Cofiroute had a higher operations and
14 maintenance cost with a back-office system, and
15 WSP had a higher cost of the customer service
16 center operations and maintenance. The key
17 difference in the 5.5 million cost differential
18 from the combination of Lines 2 and 3 was due to
19 the fact that WSP is providing more labor with
20 higher wages for the customer service center and
21 operational function, as you can see from the
22 footnote at the bottom of the slide.

23 The initial term covers a six-year
24 period after go live plus an approximate two-year
25 period of implementation prior to the go-live

1 period, so a total of approximately eight years.
2 Option Term 1 covers a three-year period, and
3 Option Term 2 covers a two-year period.

4 In total, the cost listed on the bottom
5 of the slide is for a 13-year period. The Board
6 will only be approving the initial term. There
7 is an approximate \$8 million cost differential
8 between the two firms during the initial term,
9 and about a \$5.4 million cost differential for
10 the total 13-year term of all option years are
11 exercised.

12 Next slide please. Staff
13 recommendations are listed on this next slide.
14 Based upon the work performed by the evaluation
15 committee, staff recommends that the Board
16 approves the selection of WSP USA as the firm to
17 provide the back-office system and customer
18 service center operations for the 405 Express
19 Lanes.

20 The second recommendation is to
21 authorize the CEO to negotiate and execute
22 Agreement No. C-0-2690 between the OCTA and WSP
23 USA Services Inc., in the amount of \$110.98 to
24 provide the back-office and customer service
25 center operations services for the 405 Express

1 Lanes for an initial term up to eight and a half
2 years, with one three-year, and one two-year
3 option terms.

4 Next slide please. If approved by the
5 Board, staff will work to finalize the contract
6 and issue notice to proceed with the selected
7 firm. Once the new agreement is executed and NTP
8 is issued, staff will work with the selected
9 contractor on the design documents, attend
10 workshops, and provide input and assist with the
11 development of the new operational system over
12 the next few years.

13 In the coming months, staff will return
14 to the Board with a recommendation for a location
15 for the customer service center and operation
16 center for the contractor staff. We are
17 currently reviewing various lease and buy
18 options.

19 As mentioned earlier in the
20 presentation, we will seek the Board approval for
21 the release of the roadside services RFP in 2022.
22 These services will be in place prior to the
23 opening date of the 405 Express Lanes in fall of
24 2023.

25 Mr. Chairman and Board members, that

1 concludes my presentation. I'd be happy to
2 answer any questions. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Thank you, Kirk.
4 I'm not seeing any hands raised. Let me start
5 with a few comments.

6 From my experience on different
7 agencies as well as at the county, software is
8 probably the most difficult to implement, and to
9 have a system that customized and then be
10 expected to run smoothly from day one is a
11 challenging task.

12 And then when you -- and balance that
13 out with having to deal with multiple partners to
14 run different functions of an operation, that
15 increases the complexity exponentially,
16 increasing the risk of not having things work
17 that well increase significantly.

18 I also want to -- us to think about the
19 challenges that we have had sometimes with
20 vendors, some of whom we deal with today, and put
21 in context that when we have a vendor we have
22 been working with for close to 20 years, that had
23 been providing good service, never any complaint,
24 no change order, from time to time. I think that
25 type of track record should, you know, should be

1 a significant thing that we want to focus on.

2 And when you break down the scores
3 between the two finalists, the difference isn't
4 great. And what I notice is the difference is
5 mostly based on subjective preferences as far as
6 the features that staff feels that may be
7 beneficial in the future to incorporate, but that
8 wasn't part of the RFP necessarily, so that kind
9 of depends on how proactive someone is in putting
10 that kind of information on an RFP.

11 But on the core function that was
12 covered by the RFP, staff will I think -- in my
13 conversation anyway -- indicated to me that both
14 of the finalists, WSP and Cofiroute, are capable
15 of doing the work. And if necessary, Cofiroute
16 can also scale up to be able to provide the
17 amenities that we want.

18 And so I just want to put that out
19 there that I know we -- probably most of us have
20 met with WSP already, and a lot of assurances
21 have been given to us as to future performance.
22 But I think what we have today, what we have
23 enjoyed from Cofiroute, like I said, close to 20
24 years of good experience should count for
25 something.

1 So I want to start off discussion with
2 those comments, and I will now look for hands
3 raised.

4 Supervisor Chaffee

5 SUPERVISOR DOUG CHAFFEE: Yes, thank
6 you. I noticed the contract itself was not
7 attached. Is that going to be provided to us
8 separately at a later date?

9 MAN 1: Mr. Chairman, as part of the
10 RFP process that the Board approved previously,
11 the draft contract was included at that point, so
12 our policy states that we would not make changes
13 to that that are substantive in nature. So the
14 contract was presented to the Board with the RFP
15 release.

16 SUPERVISOR DOUG CHAFFEE: Okay. I'm
17 sorry. That was some time ago, and I don't
18 remember all the provisions and how that might
19 relate to the selection made.

20 I was concerned when I learned about
21 the recommended vendor being late on a provision
22 with the state of Washington, and apparently they
23 paid a penalty, and then some unhappiness with
24 their services in both Florida and Texas. I
25 wonder if any of the negatives are actually

1 investigated by the RFP committee.

2 MAN 1: Mr. Avila?

3 KIRK AVILA: Yes. Director Chaffee,
4 Kirk Avila, general manager. Yeah. So the
5 reference checks are part of the evaluation
6 committee, and I'll defer to the director of the
7 procurement in a second.

8 But the evaluations are part of the --
9 references are part of the evaluation committee.
10 Reference checks are done. In this particular
11 instance, I believe -- and I'll defer to the
12 director of contracts. I believe there were 10
13 reference checks that were done, including the
14 one in Washington as well.

15 So Pia, would you like to comment on
16 the different reference checks that are done for
17 procurement?

18 PIA VEESAPEN: Yes. Good morning, Mr.
19 Chairman and members of the Board. Pia Veesapen,
20 director of CAM.

21 We did conduct several reference
22 checks, as this is the process -- part of the
23 procurement process and evaluation, and we did
24 reach out to all the reference checks provided by
25 (indiscernible) also provided reference checks

1 for their subcontractor as well.

2 So in this case, WSP provided reference
3 for the E-470 Public Highway Authority. The
4 positive references came back, said that WSP was
5 easy to work with, always open to improvement,
6 and worked with the organization to collectively
7 reach the organization's mission.

8 We also contacted Illinois Tollway, and
9 it was indicated the WSP is always responsive,
10 practice in meeting their needs, and their
11 expertise and knowledge based on their industry
12 and technical issues were superb.

13 We also reached out to Northwest
14 Parkway, and WSP continuously supports their toll
15 operations services, so they had a mutually
16 supportive working relationship between all
17 levels of their organization.

18 As far as ETC, we spoke with
19 individuals from the Harris County Toll Road
20 Authority, and ETC's project with the back-office
21 implementation, the project team was large, and
22 involvement ranged from their CEO to their
23 development staff, and their overall performance
24 was good. They had some responses to changes as
25 well as addressing issues, and it was indicated

1 that ETC's technical abilities are strong, and
2 management did a great job on that.

3 Same thing with Cofiroute. Received
4 some reference back from Riverside County
5 Transportation Commission in that Cofiroute did
6 an excellent job on their RCTC and 91 Express
7 Lanes as well as positive comment coming back
8 from the Central Texas Regional Mobility
9 Authority.

10 So pretty much all the references came
11 back very positive.

12 SUPERVISOR DOUG CHAFFEE: Did you check
13 with the Washington State Department of
14 Transportation regarding the penalty paid by the
15 vendor for delay in implementation?

16 PIA VEESAPEN: Yes, we did. The
17 comments we received from the Washington State is
18 that in the beginning, there was - it was a rough
19 beginning, and Washington State said that the
20 issues were not all on ETC. The agency had some
21 of their own issues, but ETC pulled it together
22 towards the end, and now they have a great
23 working relationship.

24 SUPERVISOR DOUG CHAFFEE: Okay. Well,
25 thank you for clarifying that. I was concerned

1 that they had to pay a penalty for the startup
2 delays.

3 I think I would like to have the
4 comfort of going with the vendor that has worked
5 with us for so long and has performed superbly.
6 I see less risk in that than going to a totally
7 new vendor, and the issue of having two separate
8 vendors on a similar claim, one on the 405, one
9 on the 91. I would feel more comfortable if they
10 were they same, and so I would -- I'm probably
11 going to vote no on this, so I think you for your
12 comments. I appreciate carrying some of the
13 points that were of concern to me.

14 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Okay. Supervisor
15 Bartlett?

16 SUPERVISOR LISA BARTLETT: Thank you,
17 Mr. Chair.

18 So both of these vendors -- I've done
19 some research -- are excellent. One is our
20 current vendor, and the new vendor is a good
21 company as well.

22 I'm curious as to get staff's input, so
23 Kirk, if you could elaborate. Relative to --
24 they take a different approach. One firm took
25 the approach to identify and put financial and

1 other resources into the back office, and the
2 other flipped it and decided to put all of the
3 financial resources and person resources into the
4 customer service, so completely different
5 approaches. Can you give us the rationale for
6 each company's thought process relative to that?

7 KIRK AVILA: Yes.

8 SUPERVISOR LISA BARTLETT: And why they
9 thought it was more important to do one versus
10 the other, and then the other one flipped?

11 KIRK AVILA: Yes, Director Bartlett,
12 I'll approach that. It's not that they put all
13 their resources in a particular area. I believe
14 it was the way they responded to the pricing
15 component of this sheet.

16 And as I mentioned, when they looked at
17 the pricing, one firm did it one way. The other
18 firm did it a different way. It's not that
19 they're putting -- although WSP team does have
20 more people allocated to their customer center --
21 I did mention that -- but with respect to the
22 pricing, there's a little bit different approach
23 that each of the firms took.

24 I'm going to refer to Dan Baker really
25 quickly on that from HNTB. He provided

1 assistance in reviewing the pricing scoring
2 sheet. And Dan, can you address really quickly
3 how each of the term -- each of the firms
4 approached the pricing of the pricing seats for
5 responding to proposals?

6 DAN BAKER: Yes, I can. And thank you,
7 Chairman and Board, for letting me be part of the
8 meeting today. I'm Dan Baker. I'm with the
9 project management consultant group.

10 So what I was explaining to Kirk,
11 there's obviously a large difference in two
12 categories in the pricing. One was in the back-
13 office system administration -- and these are two
14 categories that begin after implementation.

15 The implementation costs, as you saw in
16 the presentation, were within one point some
17 million of each other, relatively close. But
18 there was a huge differential in two categories,
19 one in the back-office administration category,
20 and one in the CSC category. One to do with the
21 system and its operation and one more to do with
22 the customer service center operations and
23 typically more labor.

24 Okay. So in the original pricing,
25 Cofiroute was at 50 million on the back-office

1 system administration, and WSP was at 18 million.
2 In the CSC operations category, Cofiroute was at
3 33 million. WSP was at 71 million, so a large
4 discrepancy.

5 So what I did was go in and do -- but
6 it wasn't an apples to apples. They put
7 different things in different categories. And
8 the bottom line is WSP is delivering more
9 technology as part of CSC operations, so they --
10 and their pricing for CSC operations, they're
11 pricing the customer contact system. They're
12 pricing people doing QA. They're pricing people
13 doing system administration of the customer
14 contact system. Okay.

15 Those costs -- and Cofiroute's are over
16 on the system side. All the system labors and
17 services are pretty much over there.

18 So when I did that -- when I did a --
19 to try to bring them into alignment, I took from
20 WSP the typical systems and labor that we would
21 see on the systems side, and that was about \$22
22 million worth of adjustments.

23 So after that adjustment, the post-
24 adjustment numbers were Cofiroute was at 50
25 million for the system administration, and WSP

1 was at 40 million, a much -- so they went from 18
2 to 40 once I took those and better aligned for an
3 apples-to-apples comparison the labor and the
4 systems.

5 Likewise, on CSC operations, it went
6 from 33 -- it went from a differential of 33
7 million to 71 million, to a different of 33
8 million to 48 million. And even after the
9 changes, as Kirk mentioned, there remained some
10 items that were the reason for the cost
11 differentials, okay, and so we identified them.

12 On the Cofiroute side, there was things
13 such as escrow, and bonding, and insurance, and
14 some higher labor rates on the system side, and
15 then for Cofiroute, there remained -- they had
16 more people, and people are -- over the term of a
17 long-term contract -- are a high-expense item.
18 WSP had higher costs with their consumables and
19 with the facilities and things like that, and
20 they had the -- and they had the higher labor
21 rate on that side.

22 So those things can -- were the primary
23 contributors to the -- to the deltas that
24 remained after we -- but after the adjustment,
25 they were much more in line than they were

1 previously, if that makes sense.

2 SUPERVISOR LISA BARTLETT: Okay. That
3 does. Thank you. But -- so Kirk and Dan, second
4 question, relative to the 91 -- so OCTA has 10
5 miles of the 91 Express Lane, and it's
6 essentially that one ingress and egress point.

7 The I-405 project will help multiple
8 ingress and egress points spanning two counties
9 etc. Do you think it -- is it more complex on
10 the I-405, or is it just having to scale up
11 relative to the I-405 project versus the 91
12 Express Lanes as far as complexity, the needs,
13 requirements, the ability to monitor, catch
14 violators, etc.?

15 KIRK AVILA: Director Bartlett, yes.
16 The 405 Express Lanes will -- from a technical
17 aspect will definitely be a little bit more
18 challenging than 91, as you mentioned. For OCTA
19 side, you have one in, one out at the county
20 line. The 405 will have multiple tolling spots,
21 and an ingress and egress.

22 The business rules will be very
23 similar. However, in tracking down violations,
24 we're going to be relying upon switchable
25 transponders for that for the 405 Express Lanes.

1 For the 91, we have a dedicated lane for HOV
2 travel.

3 You have slightly different business
4 rules with respect to the HOV policy on the 91.
5 You have an HOV 3 ride free policy for most of
6 the time with the exception of Monday through
7 Friday, eastbound 4 to 6 p.m.

8 On the 405, you have a different
9 approach on the HOV. The HOV 3s travel for free
10 all times, and then HOV 2s travel for free during
11 the non-peak hours, and those non-peak hours are
12 staggered throughout the week.

13 So there are some differences there,
14 but the complexities are -- there are
15 complexities between the 405 and differences
16 between the 405 and the 91 because of those
17 ingress-egress points and the configuration and
18 design of the 405.

19 SUPERVISOR LISA BARTLETT: Okay. So in
20 your opinion, are both firms capable of handling
21 the increased level of complexities on the I-405
22 project?

23 KIRK AVILA: Yes. Director Bartlett,
24 as Chairman Do mentioned at the outset, staff
25 believes that both firms are capable of handling

1 the services and the scopes required as part of
2 this procurement.

3 But one thing I do want to mention --
4 this is not solely a back-office system
5 procurement. We've decided to combine this with
6 the customer service center component, and the
7 combination of those two make up this
8 procurement.

9 So if -- the back office is key. Don't
10 get me wrong. This back office is very
11 important, but the customer-facing component of
12 this procurement is extremely important as well.
13 You know, we'll have customers using the express
14 lanes on the 405. We'll have violators,
15 unfortunately, that we're going to have to deal
16 with, so those customer-facing or violation-
17 facing components of this procurement are also
18 extremely important in addition to the back-
19 office system.

20 SUPERVISOR LISA BARTLETT: Okay. So
21 one of the differences you're saying is that the
22 91 Express Lanes is pretty much back office, but
23 the I-405 is back office plus customer service.
24 Is that correct?

25 KIRK AVILA: Director Bartlett, just to

1 clarify, the 91 does include the customer service
2 component as well.

3 SUPERVISOR LISA BARTLETT: Okay.

4 KIRK AVILA: That procurement includes
5 that as well, but the complexities are a little
6 bit different with the 405, given the different
7 HOV policies, given the fact -- given the fact
8 that there's no dedicated HOV lane to ingress-
9 egress points, slightly different than the 91
10 Express Lane.

11 SUPERVISOR LISA BARTLETT: All right.
12 Thank you much.

13 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Supervisor Wagner?

14 DIRECTOR DONALD WAGNER: Thank you, Mr.
15 Chairman. I did have an opportunity to meet with
16 the WSP folks. I came away quite impressed with
17 the level of skill, the dedication, the --
18 frankly, the eagerness they have to serve us and
19 to serve us well. But then as I go through the
20 staff report and listen to the presentation
21 today, it doesn't entirely reflect some of the
22 differences and distinctions.

23 I really think you -- you know, you hit
24 on some stuff in your introductory comment that
25 we don't want to lose sight of.

1 You know, I go through the staff report
2 on the last page, or almost the last page, Page
3 24. You've got these bullet options where WSP
4 and ETC are apparently superior in staff's
5 impression than Cofiroute, but, you know, I look
6 at like the very first one. WSP and ETC have a
7 larger and more diverse portfolio. But at the
8 end of the day, we -- OCTA -- we are in
9 Cofiroute's portfolio, and I didn't hear in the
10 presentation, or I don't read in the staff
11 report, any dissatisfaction with the job
12 Cofiroute did with us in its portfolio.

13 We've got a statement in here that the
14 planning, technical, and operational aspects of
15 the work and onsite staff available support the
16 higher price, but nobody's identified
17 shortcomings in Cofiroute in those areas that, to
18 my mind, justify this significant additional
19 increase in taxpayer dollars going to fund this.

20 Nowhere in the report does it say, "Oh,
21 405 is more complicated than 91. It's got more
22 entry and exit points." Really, the only knock
23 on Cofiroute in here is that -- on Page 9 of the
24 staff report, questions remain about the risk
25 involved in Cofiroute's plan to promote employees

1 from within, etc., which isn't a risk ever
2 identified with the 91. It isn't anything that
3 someone has said -- has hurt us with the 91 and
4 Cofiroute's performance in the 91.

5 I just -- you know, I hate to second
6 guess staff, but I just don't think the -- you
7 know, the argument's been made, the loop -- you
8 know, the circle's been closed here to in fact
9 justify bringing on a new vendor, making the
10 kinds of changes that are suggested here.

11 So I'm a little troubled, a little
12 unsure why we are spending all of this extra
13 money without being able to identify the
14 shortcomings on the 91 in Cofiroute's performance
15 with us in its portfolio that justifies making
16 the transition.

17 Thanks, Chairman.

18 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Thank you.
19 Director Hennessey?

20 DIRECTOR MICHAEL HENNESSEY: Got the
21 mute. Thank you, Chairman Do.

22 Colleagues, this was vetted at the
23 finance committee, and I think we spent a lot of
24 time at it and asked a lot of deep questions, and
25 I think we were -- probably had an hourlong

1 discussion on it. And ultimately, it was
2 approved with a unanimous vote in support of
3 staff's recommendation.

4 A couple of things I would just bear in
5 mind as we go forward, things that kind of stood
6 out to me. I want to -- I do want to begin --
7 and I said this at committee, that I think it
8 should be acknowledged that this toll road is
9 arguably -- well, probably is the most successful
10 toll road in the United States and, you know,
11 arguably one of the most successful toll roads in
12 the world, and Cofiroute was our partner in that,
13 and they are part and parcel of that success, and
14 I think they've done a fabulous job for us.

15 That said, we have a different set of
16 circumstances over on the 405. We have federal
17 funding, and we're going to be going out for a
18 competitive bid. And I think we've just got to
19 be clear that if we're going to go out to the
20 marketplace and conduct what we believe is a
21 competitive bid and useful to spend time, effort,
22 and resources, their money, in bidding, that we
23 would give them a fair shake. The criteria ought
24 to be applied equally.

25 And I think in this particular

1 circumstance, the Board approved the criterion
2 that we went out with. If we wanted to sole
3 source -- I don't know -- Kirk, remind me. Could
4 we have sole sourced on this project? Could we
5 have sole sourced this particular endeavor?

6 KIRK AVILA: Director Hennessey, no.
7 This is a federalized project. We have to go
8 through a procurement process.

9 DIRECTOR MICHAEL HENNESSEY: Okay.

10 KIRK AVILA: That's part of the Board's
11 policy with regards to procurement.

12 DIRECTOR MICHAEL HENNESSEY: Okay. So
13 I -- I mean, I personally don't -- if you really
14 want somebody bad enough, and if it's not
15 federalized, and we can do it, I don't -- I'm not
16 opposed to sole sourcing if we think that that's
17 in the best interest of the taxpayer. But in
18 this instance, that's not what we've gotten.
19 That's not what we can do.

20 We went out into the market once and
21 didn't get sufficient response in the marketplace
22 because people assumed that it was just, I
23 believe, just kind of a flat slam-dunk towards
24 Cofiroute. And so we went out again and said,
25 "No, no. It's a real procurement. Let's have a

1 real competition," and we did.

2 And you know, one of my concerns is,
3 you know, if we set the rules of the match, and
4 then we have a fair fight, and you don't like --
5 and somebody doesn't like the result after the
6 fact, I think you don't go change the rules. I
7 think what we do is we say, "Okay. Well, maybe
8 next time we do it a little differently if we
9 don't like the way it came out," but we had a
10 chance to change those rules beforehand, and we
11 didn't.

12 And I've not heard anything so far that
13 tells me that this was not a -- kind of a fair
14 procurement, and that something -- there was a
15 violation in process or something.

16 And so using the standards that the
17 Board approved, they had a procurement, and it --
18 you know, this was the result. That said, you
19 know, certainly there are contractors that we've
20 had great success with on freeway construction
21 projects, and I haven't heard so far yet the
22 logic used that, "Well, we had a successful
23 contractor on a freeway project. Let's give them
24 all the next 12 projects." We bid it each time.

25 And because why? Because competition

1 is good. Competition in the marketplace makes
2 people sharpen the pencils. It makes you not
3 take your customer for granted, and it makes you
4 do your best every time.

5 And so I look at this, and I've looked
6 -- you know, talked with -- and met with both
7 parties. And again, no criticism in here is
8 implied of Cofiroute, but we conducted, you know,
9 interviews with both parties, many of us on the
10 committee.

11 And what I came away with this is that
12 you have folks here that are sophisticated, that
13 are fully capable of doing this. They've
14 actually gotten some innovations I'm very
15 interested in seeing there, seeing them implement
16 as far as, you know, technology and customer
17 interfacing, and improving that customer
18 relationship and being more responsive to our
19 customers. And we could go into that more if you
20 want to, but I think if they've got neat stuff.

21 And if I look forward, you know, this
22 isn't the only procurement we're going to do for
23 tolling. And in the future, we're going to do
24 more tolling procurement, and I like the idea
25 that if WSP is successful, we might have two

1 really good vendors who know us, who work well
2 with our staff, now competing for the next
3 tolling project that we do, or if we end up
4 combining systems.

5 You know, we've got -- now we've got a
6 marketplace of one, and thankfully they've been
7 good. But I think it certainly doesn't put our
8 agency in a bad position to have two credible
9 choices.

10 Now, if we get down the road and we
11 find out that WSP doesn't perform in a fashion
12 that we're happy with, well, that can -- that'll
13 play out in the next procurement.

14 But right now, I've not seeing anything
15 in process that tells me we shouldn't go with
16 staff's recommendation, and I think it will
17 actually leave us in a better position.

18 And I'm certainly -- and I do also want
19 to extend my thanks to the members of the finance
20 committee. They had a really robust dialogue and
21 a debate, and I think members of our committee
22 came in with one point of view and wound up with
23 another point of view after the give-and-take of
24 this thing and a thorough examination.

25 So I just want to -- you know, however

1 this comes out, I just want to thank the finance
2 committee for doing what is an excellent job for
3 doing their job robustly, and I'm in support of
4 staff's recommendation for the reasons that I've
5 just stated. And I'll make the motion to
6 approve.

7 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Before I call on
8 Director Hernandez, I agree with you, Director
9 Hennessey, that the committee deliberated on
10 this, and there were divergent viewpoints in the
11 beginning.

12 That does point out the validity of the
13 process that we are taking on in that, as
14 directors, we look at different factors, and then
15 we come up with our own solution -- or
16 conclusion.

17 But I think to couch it as changing the
18 rules or second-guessing staff, I think that's
19 not -- that's not what we do here. We are
20 entitled to our own opinion and our own
21 assessment, and we put different weights on
22 different factors because if going with -- or
23 going against staff's recommendation is to second
24 guess people or changing rules, then why don't we
25 just implement a thing where if the -- we just go

1 strictly by the scores. Then what's the point of
2 the Board of Directors discussing and exercising
3 our own independent judgment.

4 So I want to be careful in how we couch
5 this discussion because I think it could be
6 unfair to try to phrase it a certain way.

7 DIRECTOR MICHAEL HENNESSEY: If I may
8 clarify, Director Do, and you raise a good point.
9 And certainly, the Board has the right and
10 obligation to do what they feel is best.

11 My concern is that, you know, we're
12 going out to the marketplace and asking people to
13 compete for things, and we set the criteria. And
14 so sometimes -- what I was addressing was if
15 people are saying, "Hey, this was weighted higher
16 than that, and I don't like that." I want -- you
17 know, some people might feel a price should be
18 preeminent. Well, we could assess that.

19 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: But there -- you
20 make a point.

21 DIRECTOR MICHAEL HENNESSEY: But we
22 didn't.

23 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Yeah. We got your
24 point. I mean, yes. That process was undertaken
25 by staff, and there's a certain point given. But

1 I'm just saying we're at a different point now
2 where the Board now is entitled to exercise its
3 own judgment. This is not a about second
4 guessing staff or changing rules. We just -- we
5 just exercise our own independent judgment.
6 That's it.

7 DIRECTOR MICHAEL HENNESSEY: I -- go
8 ahead.

9 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Director
10 Hernandez.

11 DIRECTOR GENE HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
12 Director Do and to my colleagues. Very excellent
13 discussions, all valid points.

14 As a member of the finance committee,
15 we had the same discussion with all those valid
16 points. And at the end of the day, you're right.
17 We went one way, but clearly it is the option of
18 this Board to weigh other factors to bring in. I
19 have no problem with that. I really don't have a
20 dog in the fight, as I said last time.

21 And Director Wagner made a good point
22 about this diversity in cost, that should have
23 some influence in this group, and for me it did.
24 However, in our robust discussion at the finance
25 committee, it really boiled down to that

1 difference being one of technology, that one
2 group was going to come in with current --
3 greater technology. Another one was going to
4 come in with older technology that may have to
5 ramp up.

6 My question would be if we go with
7 Cofiroute and they have to ramp up, will they
8 still give us the same cost that they just did
9 here, or will it now ramp up to what this initial
10 that we're looking at cost would be, and then it
11 balances out?

12 So I just want to make sure that we're
13 not going into this saying, "Well, Cofiroute's
14 lower," and then a year or two down the road, we
15 do a change order to ramp up.

16 So that's the only thing I'd be
17 cautious with. But other than that, I think
18 they're both fine organizations, and we heard
19 staff say they both could do a good job.

20 But I agree with Director Hennessey.
21 We have a process. We followed it. Doesn't mean
22 we can't overrule it here. Absolutely. But if
23 that's going to be our criteria, that cost is
24 much more important than the others, we need to
25 weigh in and change that when we put this out to

1 bid.

2 Anyway, thank you for allowing me those
3 comments.

4 DIRECTOR MICHAEL HENNESSEY: Otherwise
5 why would you bid again?

6 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Director Muller?

7 DIRECTOR JOSEPH MULLER: Thank you, Mr.
8 Chair. And along with the two previous
9 directors, I'm also on the finance committee, and
10 I had a lot of the same concerns that are being
11 expressed here today, and I did vote yes to -- on
12 this approval, but it was a tepid yes. I wasn't
13 completely sold on it. I had some concerns, and
14 the more I thought about it over the last week,
15 more of those concerns kept coming to the
16 surface.

17 We had a group of evaluators that
18 looked at the separate proposals without cost in
19 mind. And I guess that's fine, but I guess if
20 they would've put the cost in front of it, maybe
21 they would've had a different opinion.

22 But the reality is WSP came in with a
23 bunch of new technology that comes at a cost.
24 Now, we did request it, and it was -- I could
25 come out there -- I could respond to any RFP and

1 give you all the greatest things in the world
2 that could be 10 times more than were ever
3 requested.

4 And while I'm evaluating it without the
5 cost in front of me, I'm like, "Yeah. That's the
6 one I want." But when the cost comes back into
7 the discussion, that's when I have to take a look
8 at it and say, "Wow. All those gee-whiz, great,
9 new technologies that were just presented to me,
10 can I really afford them?"

11 The question I asked to Mr. Avila, can
12 they both deliver this project? And the answer
13 was yes, they absolutely can both deliver it.

14 Going back to what Director Wagner
15 said, can I justify the additional costs? These
16 are taxpayer dollars, \$8 million. That's 8
17 percent of this project. I don't know.

18 You know, another question I ask is
19 what if -- you know, Director Chaffee hit this
20 right on the head. Most people -- most
21 organizations when they do a back-office system,
22 they don't have separate back-offices. They have
23 a back office that delivers whatever product
24 they're presenting out to the public operates the
25 backside of their business. They don't have

1 multiple ones for different projects.

2 And I call these projects because
3 tolling is tolling. You know, one's state.
4 One's federal. They have different requirements,
5 but the reality is tolling is tolling. I'm
6 counting cars as they go through. My back office
7 should be the same. It doesn't make a lot of
8 sense to me. It's not efficient to have to
9 operate two separate back offices.

10 When I asked could you combine them,
11 the answer was -- well, it was kind of a loaded
12 question when I asked it, the answer is, "No,
13 you're not going to be able to combine these two
14 back offices. You're going to have to build a
15 new one. Now, you can combine features of it,
16 but you're going to have to build a new back
17 office."

18 And so, you know, this all comes down
19 to risk. And when you have a vendor that has
20 never issued a change order, as far as I know. I
21 could be wrong on that. Kirk, you can correct me
22 if I am. In Cofiroute, we haven't had a change
23 order from them on the systems they've delivered
24 to us. They've delivered them on time.

25 And we have a new vendor coming in that

1 we don't know that has had an issue in the past,
2 the state of Washington. They paid \$2.6 million
3 in a fine because they didn't deliver. And I
4 find it hard to believe it was something that the
5 state of Washington did. If it was their fault,
6 ETC would not have had to pay that fine. That
7 was an ETC issue. And that's fine. They've
8 worked it all out.

9 North Texas was brought up. Florida
10 was brought up. We didn't get a response on what
11 happened there. We don't have any of those
12 experiences with Cofiroute, even when we've not
13 looked at it, but Director Wagner is correct
14 again. We are part of their portfolio. We know
15 this company. We know how they operate, and
16 that's worth something.

17 You know, when I look at how we did our
18 evaluation and the criteria we put out, it is
19 loaded for somebody to come in and say, "I'm
20 going to give you everything in the world because
21 you don't get to see cost until the end."

22 My question would be, to Kirk, and you
23 probably can't answer this. I wouldn't expect
24 you to. If cost was part of the original
25 evaluation, I know it's 20 percent. It was

1 weighted 20 percent, and I could weight it
2 however I want. I could give Cofiroute 20, and I
3 could give WSP five because of the cost
4 differential. That could change the weighting
5 and the scoring.

6 But if our evaluators were allowed to
7 see the cost while they were evaluating this,
8 would that change their perception of which one
9 is better, especially when they're looking at
10 features that were not part of the RFP. They
11 were above and beyond what we requested.

12 KIRK AVILA: Director Muller, you know,
13 you're correct. I can't answer the -- you know,
14 get in the minds of the different evaluators.
15 But what I can say is that in the discussion, you
16 know, cost was not discussed.

17 However, experience of the team and the
18 team members were discussed, and discussed
19 extensively, and the risks involved with having
20 one set of individuals from one firm versus
21 another.

22 Director Wagner pointed out in the
23 staff report that we didn't highlight any -- or
24 many of the negatives that were raised. We
25 wanted to focus on the positives that were

1 brought to the table by WSP. We have an existing
2 relationship with Cofiroute and TollPlus on the
3 91, and that's a relationship that we've enjoyed
4 for many years. That's been brought up many
5 times.

6 However, when you focus in to the team
7 that is proposed for the 405, and you look at the
8 background of the individuals, and you look at
9 the resumes of the individuals, and the
10 experience that they bring to the table with
11 respect to delivering the 405, the evaluation
12 team felt positive about that group of
13 individuals working together to bring this
14 project to its fruition.

15 With respect to Cofiroute, the staff
16 report did mention that there were a couple
17 individuals that, looking at their background,
18 felt that it was a stretch assignment for some of
19 those to be going into particular areas. One
20 particular individual who serves on the 91 for
21 roadside assistance overview of our traffic
22 operation staffing is now being assigned to a
23 quality assurance role, and this person doesn't
24 have much experience in that particular area.

25 That's just one example, but when you

1 take a look at that, that's what was evaluated,
2 and that's what was discussed. And once again, I
3 can't get into the heads of the individual
4 evaluators, but that was what was really a
5 driving force for the differentials of the
6 scores.

7 DIRECTOR JOSEPH MULLER: So Kirk,
8 that's a really interesting point you brought up.
9 Cofiroute was promoting from within. That is a
10 core value for this organization. We have
11 succession planning, right? I mean, Darrell is
12 working on his successor when he retires. Maybe
13 it's Jennifer. Hopefully it is. I mean, she's
14 fantastic. I'm sure you have a successor in mind
15 for you when you move on to your next position.

16 How is that a negative when it's
17 something that we believe in as an organization
18 we should be doing that Cofiroute is doing the
19 same thing? They're building people up for their
20 next job. And so we bring this person
21 (indiscernible) to stretch, I don't know.
22 Obviously I'm not in the toll business, so I
23 don't understand that. Maybe it is.

24 But to me on the surface, it looks like
25 they should be doing that. This is a person

1 that's grown within the OCTA environment. They
2 worked on 91. They understand what we need.
3 They understand our organization. We should want
4 somebody over that -- like that over on a new
5 project within our organization (indiscernible)
6 will be, Express Lanes will be.

7 I don't see that as a negative. I see
8 that as a positive, quite frankly. But you know,
9 that's neither here nor there. I don't want to
10 belabor that point a little bit, but I think
11 that's important.

12 I do have a question for Dan Baker
13 about the back office, and what Cofiroute did and
14 what WSP did. Is Dan still here?

15 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Yes, he is.

16 DIRECTOR JOSEPH MULLER: Okay. Quick
17 question. WSP in their cost input \$18 million
18 for the back office, correct? I'm just using
19 round numbers.

20 DAN BAKER: Yes.

21 DIRECTOR JOSEPH MULLER: And Cofiroute
22 had 50 million in.

23 DAN BAKER: Yeah, you're talking for
24 the back office -- post-implementation back-
25 office support.

1 DIRECTOR JOSEPH MULLER: Right. So --

2 DAN BAKER: Not the (indiscernible).

3 DIRECTOR JOSEPH MULLER: My question is
4 both of these components are important. Don't
5 you believe the back office is more important?
6 If that system goes down, we no longer have the
7 ability to collect tolls.

8 If the customer service center goes
9 negative, we get some bad press. We get some
10 upset customers. And in my opinion in my past
11 life in sales, an upset customer is an
12 opportunity. You always have an opportunity to
13 to help them out and help them understand and get
14 them on your side.

15 When the back office goes down, we're
16 down. I mean, that creates a fire drill. And
17 how do we -- how do you, you know, evaluate
18 what's more important in terms of where I want my
19 support?

20 DAN BAKER: I'm hesitant to comment
21 because I wasn't on the evaluation committee. I
22 do not -- OCTA has such a firewall between the
23 consultant and the evaluation committee. I did
24 not participate in any of their discussions. I
25 didn't --

1 DIRECTOR JOSEPH MULLER: I'm asking you
2 that question.

3 DAN BAKER: No, I know. I know.

4 DIRECTOR JOSEPH MULLER: I'm asking you
5 that question directly because you went up, and
6 you tore those dollars apart to try to understand
7 how they did things, correct?

8 DAN BAKER: Right.

9 DIRECTOR JOSEPH MULLER: I guess my
10 question is, as a consultant, does WSP have
11 enough money in that back-office system to truly
12 support it?

13 DAN BAKER: Yeah. We -- I saw nothing
14 in their back-office support from a labor
15 standpoint that raised any red flags that they
16 wouldn't be able to support it.

17 This is a system that's completely
18 cloud environment. There's a lot of that typical
19 support that you do within labor yourself that
20 moves to the cloud when you do a pure cloud
21 environment, so you're paying for some of that
22 there.

23 And so I did not see any red flags in
24 their staffing of the back-office system.

25 DIRECTOR JOSEPH MULLER: So how --

1 they've got 18 million in, and Cofiroute's got 50
2 million in. Are you saying then that you think
3 Cofiroute is overstaffed?

4 DAN BAKER: No, I'm not saying that.
5 It's not --

6 DIRECTOR JOSEPH MULLER: I guess the
7 question is -- and I'm waiting on you because
8 you're our consultant on it, and I know you did a
9 one-week -- or a four-week evaluation between
10 these two systems, and we're seeing such a huge
11 differential, and you spent more time looking at
12 those dollars than anybody.

13 I'm just trying to understand why
14 there's such a big disconnect. Or not a
15 disconnect, a discrepancy in between the two. If
16 18 million's enough and Cofiroute's putting 50
17 million in, I'm kind of confused on how that
18 happened.

19 DAN BAKER: Right. So let me explain
20 the pricing a bit. The way the pricing goes in,
21 it's on a per-transaction -- or a per-trip basis
22 that we're paying. We're not paying for certain
23 levels of labor. We're not paying for certain
24 levels -- it's on a per-trip basis. It's on a
25 per-violation basis. It's on a per-account

1 basis.

2 So it really -- that is the basis of
3 the pricing. What we ask them to do to back up
4 that pricing, just for Year 1, is provide
5 additional detail of how did you build that
6 pricing up? And that helps us look for red flags
7 in the way they did their pricing. Okay.

8 And so -- and that only applies to Year
9 1. There's 13 potential more years within the --
10 or 11 more years within the contract we don't --
11 we don't look at. We're just looking for red
12 flags because it really is a service that they're
13 providing for a cost, right? So then we just
14 look for red flags.

15 So I tear it down to look for red
16 flags, and like I said, the areas that we saw
17 things in, we saw wide discrepancy and wide
18 differences in just some escrow and bonding
19 things. I don't question what it costs someone
20 to go out and bond.

21 And then all of them have to put all
22 their profit and overhead into those numbers that
23 they're building up, and I don't control where
24 they put those.

25 So I just want to be clear that we

1 don't -- I don't look at it in the detail to make
2 that type of judgment. I just look at for red
3 flags, and I saw none.

4 But there's individual line items that
5 are greatly different that make sense. Some
6 people pay a lot more for something than others.
7 Some people put a lot more cost into one item
8 than another, but nothing concerns me with the
9 labor -- just the levels of labor, which is just
10 one component of that.

11 DIRECTOR JOSEPH MULLER: Okay. I
12 appreciate that. And the reason I'm kind of
13 asking you these questions -- I know you're the
14 one that did a large part of the evaluation on
15 these systems because you went out and looked at
16 them. That's not something that we were afforded
17 as Board members.

18 So I think that's all I have for right
19 now. I appreciate it.

20 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Thank you. Vice
21 Chair Murphy?

22 VICE CHAIR MARK MURPHY: Thank you, Mr.
23 Chair. The peril of waiting to speak is that the
24 folks in front of you ask the questions that you
25 were going to touch upon, so I'll try and be

1 brief here.

2 I too had some concerns about thinking
3 about a new system may be over scoped for the
4 solution versus one that is a proven commodity.

5 I also have sort of the challenge of
6 having come out of the technology business and
7 being involved in bid and proposal work for a
8 long time, looking at it maybe with slightly
9 different lens than others.

10 But there is no substitute in my
11 opinion for proven experience in these sorts of
12 circumstances when the results affect the bottom-
13 line revenue of the entity that it's looking at,
14 and so while I still look forward to hearing -- I
15 think there's a public comment on this of some
16 sort. My inclination is to stick with people
17 that we've had positive experiences with.

18 And also if there's concerns about the
19 levels of the proposals in terms of the
20 technology or the rest, that's something that
21 would be taken care of in the next round of
22 things in terms of the final analysis and the
23 stipulations.

24 But for me looking at all of it, I
25 think there was some additional award for the

1 initiative of talking about a "new solution" when
2 in fact I think both solutions are very
3 comparable, and one we have experience with and
4 one we don't.

5 And so with that, I'll defer final
6 judgment until I hear public comments and other
7 discussion, but I'm leaning towards going with
8 Cofiroute.

9 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: I have two hands
10 raised, Supervisors Chaffee and Wagner. Are
11 those old hands, or did you want to speak again?

12 DIRECTOR DONALD WAGNER: Old on my
13 part, Mr. Chairman.

14 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Okay. So --

15 SUPERVISOR DOUG CHAFFEE: That's my
16 fault. I forgot to take the hand down. Thank
17 you.

18 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Okay. So I don't
19 have anybody else.

20 There was a motion from Director
21 Hennessey to adopt staff's recommendation. I
22 hadn't heard a second.

23 So the motion dies --

24 DIRECTOR BRIAN GOODELL: Goodell will
25 second.

1 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Okay. So there's
2 a second. So then at this point, okay, I don't
3 see any other hands raised, so Madam Clerk,
4 please take the roll call vote on the motion by
5 Director Hennessey.

6 VICE CHAIR MARK MURPHY: Mr. Chair, if
7 I might just for confirmation purposes, did I
8 misunderstand? Was there not a public comment on
9 this item?

10 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Was there? I
11 don't think so, right?

12 CLERK: There was.

13 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Madam Clerk?

14 CLERK: There was.

15 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Huh?

16 CLERK: Yes, there is.

17 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: I'm sorry. Okay.

18 CLERK: I can read it into the record.

19 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Go ahead. Call on
20 the people at this time.

21 CLERK: Okay. Chairman Do and Board
22 members, on August 8th, 2021 at 9:11 p.m. OCTA's
23 Clerk of the Board Department received a public
24 comment from Tonya Friend of Cofiroute USA. The
25 comment was e-mailed to the Board of Directors on

1 August 9th at 8:20 a.m. and will be retained as
2 part of the record for today's Board meeting.

3 Chairman Do, that concludes my report.

4 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Thank you. All
5 right. So that's a letter that we all received.

6 VICE CHAIR MARK MURPHY: Oh, okay.
7 Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Yeah. Okay. So
9 that's it. Now, Madam Clerk, please take roll
10 call vote.

11 CLERK: Chairman Do?

12 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: No.

13 CLERK: Vice Chairman Murphy?

14 VICE CHAIR MARK MURPHY: I'm a no.

15 CLERK: Director Bartlett?

16 SUPERVISOR LISA BARTLETT: Yes.

17 CLERK: Director Chaffee?

18 SUPERVISOR DOUG CHAFFEE: No.

19 CLERK: Director Delgleize?

20 DIRECTOR BARBARA DELGLEIZE: Yes.

21 CLERK: Director Foley?

22 DIRECTOR KATRINA FOLEY: No.

23 CLERK: Director Goodell?

24 DIRECTOR BRIAN GOODELL: Yes.

25 CLERK: Director Harper?

1 DIRECTOR PATRICK HARPER: Yes.
2 CLERK: Director Hennessey?
3 DIRECTOR MICHAEL HENNESSEY: Yes.
4 CLERK: Director Hernandez?
5 DIRECTOR GENE HERNANDEZ: Yes.
6 CLERK: Director Jones?
7 DIRECTOR STEVE JONES: Yes.
8 CLERK: Director Muller?
9 DIRECTOR JOSEPH MULLER: No.
10 CLERK: Director Nguyen?
11 DIRECTOR TOM NGUYEN: Yes.
12 CLERK: Director Sarmiento?
13 DIRECTOR VICENTE SARMIENTO: No.
14 CLERK: Director Sidhu?
15 DIRECTOR HARRY SIDHU: No.
16 CLERK: Director Wagner?
17 DIRECTOR DONALD WAGNER: No.
18 CLERK: Mr. Chairman, the motion does
19 not pass.
20 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Okay. I will
21 entertain another motion at this time.
22 VICE CHAIR MARK MURPHY: I'll go ahead
23 and move --
24 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: I --
25 VICE CHAIR MARK MURPHY: I'll -- go

1 ahead, Mr. Chair.

2 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: No, no. Go ahead
3 Mr. Murphy.

4 VICE CHAIR MARK MURPHY: I was going to
5 move I'll move the selection of Cofiroute for
6 this award.

7 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Second? So motion
8 by Vice Chair Murphy and seconded by me, Chair
9 Do. Any other comments or questions?

10 Madam Clerk, please take roll call
11 vote.

12 CLERK: Chairman Do?

13 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Aye.

14 CLERK: Vice Chairman Murphy?

15 VICE CHAIR MARK MURPHY: Aye.

16 CLERK: Director Bartlett?

17 SUPERVISOR LISA BARTLETT: No.

18 CLERK: Director Chaffee?

19 SUPERVISOR DOUG CHAFFEE: Aye.

20 CLERK: Director Delgleize?

21 DIRECTOR BARBARA DELGLEIZE: No.

22 CLERK: Director Foley?

23 DIRECTOR KATRINA FOLEY: Yes.

24 CLERK: Director Goodell?

25 DIRECTOR BRIAN GOODELL: No.

1 CLERK: Director Harper?
2 DIRECTOR PATRICK HARPER: No.
3 CLERK: Director Hennessey?
4 DIRECTOR MICHAEL HENNESSEY: No.
5 CLERK: Director Hernandez?
6 DIRECTOR GENE HERNANDEZ: No.
7 CLERK: Director Jones?
8 DIRECTOR STEVE JONES: Yes.
9 CLERK: Director Muller?
10 DIRECTOR JOSEPH MULLER: Aye.
11 CLERK: Director Nguyen?
12 DIRECTOR TOM NGUYEN: Yes.
13 CLERK: Director Sarmiento?
14 DIRECTOR VICENTE SARMIENTO: Yes.
15 CLERK: Director Sidhu?
16 DIRECTOR HARRY SIDHU: Yes.
17 CLERK: Director Wagner?
18 DIRECTOR DONALD WAGNER: Yes.
19 CLERK: Mr. Chairman, motion passes for
20 Cofiroute.
21 CHAIRMAN ANDREW DO: Thank you very
22 much.
23 Brief discussion, colleagues. So that
24 wraps up Item Number 16.
25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certify that the
foregoing transcript is a true and accurate
record of the proceedings.

Sonya M. Ledanski Hyde

Veritext Legal Solutions
330 Old Country Road
Suite 300
Mineola, NY 11501

Date: August 14, 2021

0	2s 25:10	9	adjustments 22:22
0-2690 11:22	3	9 28:23	administration
1	3 9:20,24 10:1,18 25:5	91 3:2,3,9,12,14,16 8:3 18:6 19:9 24:4 24:5,11,18 25:1,4 25:16 26:22 27:1 27:9 28:21 29:2,3 29:4,14 44:3,20 46:2	21:13,19 22:1,13 22:25
1 9:16,16 11:2 15:9 16:2 50:4,9	300 59:13	9:11 54:22	adopt 53:21
1.6 9:18	33 22:3 23:6,6,7	9th 55:1	affect 52:12
10 8:14 16:12 24:4 40:2	330 59:12	a	afford 40:10
100 8:16	3s 25:9	a.m. 55:1	afforded 51:16
11 8:8 50:10	4	abilities 18:1	agencies 5:11,11 6:19 13:7
110.98 11:23	4 25:7	ability 5:7 24:13 47:7	agency 5:22 18:20 34:8
11501 59:14	40 23:1,2	able 14:16 29:13 41:13 48:16	agents 6:7
12 32:24	405 2:8,20,21,22 3:6,8,11,12,17 4:1 4:2,3,4,9 5:1,7 7:25 8:4,17 9:21 11:18,25 12:23 19:8 24:7,10,11,16 24:20,25 25:8,15 25:16,18,21 26:14 26:23 27:6 28:21 30:16 44:7,11	absolutely 38:22 40:13	ago 2:15 15:17
12151 59:8	470 17:3	account 5:4,16,20 6:1 49:25	agree 35:8 38:20
13 11:5,10 50:9	48 23:8	accounts 5:25	agreement 11:22 12:7
14 59:16	5	accurate 59:4	ahead 37:8 54:19 56:22 57:1,2
15 8:1,2	5.4 11:9	acknowledged 30:8	aligned 23:2
16 2:3 58:24	5.5 10:1,17	action 4:6	alignment 22:19
17 8:15	50 21:25 22:24 46:22 49:1,16	active 5:20	allocated 20:20
18 22:1 23:1 46:17 49:1,16	6	activities 10:9,10	allowed 43:6
2	6 25:7	ad 9:1	allowing 39:2
2 9:20,23,25 10:18 11:3	7	added 6:23	allows 6:6
2.6 42:2	71 22:3 23:7	addition 8:2 26:18	amenities 14:17
20 13:22 14:23 42:25 43:1,2	8	additional 9:3 28:18 40:15 50:5 52:25	amount 11:23
2016 4:5	8 11:7 40:16,16	address 5:16 21:2	amounts 9:25
2017 2:23	8:20 55:1	addressing 17:25 36:14	analysis 52:22
2018 4:6	8th 54:22	adjustment 22:23 22:24 23:24	andrew 2:1 13:3 19:14 27:13 29:18 35:7 36:19,23 37:9 39:6 46:15 51:20 53:9,14,18 54:1,10,13,15,17 54:19 55:4,8,12 56:20,24 57:2,7,13 58:21
2019 3:4			answer 13:2 40:12 41:11,12 42:23 43:13
2020 2:15 6:12			
2021 6:13,14 54:22 59:16			
2022 4:16 12:21			
2023 3:18 12:24			
22 22:21			
24 28:3			

[anybody - building]

anybody 49:12 53:19 anyway 14:13 39:2 apart 48:6 apparently 15:22 28:4 appears 10:8 apples 22:6,6 23:3 23:3 applicable 5:5 applied 30:24 applies 50:8 appreciate 19:12 51:12,19 approach 9:5 19:24,25 20:12,22 25:9 approached 21:4 approaches 10:6 20:5 appropriate 5:3 approval 12:20 39:12 approve 35:6 approved 2:16 4:5 12:4 15:10 30:2 31:1 32:17 approves 11:16 approving 11:6 approximate 10:24 11:7 approximately 11:1 area 4:19 20:13 44:24 areas 4:21 28:17 44:19 50:16 arguably 30:9,11 argument's 29:7	asked 29:24 40:11 41:10,12 asking 36:12 48:1 48:4 51:13 aspect 24:17 aspects 28:14 assess 36:18 assessment 35:21 assigned 7:25 44:22 assignment 44:18 assist 12:10 assistance 4:17 21:1 44:21 associated 6:5 assumed 31:22 assurance 44:23 assurances 14:20 attached 15:7 attend 12:9 august 54:22 55:1 59:16 authority 1:13 17:3,20 18:9 authorize 11:21 authorized 2:17 availability 8:17 available 28:15 avila 2:4,5 16:2,3 16:4 20:7,11 24:15 25:23 26:25 27:4 31:6,10 40:11 43:12 award 7:10 52:25 57:6 aye 57:13,15,19 58:10	9:4,18,22 10:9,14 11:17,24 17:4,20 18:4,7,11 20:1 21:12,19,25 26:4,9 26:10,18,22,23 40:6,14,21,22,23 41:6,9,14,16 46:13 46:18,24,24 47:5 47:15 48:11,14,24 50:3 background 2:13 44:8,17 backside 40:25 bad 31:14 34:8 47:9 baker 20:24 21:6,8 46:12,20,23 47:2 47:20 48:3,8,13 49:4,19 balance 13:12 balances 38:11 bank 6:1 barbara 55:20 57:21 bartlett 19:15,16 20:8,11 24:2,15 25:19,23 26:20,25 27:3,11 55:15,16 57:16,17 based 6:7 8:20 11:14 14:5 17:11 basis 49:21,24,25 50:1,2 bear 30:4 began 2:23 beginning 18:18 18:19 35:11 belabor 46:10 believe 16:11,12 20:13 30:20 31:23 42:4 45:17 47:5	believes 25:25 beneficial 14:7 best 7:5 31:17 33:4 36:10 better 23:2 34:17 43:9 beyond 43:11 bid 7:7 30:18,21 32:24 39:1,5 52:7 bidding 30:22 big 49:14 bit 20:22 24:17 27:6 46:10 49:20 board 2:5,13,16 4:5,6,14 11:5,15 12:5,14,20,25 15:10,14 16:19 21:7 31:1 32:17 36:2,9 37:2,18 51:17 54:21,23,25 55:2 board's 31:10 boiled 37:25 bond 50:20 bonding 23:13 50:18 bottom 10:22 11:4 22:8 52:12 break 14:2 brian 53:24 55:24 57:25 brief 52:1 58:23 bring 22:19 37:18 44:10,13 45:20 bringing 29:9 brought 42:9,10 44:1,4 45:8 build 4:4 41:14,16 50:5 building 10:7 45:19 50:23
	b		
	back 2:8,19,23 3:1 4:25,25 5:6 7:14 7:18 8:7,19,20,25		

[built - company]

built 2:21 bullet 28:3 bunch 39:23 business 24:22 25:3 40:25 45:22 52:6 buy 12:17	certainly 32:19 34:7,18 36:9 certify 59:3 chaffee 15:4,5,16 16:3 18:12,24 40:19 53:10,15 55:17,18 57:18,19 chair 19:17 39:8 51:21,22,23 54:6,6 55:6,14 56:22,25 57:1,4,8,8,15 chairman 2:1,4 12:25 13:3 15:9 16:19 19:14 21:7 25:24 27:13,15 29:17,18,21 35:7 36:19,23 37:9 39:6 46:15 51:20 53:9,13,14,18 54:1 54:10,13,15,17,19 54:21 55:3,4,8,11 55:12,13 56:18,20 56:24 57:2,7,12,13 57:14 58:19,21 challenge 52:5 challenges 13:19 challenging 13:11 24:18 chance 32:10 change 13:24 32:6 32:10 38:15,25 41:20,22 43:4,8 changes 15:12 17:24 23:9 29:10 changing 35:17,24 37:4 channel 7:15 charges 5:3 chat 8:23 check 18:12	checks 16:5,10,13 16:16,22,24,25 choices 34:9 circle's 29:8 circumstance 31:1 circumstances 30:16 52:12 claim 19:8 clarify 27:1 36:8 clarifying 18:25 clear 30:19 50:25 clearly 37:17 clerk 54:3,12,13 54:14,16,18,21,23 55:9,11,13,15,17 55:19,21,23,25 56:2,4,6,8,10,12 56:14,16,18 57:10 57:12,14,16,18,20 57:22,24 58:1,3,5 58:7,9,11,13,15,17 58:19 clients 7:20 close 13:22 14:23 21:17 closed 29:8 cloud 8:20 48:18 48:20,20 cofiroute 7:1 10:13 14:14,15,23 18:3,5 21:25 22:2 22:24 23:12,15 28:5,12,17,23 30:12 31:24 33:8 38:7 41:22 42:12 43:2 44:2,15 45:9 45:18 46:13,21 49:3 53:8 54:24 57:5 58:20 cofiroute's 22:15 28:9,25 29:4,14	38:13 49:1,16 colleagues 29:22 37:12 58:23 collect 47:7 collection 5:11,21 collections 5:18,23 collectively 17:6 colorado 7:20 combination 10:18 26:7 combine 9:25 26:5 41:10,13,15 combining 34:4 come 35:15 38:2,4 39:25 42:19 52:6 comes 35:1 39:23 40:6 41:18 comfort 19:4 comfortable 19:9 coming 12:13 18:7 39:15 41:25 comment 16:15 18:7 27:24 47:20 52:15 54:8,24,25 comments 13:5 15:2 18:17 19:12 39:3 53:6 57:9 commission 18:5 commitment 8:17 committee 6:15,20 7:3 11:15 16:1,6,9 29:23 30:7 33:10 34:20,21 35:2,9 37:14,25 39:9 47:21,23 commodity 52:4 communications 7:16 company 10:11 19:21 42:15
c			
c 11:22 59:1,1 calendar 2:2 call 5:15 8:11 35:7 41:2 54:4,19 55:10 57:10 calls 6:7 cam 16:20 cameras 4:8 capable 14:14 25:20,25 33:13 card 5:10 care 52:21 careful 36:4 carrying 19:12 cars 41:6 case 17:2 catch 24:13 categories 21:12 21:14,18 22:7 category 10:5 21:19,20 22:2 cautious 38:17 center 2:9,19 3:1 5:16 6:6 7:19 8:9 8:11 9:5,24 10:10 10:16,20 11:18,25 12:15,16 20:20 21:22 26:6 47:8 central 18:8 centric 9:5 ceo 11:21 17:22 certain 36:6,25 49:22,23			

[company's - delivered]

company's 20:6 comparable 53:3 comparison 9:12 23:3 compete 36:13 competing 34:2 competition 32:1 32:25 33:1 competitive 30:18 30:21 complaint 13:23 complete 4:1 completed 2:25 3:3,25 6:24 completely 20:4 39:13 48:17 complex 24:9 complexities 25:14 25:15,21 27:5 complexity 13:15 24:12 complicated 28:21 component 5:10 6:21 20:15 26:6 26:11 27:2 51:10 components 26:17 47:4 concern 19:13 36:11 concerned 15:20 18:25 concerns 32:2 39:10,13,15 51:8 52:2,18 concludes 13:1 55:3 conclusion 35:16 conduct 16:21 30:20 conducted 33:8	conference 6:12 configuration 25:17 confirmation 54:7 confused 49:17 consent 2:2 construction 2:23 32:20 consultant 3:8 21:9 47:23 48:10 49:8 consultants 7:13 consumables 23:18 contact 6:6 22:11 22:14 contacted 17:8 context 13:21 continuously 17:14 contract 7:10 12:5 15:6,11,14 23:17 50:10 contractor 3:19 12:9,16 32:23 contractors 3:21 32:19 contracts 16:12 contributors 23:23 control 50:23 conversation 14:13 core 5:1 14:11 45:10 correct 26:24 41:21 42:13 43:13 46:18 48:7 corridor 4:10 cost 6:22,22 7:9 9:10,13,18 10:14	10:15,17 11:4,7,9 23:10 37:22 38:8 38:10,23 39:18,20 39:23 40:5,6 42:21,24 43:3,7,16 46:17 50:13 51:7 costs 3:16 7:8 21:15 22:15 23:18 40:15 50:19 couch 35:17 36:4 count 14:24 counties 24:8 counting 41:6 country 8:9 59:12 county 1:13 13:7 17:19 18:4 24:19 couple 3:11 7:9 30:4 44:16 cover 9:20 covered 14:12 covers 10:23 11:2 11:3 created 6:15 creates 47:16 credible 34:8 credit 5:10 criteria 2:16 30:23 36:13 38:23 42:18 criterion 31:1 criticism 33:7 csc 21:20 22:2,9 22:10 23:5 curious 19:22 current 19:20 38:2 currently 12:17 customer 2:9,19 3:1 5:14,25 7:19 8:9 9:3,4,5,6,8,23 10:9,15,20 11:17 11:24 12:15 20:4 20:20 21:22 22:11	22:13 26:6,11,16 26:23 27:1 33:3 33:16,17 47:8,11 customer's 5:4 customers 4:17 5:16 26:13 33:19 47:10 customized 13:9
d			
dan 20:24 21:2,6,8 24:3 46:12,14,20 46:23 47:2,20 48:3,8,13 49:4,19 darrell 45:11 data 5:2 9:3,9 date 12:23 15:8 59:16 day 13:10 28:8 37:16 deal 13:13,20 26:15 dealing 5:19 debate 34:21 december 6:12 decided 20:2 26:5 dedicated 25:1 27:8 dedication 27:17 deep 29:24 defer 16:6,11 53:5 definitely 24:17 delay 18:15 delays 19:2 delgleize 55:19,20 57:20,21 deliberated 35:9 deliver 40:12,13 42:3 delivered 8:8 41:23,24			

[delivering - evaluation]

delivering 22:8 44:11 delivers 40:23 deltas 23:23 department 18:13 54:23 depends 14:9 deploying 8:20 deployment 7:19 deposited 6:1 design 3:19 4:3,23 12:9 25:18 despite 7:9 detail 50:5 51:1 details 2:13 4:13 developing 3:5 development 3:10 4:24 12:11 17:23 dialogue 34:20 diego 8:2 dies 53:23 difference 3:11 10:17 14:3,4 21:11 38:1 differences 9:14 25:13,15 26:21 27:22 50:18 different 6:18 10:6 13:6,14 16:16 19:24 20:4,18,22 22:7,7 23:7 25:3,8 27:6,6,9 30:15 35:14,21,22 37:1 39:21 41:1,4 43:14 51:5 52:9 differential 9:19 10:2,17 11:7,9 21:18 23:6 43:4 49:11 differentials 10:4 23:11 45:5	differently 32:8 difficult 13:8 direct 7:23 directly 48:5 director 16:3,6,12 16:20 20:11 24:15 25:23 26:25 27:14 29:19,20 31:6,9,12 35:8,8 36:7,8,21 37:7,9,11,12,21 38:20 39:4,6,7 40:14,19 42:13 43:12,22 45:7 46:16,21 47:1,3 48:1,4,9,25 49:6 51:11 53:12,20,24 54:5 55:15,17,19 55:20,21,22,23,24 55:25 56:1,2,3,4,5 56:6,7,8,9,10,11 56:12,13,14,15,16 56:17 57:16,18,20 57:21,22,23,24,25 58:1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8 58:9,10,11,12,13 58:14,15,16,17,18 directors 35:14 36:2 39:9 54:25 disconnect 49:14 49:15 discrepancy 22:4 49:15 50:17 discuss 2:11 discussed 43:16,18 43:18 45:2 discussing 4:11 36:2 discussion 15:1 30:1 36:5 37:15 37:24 40:7 43:15 53:7 58:23	discussions 37:13 47:24 dissatisfaction 28:11 distinctions 27:22 distributed 6:7 divergent 35:10 diverse 28:7 diversified 7:17 9:7 diversity 37:22 document 3:9 documents 3:6 12:9 dog 37:20 doing 14:15 22:12 22:13 33:13 35:2 35:3 45:18,18,25 dollars 28:19 40:16 48:6 49:12 donald 27:14 53:12 56:17 58:18 doug 15:5,16 18:12,24 53:15 55:18 57:19 draft 15:11 drill 47:16 drills 9:13 driving 45:5 due 10:5,18 dunk 31:23	effort 30:21 egress 24:6,8,21 25:17 27:9 eight 11:1 12:1 elaborate 19:23 electronic 4:8 7:12 emphasis 9:8 emphasized 8:24 emphasizing 9:6 employees 28:25 endeavor 31:5 enjoyed 14:23 44:3 ensuring 5:24 entertain 56:21 entirely 27:21 entities 6:16 entitled 35:20 37:2 entity 52:13 entry 28:22 environment 46:1 48:18,21 equally 30:24 escorting 4:19 escrow 23:13 50:18 especially 43:9 essentially 24:6 establishes 5:4 estimate 9:13 etc's 17:20 18:1 evaluate 47:17 evaluated 6:21 45:1 evaluating 40:4 43:7 evaluation 2:16 6:14,20,23 7:2,10 11:14 16:5,9,23 42:18,25 44:11 47:21,23 49:9
--	--	---	--

<p>51:14 evaluations 16:8 evaluators 39:17 43:6,14 45:4 examination 34:24 example 44:25 excellent 18:6 19:19 35:2 37:12 exception 25:6 execute 11:21 executed 12:7 exercise 37:2,5 exercised 11:11 exercising 36:2 existing 44:1 exit 28:22 expect 42:23 expected 13:10 expense 23:17 experience 6:19 7:24 8:1,10,14,15 8:19 9:7 13:6 14:24 43:17 44:10 44:24 52:11 53:3 experiences 42:12 52:17 expertise 17:11 experts 6:21 explain 49:19 explaining 21:10 exponentially 13:15 express 2:6,8,20 2:21 3:2,3,6,9,17 4:1,2 5:1,7 6:17 8:2,3 9:22 11:18 11:25 12:23 18:6 24:5,12,16,25 26:13,22 27:10 46:6</p>	<p>expressed 39:11 extend 34:19 extensive 9:1 extensively 43:19 extra 29:12 extremely 26:12 26:18</p> <p>f</p> <p>f 59:1 fabulous 30:14 facilities 23:19 facility 5:19 facing 26:11,16,17 fact 10:19 27:7,7 29:8 32:6 53:2 factors 35:14,22 37:18 fair 30:23 32:4,13 fall 3:18 12:23 fantastic 45:14 far 14:5 17:18 24:12 32:12,21 33:16 41:20 fashion 34:11 fault 42:5 53:16 features 14:6 41:15 43:10 federal 30:16 41:4 federalized 3:13 31:7,15 fee 5:4 feel 19:9 36:10,17 feels 14:6 felt 44:12,18 fight 32:4 37:20 files 5:21 final 7:5 52:22 53:5 finalists 14:3,14 finalize 12:5</p>	<p>finance 29:23 34:19 35:1 37:14 37:24 39:9 financial 19:25 20:3 find 34:11 42:4 fine 38:18 39:19 42:3,6,7 fire 47:16 firewall 47:22 firm 10:8,10 11:16 12:7 19:24 20:17 20:18 43:20 firms 7:1,1 9:11 9:15,19 10:1,2,5 11:8 20:23 21:3 25:20,25 first 28:6 five 43:3 fixing 4:18 flags 48:15,23 50:6 50:12,14,16 51:3 flat 4:18 31:23 flipped 20:2,10 florida 15:24 42:9 focus 14:1 43:25 44:6 foley 55:21,22 57:22,23 folks 27:16 33:12 51:24 followed 38:21 following 7:11 footnote 10:22 force 45:5 foregoing 59:4 forgot 53:16 forward 30:5 33:21 52:14 four 6:18 49:9</p>	<p>frankly 27:18 46:8 free 25:5,9,10 freeway 32:20,23 friday 25:7 friend 54:24 front 39:20 40:5 51:24 fruition 44:14 fully 33:13 function 5:1 10:8 10:21 14:11 functions 5:2 13:14 fund 28:19 funding 30:17 future 14:7,21 33:23</p> <p>g</p> <p>gap 10:5 gas 4:18 gee 40:8 gene 37:11 56:5 58:6 general 2:6 16:4 georgia 7:21 give 20:5 30:23 32:23 34:23 38:8 40:1 42:20 43:2,3 given 14:21 27:6,7 27:7 36:25 go 2:7 7:8 10:24 10:25 22:5 27:19 28:1 30:5,19 31:7 32:6 33:19 34:15 35:25 37:7 38:6 41:6 50:20 54:19 56:22,25 57:2 goes 47:6,8,15 49:20 going 15:7 19:4,6 19:11 20:24 24:24</p>
---	---	--	---

[going - interfacing]

26:15 28:19 30:17 30:17,19 33:22,23 35:22,23 36:12 38:2,3,13,23 40:14 41:13,14,16 42:20 44:19 51:25 53:7 57:4 good 2:4 13:23 14:24 16:18 17:24 19:20 33:1 34:1,7 36:8 37:21 38:19 goodell 53:24,24 55:23,24 57:24,25 gotten 31:18 33:14 government 7:14 granted 33:3 great 14:4 18:2,22 32:20 40:8 greater 38:3 greatest 40:1 greatly 51:5 group 21:9 37:23 38:2 39:17 44:12 grown 46:1 guess 29:6 35:24 39:19,19 48:9 49:6 guessing 35:18 37:4	harper 55:25 56:1 58:1,2 harris 17:19 harry 56:15 58:16 hate 29:5 head 40:20 heads 45:3 hear 28:9 53:6 heard 32:12,21 38:18 53:22 hearing 52:14 held 6:13 help 24:7 47:13,13 helps 50:6 hennessey 29:19 29:20 31:6,9,12 35:9 36:7,21 37:7 38:20 39:4 53:21 54:5 56:2,3 58:3,4 hernandez 35:8 37:10,11 56:4,5 58:5,6 hesitant 47:20 hey 36:15 high 23:17 higher 7:9 10:13 10:15,20 23:14,18 23:20 28:16 36:15 highlight 3:24 4:22 43:23 highlighted 4:12 8:18 highlights 4:21 highly 7:23 highway 17:3 hit 27:23 40:19 hntb 3:7 20:25 ho 47:6 hoc 9:1 hopefully 45:13	hourlong 29:25 hours 25:11,11 hov 25:1,4,5,9,9 25:10 27:7,8 huge 21:18 49:10 huh 54:15 hurt 29:3 hyde 59:3 i idea 33:24 identified 23:11 28:16 29:2 identify 19:25 29:13 illinois 17:8 implement 3:20 13:8 33:15 35:25 implementation 4:24 8:5 9:17 10:25 17:21 18:15 21:14,15 46:24 implied 33:8 important 20:9 26:11,12,18 38:24 46:11 47:4,5,18 impressed 27:16 impression 28:5 improvement 2:22 4:3 17:5 improving 33:17 inclination 52:16 include 3:12 4:16 4:18 7:20 27:1 included 9:2 15:11 includes 4:23 5:12 5:14,24 6:4,15 9:16 27:4 including 16:13 incorporate 14:7 increase 13:17 28:19	increased 25:21 increases 13:15 increasing 13:16 independent 9:13 36:3 37:5 indicated 14:13 17:9,25 indicates 9:16 indiscernible 3:14 6:8 7:24 16:25 45:21 46:5 47:2 individual 44:20 45:3 51:4 individuals 17:19 43:20 44:8,9,13,17 industry 17:11 influence 37:23 information 6:10 14:10 ingress 24:6,8,21 25:17 27:8 initial 10:23 11:6,8 12:1 38:9 initiative 53:1 innovation 8:24 innovations 33:14 input 12:10 19:22 46:17 instance 16:11 31:18 insurance 23:13 integrated 8:18,21 interact 5:7 interactive 5:9 8:21 interest 31:17 interested 33:15 interesting 45:8 interfaces 5:10 interfacing 33:17
h			
half 12:1 hand 53:16 handling 25:20,25 hands 13:4 15:2 53:9,11 54:3 happened 42:11 49:18 happy 13:1 34:12 hard 42:4 hardware 5:12 6:4			

[interview - major]

interview 7:5 interviewed 7:1 interviews 33:9 introductory 27:24 inventory 5:8 investigated 16:1 involve 5:19 involved 28:25 43:19 52:7 involvement 17:22 issue 12:6 19:7 42:1,7 issued 12:8 41:20 issues 5:17 17:12 17:25 18:20,21 issuing 5:20 item 2:2 23:17 51:7 54:9 58:24 items 23:10 51:4 ivr 6:5	k kapsch 4:6 katrina 55:22 57:23 kept 39:15 key 8:13,14,16 10:16 26:9 kind 14:8,10 30:5 31:23 32:13 41:11 49:17 51:12 kinds 29:10 kirk 2:4,5 13:3 16:3,4 19:23 20:7 20:11 21:10 23:9 24:3,15 25:23 26:25 27:4 31:3,6 31:10 41:21 42:22 43:12 45:7 knock 28:22 know 13:25 14:19 26:13 27:23 28:1 28:5 29:5,7,8 30:10 31:3 32:2,3 32:18,19 33:6,8,16 33:21 34:1,5,25 36:11,17 40:17,18 40:19 41:3,18,20 42:1,14,15,17,25 43:12,13,16 45:21 46:8 47:17 48:3,3 49:8 51:13 knowledge 17:11	lane 3:6 4:7 5:3 8:4 24:5 25:1 27:8 27:10 lanes 2:6,8,20,21 3:2,3,9,17 4:1,2 5:1,7 6:17 8:2,4 9:22 11:19 12:1 12:23 18:7 24:12 24:16,25 26:14,22 46:6 large 7:17 10:4 17:21 21:11 22:3 51:14 larger 2:22 28:7 lastly 4:14 late 6:14 15:21 leaning 53:7 learned 15:20 lease 12:17 leave 34:17 ledanski 59:3 legal 59:11 lens 52:9 letter 55:5 letting 21:7 level 25:21 27:17 levels 17:17 49:23 49:24 51:9 52:19 library 9:1 life 47:11 likewise 23:5 line 9:16,16,23,24 9:25 22:8 23:25 24:20 51:4 52:13 lines 9:20 10:18 lisa 19:16 20:8 24:2 25:19 26:20 27:3,11 55:16 57:17 listed 11:4,13	listen 27:20 little 20:22 24:17 27:5 29:11,11 32:8 46:10 live 10:24,25 loaded 41:11 42:19 location 12:14 logic 32:22 long 19:5 23:17 52:8 longer 47:6 look 15:2 28:5 33:5,21 35:14 40:7 42:17 44:7,8 45:1 50:6,11,14,15 51:1,2 52:14 looked 20:16 33:5 39:18 42:13 51:15 looking 38:10 43:9 44:17 49:11 50:11 52:8,13,24 looks 45:24 loop 29:7 lose 27:25 lot 14:20 29:23,24 39:10 41:7 48:18 51:6,7 louisiana 7:21 lower 38:14 lowest 7:7
j january 6:13 jennifer 45:13 job 18:2,6 28:11 30:14 35:2,3 38:19 45:20 joint 3:15 jones 56:6,7 58:7,8 joseph 39:7 45:7 46:16,21 47:1,3 48:1,4,9,25 49:6 51:11 56:9 58:10 judgment 36:3 37:3,5 51:2 53:6 june 2:15 justifies 29:15 justify 28:18 29:9 40:15	l la 8:10 labor 10:19 21:23 22:20 23:3,14,20 48:14,19 49:23 51:9,9 labors 22:16	m madam 54:3,13 55:9 57:10 mail 8:23 mailed 54:25 maintenance 4:24 9:21,23,24 10:14 10:16 major 3:25 4:21 8:8	

[majority - once]

majority 8:16 making 29:9,15 man 15:9 16:2 management 3:8 18:2 21:9 manager 2:6 7:25 8:7,10 16:4 manner 8:6 march 6:14 mark 51:22 54:6 55:6,14 56:22,25 57:4,15 market 31:20 marketplace 30:20 31:21 33:1 34:6 36:12 match 32:3 matter 6:20 mean 31:13 36:24 38:21 45:11,13 47:16 media 8:23 meet 27:15 meeting 17:10 21:8 55:2 member 37:14 members 2:5 6:15 12:25 16:19 34:19 34:21 43:18 51:17 54:22 mention 20:21 26:3 44:16 mentioned 4:2 12:19 20:16 23:9 24:18 25:24 met 14:20 33:6 metro 8:10 michael 29:20 31:9,12 36:7,21 37:7 39:4 56:3 58:4	miles 24:5 million 9:18 10:2 10:17 11:7,9 21:17,25 22:1,3,3 22:22,25 23:1,7,7 23:8,8 40:16 42:2 46:17,22 49:1,2,17 million's 49:16 mind 28:18 30:5 39:19 45:14 minds 43:14 mineola 59:14 minnesota 7:21 minutes 7:9 mission 17:7 misunderstand 54:8 mobility 18:8 moment 3:24 monday 25:6 money 29:13 30:22 48:11 monitor 24:13 months 12:13 morning 2:4,7 16:18 motion 35:5 53:20 53:23 54:4 56:18 56:21 57:7 58:19 move 2:2 45:15 56:23 57:5,5 moves 48:20 muller 39:6,7 43:12 45:7 46:16 46:21 47:1,3 48:1 48:4,9,25 49:6 51:11 56:8,9 58:9 58:10 multiple 13:13 24:7,20 41:1	murphy 51:21,22 54:6 55:6,13,14 56:22,25 57:3,4,8 57:14,15 mute 29:21 mutually 17:15 n n 59:1 nature 15:13 neat 33:20 necessarily 14:8 necessary 14:15 need 4:1 38:24 46:2 needs 17:10 24:12 negative 45:16 46:7 47:9 negatives 15:25 43:24 negotiate 11:21 neither 46:9 never 13:23 41:20 new 3:20 12:7,11 19:7,20 29:9 39:23 40:9 41:15 41:16,25 46:4 52:3 53:1 nguyen 56:10,11 58:11,12 nobody's 28:16 non 25:11,11 north 42:9 northwest 17:13 notice 12:6 14:4 noticed 15:6 notices 5:21 november 4:5 ntp 12:7 number 2:2 58:24 numbers 22:24 46:19 50:22	ny 59:14
			o o 59:1 obligation 36:10 obviously 21:11 45:22 oc 4:4 octa 3:7 11:22 24:4,18 28:8 46:1 47:22 octa's 2:6 6:17 8:3 54:22 offer 7:6 office 2:9,19 3:1 4:25,25 5:6 7:14 7:18 8:7,19,21,25 9:4,18,22 10:9,14 11:17,24 17:20 20:1 21:13,19,25 26:4,9,10,19,22,23 40:21,23 41:6,17 46:13,18,24,25 47:5,15 48:11,14 48:24 offices 40:22 41:9 41:14 oh 28:20 55:6 okay 15:16 18:24 19:14 21:24 22:14 23:11 24:2 25:19 26:20 27:3 31:9 31:12 32:7 46:16 50:7 51:11 53:14 53:18 54:1,2,17,21 55:6,8 56:20 old 53:11,12 59:12 older 38:4 omni 7:15 once 12:7 23:2 31:20 45:2

[one's - price]

one's 41:3,4 ones 41:1 onsite 28:15 open 3:18 17:5 opening 3:22 9:21 12:23 operate 41:9 42:15 operates 40:24 operation 2:20 9:22 12:15 13:14 21:21 44:22 operational 10:21 12:11 28:14 operations 2:10 3:2 4:9 7:20 9:20 9:24 10:13,16 11:18,25 17:15 21:22 22:2,9,10 23:5 opinion 25:20 35:20 39:21 47:10 52:11 opportunity 27:15 47:12,12 opposed 31:16 optimization 9:6 option 11:2,3,10 12:3 37:17 options 12:18 28:3 orange 1:13 order 13:24 38:15 41:20,23 organization 17:6 17:17 45:10,17 46:3,5 organization's 17:7 organizations 38:18 40:21 original 21:24 42:24	ought 30:23 outset 25:24 overall 17:23 overhead 50:22 overrule 38:22 overstaffed 49:3 overview 44:21 <p style="text-align: center;">p</p> p.m. 25:7 54:22 page 28:2,2,2,23 paid 15:23 18:14 42:2 parcel 30:13 parkway 17:14 part 2:22 4:3 14:8 15:9 16:5,8,9,22 21:7 22:9 26:1 30:13 31:10 42:14 42:24 43:10 51:14 53:13 55:2 participate 47:24 particular 16:10 20:13 30:25 31:5 44:19,20,24 parties 33:7,9 partner 30:12 partners 4:4 13:13 pass 56:19 passes 58:19 patrick 56:1 58:2 pay 19:1 42:6 51:6 paying 48:21 49:22,22,23 peak 25:11,11 penalty 15:23 18:14 19:1 pencils 33:2 people 8:12 20:20 22:12,12 23:16,16 31:22 33:2 35:24 36:12,15,17 40:20	45:19 51:6,7 52:16 54:20 percent 8:16 40:17 42:25 43:1 perception 43:8 perform 34:11 performance 14:21 17:23 29:4 29:14 performed 11:14 19:5 peril 51:23 period 3:19,21 9:21 10:24,25 11:1,2,3,5 person 8:3 20:3 44:23 45:20,25 personally 31:13 personnel 8:13,15 8:16 phones 5:9 phrase 36:6 pia 16:15,18,19 18:16 place 12:22 plan 28:25 planning 28:14 45:11 platform 7:16 platforms 8:23 play 34:13 please 2:11 3:23 4:20 6:9 9:10 11:12 12:4 54:4 55:9 57:10 plus 6:16 10:24 26:23 point 3:10 15:11 21:16 24:6 34:22 34:23 35:12 36:1 36:8,20,24,25 37:1	37:21 45:8 46:10 54:2 pointed 43:22 points 19:13 24:8 25:17 27:9 28:22 37:13,16 policies 27:7 policy 15:12 25:4 25:5 31:11 portfolio 7:18 28:7 28:9,12 29:15 42:14 position 34:8,17 45:15 positive 17:4 18:7 18:11 44:12 46:8 52:17 positives 43:25 post 22:23 46:24 posted 5:25 potential 50:9 practice 17:10 prebuilt 9:1 preeminent 36:18 preferences 14:5 preproposal 6:12 presentation 12:20 13:1 21:16 27:20 28:10 presented 15:14 40:9 presenting 40:24 press 47:9 pretty 18:10 22:17 26:22 previous 39:8 previously 15:10 24:1 price 7:7 28:16 36:17
---	--	--	---

[priced - relative]

priced 10:8,11 pricing 9:14 10:4 10:7 20:14,17,22 21:1,4,4,12,24 22:10,11,12,12 49:20,20 50:3,4,6 50:7 primary 23:22 prior 3:21 10:25 12:22 proactive 14:9 probably 13:8 14:19 19:10 29:25 30:9 42:23 problem 37:19 proceed 12:6 proceedings 59:5 process 7:5 15:10 16:22,23 20:6 31:8 32:15 34:15 35:13 36:24 38:21 processing 5:11,18 5:24 procured 2:25 procurement 2:10 2:17,24 3:2,3,6,14 3:15 4:11,15,22,23 5:12 6:11 16:7,17 16:23 26:2,5,8,12 26:17 27:4 31:8 31:11,25 32:14,17 33:22,24 34:13 procurements 3:12,25 procuring 2:14 product 40:23 profit 50:22 program 6:17 programs 2:6 project 2:22 3:8 3:13 4:3 7:25 8:4	8:17 17:20,21 21:9 24:7,11 25:22 31:4,7 32:23 34:3 40:12 40:17 44:14 46:5 project's 7:24 projected 3:17 projects 8:8 32:21 32:24 41:1,2 promote 28:25 promoting 45:9 properly 5:25 proposal 6:22 9:2 52:7 proposals 2:18 6:25 7:4 10:7,12 21:5 39:18 52:19 proposed 7:22 8:13 9:10 44:7 proposers 10:6 proven 52:4,11 provide 2:12 4:7 11:17,24 12:10 14:16 50:4 provided 3:21 5:13 9:11 15:7 16:24,25 17:2 20:25 provides 6:10 providing 3:18 4:17,18 5:14 6:3 7:13,15 8:25 10:19 13:23 50:13 provision 15:21 provisions 15:18 public 17:3 40:24 52:15 53:6 54:8 54:23 pulled 18:21 pure 48:20	purposes 54:7 put 13:20 14:18 19:25 20:2,12 22:6 34:7 35:21 38:25 39:20 42:18 50:21,24 51:7 putting 14:9 20:19 49:16 q qa 22:12 qualified 7:23 quality 44:23 question 24:4 38:6 40:11,18 41:12 42:22 46:12,17 47:3 48:2,5,10 49:7 50:19 questions 13:2 28:24 29:24 51:13 51:24 57:9 quick 46:16 quickly 20:25 21:2 quite 27:16 46:8 r r 59:1 raise 36:8 raised 13:4 15:3 43:24 48:15 53:10 54:3 ramp 38:5,7,9,15 ranged 17:22 rate 23:21 rates 23:14 rationale 20:5 rctc 3:15 18:6 reach 16:24 17:7 reached 17:13 read 28:10 54:18 real 31:25 32:1	reality 39:22 41:5 really 20:24 21:2 27:23 28:22 31:13 34:1,20 37:19,25 40:10 45:4,8 50:2 50:12 reason 23:10 51:12 reasons 7:11 35:4 received 6:25 18:3 18:17 54:23 55:5 recommendation 11:20 12:14 30:3 34:16 35:4,23 53:21 recommendations 2:8,12 11:13 recommended 15:21 recommends 7:3 7:10 11:15 record 13:25 54:18 55:2 59:5 red 48:15,23 50:6 50:11,14,15 51:2 refer 20:24 reference 16:5,10 16:13,16,21,24,25 17:2 18:4 references 16:9 17:4 18:10 reflect 27:21 regarding 18:14 regards 31:11 regional 18:8 relate 15:19 relationship 17:16 18:23 33:18 44:2 44:3 relative 19:23 20:6 24:4,11
--	--	--	---

[relatively - sight]

relatively 21:17 release 2:18 4:15 12:21 15:15 released 6:11 relevant 7:23 relying 24:24 remain 28:24 remained 23:9,15 23:24 remember 15:18 remind 31:3 report 9:2 27:20 28:1,11,20,24 43:23 44:16 55:3 representatives 6:16 represented 6:19 request 2:18 39:24 requested 40:3 43:11 requesting 4:14 required 26:1 requirements 24:13 41:4 research 19:19 resources 20:1,3,3 20:13 30:22 respect 20:21 25:4 44:11,15 respective 10:7 respond 39:25 responded 20:14 responding 21:5 response 5:9 8:22 31:21 42:10 responses 6:13 17:24 responsible 6:3 8:11 responsive 17:9 33:18	rest 52:20 result 32:5,18 results 6:10 52:12 resumes 44:9 retained 55:1 retires 45:12 retrieves 5:2 return 12:13 revenue 5:23 52:13 revenues 6:1 review 6:24 reviewing 7:4 12:17 21:1 rfp 6:11 12:21 14:8,10,12 15:10 15:14 16:1 39:25 43:10 ride 25:5 right 27:11 34:14 36:9 37:16 40:20 45:11 47:1 48:8 49:19 50:13 51:18 54:11 55:5 risk 13:16 19:6 28:24 29:1 41:19 risks 43:19 riverside 18:4 road 17:19 30:8,10 34:10 38:14 59:12 roads 30:11 roadside 4:17 12:21 44:21 roadway 4:15 robust 34:20 37:24 robustly 35:3 robustness 8:25 role 44:23 roll 54:4 55:9 57:10	rough 18:18 round 46:19 52:21 rules 24:22 25:4 32:3,6,10 35:18,24 37:4 run 13:10,14 s safe 4:19 safeguards 9:3 sales 47:11 san 8:1 sarmiento 56:12 56:13 58:13,14 satisfaction 9:7 saw 21:15 48:13 50:16,17 51:3 saying 26:21 36:15 37:1 38:13 49:2,4 scale 14:16 24:10 scope 3:5 scoped 52:3 scopes 26:1 scores 14:2 36:1 45:6 scoring 6:23 21:1 43:5 seats 21:4 second 11:20 16:7 24:3 29:5 35:18 35:23 37:3 53:22 53:25 54:2 57:7 seconded 57:8 securing 9:8 see 10:3,12,21 19:6 22:21 42:21 43:7 46:7,7 48:23 54:3 seeing 13:4 33:15 33:15 34:14 49:10 seek 12:20	selected 3:19 4:4,6 6:2 12:6,8 selection 7:3 11:16 15:19 57:5 sense 24:1 41:8 51:5 separate 19:7 39:18 40:22 41:9 separated 9:22 separately 15:8 serve 27:18,19 serves 3:7 44:20 service 2:9,19 3:1 5:14 7:19 8:9 9:5 9:23 10:10,15,20 11:18,24 12:15 13:23 20:4 21:22 26:6,23 27:1 47:8 50:12 services 2:14,20 2:24 3:22 4:13,15 4:16 7:2,4 11:23 11:25 12:21,22 15:24 17:15 22:17 26:1 set 30:15 32:3 36:13 43:20 shake 30:23 sharpen 33:2 sheet 20:15 21:2 shortcomings 28:17 29:14 shortlisted 9:11 show 8:16 side 22:16,21 23:12,14,21 24:19 47:14 sidhu 56:14,15 58:15,16 sight 27:25
---	--	---	--

[signage - technology]

signage 4:8 signature 59:8 significant 14:1 28:18 significantly 13:17 similar 2:25 19:8 24:23 six 10:23 skill 27:17 slam 31:23 slide 2:11 3:23,24 4:13,20,20 6:9,9 7:8 9:10,12,13 10:22 11:5,12,13 12:4 slightly 25:3 27:9 52:8 smoothly 13:10 social 8:23 software 5:12 6:5 8:6 13:7 sold 39:13 sole 31:2,4,5,16 solely 26:4 solution 8:19 35:15 52:4 53:1 solutions 7:15 8:20,25 53:2 59:11 somebody 31:14 32:5 42:19 46:4 sonya 59:3 sophisticated 33:12 sorry 15:17 54:17 sort 52:5,16 sorts 52:11 source 31:3 sourced 31:4,5 sourcing 31:16	spanning 24:8 speak 51:23 53:11 spend 30:21 spending 29:12 spent 29:23 49:11 splitting 3:16 spoke 17:18 spots 24:20 spring 4:16 staff 6:15 7:22 8:12 11:12,15 12:5,8,13,16 14:6 14:12 17:23 25:24 27:20 28:1,10,15 28:24 29:6 34:2 35:18 36:25 37:4 38:19 43:23 44:15 staff's 19:22 28:4 30:3 34:16 35:4 35:23 53:21 staffing 4:9 5:15 44:22 48:24 staggered 25:12 standards 32:16 standpoint 48:15 start 13:4 15:1 starting 3:9 startup 19:1 state 15:22 18:13 18:17,19 41:3 42:2,5 stated 35:5 statement 28:13 states 15:12 30:10 steve 56:7 58:8 stick 52:16 stipulations 52:23 stood 30:5 stretch 44:18 45:21	strictly 36:1 strong 18:1 stuff 27:24 33:20 subcontractor 17:1 subject 6:20 subjective 14:5 submission 7:6 submitted 6:14 substantive 15:13 substitute 52:10 success 30:13 32:20 successful 30:9,11 32:22 33:25 succession 45:11 successor 45:12,14 sufficient 31:21 suggested 29:10 suite 59:13 superb 17:12 superbly 19:5 superior 28:4 supervisor 15:4,5 15:16 18:12,24 19:14,16 20:8 24:2 25:19 26:20 27:3,11,13 53:15 55:16,18 57:17,19 supervisors 53:10 support 5:13 28:15 30:2 35:3 46:25 47:19 48:12 48:14,16,19 supporting 6:3 supportive 17:16 supports 17:14 sure 38:12 45:14 surface 39:16 45:24	switchable 24:24 system 2:9,19 3:1 3:20 4:7,25,25 5:3 5:6,8,9 6:4,5,5,6 7:14 8:4,8,19,22 9:4,18 10:9,14 11:17 12:11 13:9 21:13,21 22:1,11 22:13,14,16,16,25 23:14 26:4,19 40:21 47:6 48:11 48:17,24 52:3 systems 5:13 7:18 8:21 22:20,21 23:4 34:4 41:23 49:10 51:15
			t
			t 59:1,1 table 10:3 44:1,10 take 3:24 19:24 33:3 34:23 40:7 45:1 53:16 54:4 55:9 57:10 taken 52:21 talked 33:6 talking 46:23 53:1 task 13:11 taxpayer 28:19 31:17 40:16 team 4:4 7:10,17 7:22 8:18,24 17:21 20:19 43:17 43:18 44:6,12 teamed 7:12 tear 50:15 technical 6:21 17:12 18:1 24:16 28:14 technologies 40:9 technology 8:6,7 22:9 33:16 38:1,3

[technology - violation]

<p>38:4 39:23 52:6 52:20 telephone 6:4 tells 32:13 34:15 templates 9:2 tepid 39:12 term 10:23 11:2,3 11:6,8,10 12:1 21:3 23:16,17 terms 12:3 47:18 52:19,22 texas 7:21 15:24 18:8 42:9 thank 13:2,3 15:5 18:25 19:16 21:6 24:3 27:12,14 29:18,21 35:1 37:11 39:2,7 51:20,22 53:16 55:4,7 58:21 thankfully 34:6 thanks 29:17 34:19 thing 14:1 18:3 26:3 34:24 35:25 38:16 45:19 things 13:16 22:7 23:12,19,22 30:4,5 36:13 40:1 48:7 50:17,19 52:22 think 13:18,24 14:12,22 19:3,11 24:9 27:23 29:6 29:23,25 30:7,14 30:18,25 31:16 32:6,7 33:20 34:7 34:16,21 35:17,18 36:5 38:17 46:10 49:2 51:18 52:15 52:25 53:2 54:11</p>	<p>thinking 52:2 thorough 34:24 thought 20:6,9 39:14 three 6:25 11:2 12:2 time 3:21 13:24,24 15:17 25:6 29:24 30:21 32:8,24 33:4 37:20 41:24 49:11 52:8 54:20 56:21 times 25:10 40:2 44:5 tires 4:18 today 4:11 13:20 14:22 21:8 27:21 39:11 today's 55:2 toll 5:4 8:4 17:14 17:19 30:8,10,11 45:22 tolling 6:16,19 7:18 8:1,6,8,14 24:20 33:23,24 34:3 41:3,3,5,5 tollplus 44:2 tolls 47:7 tollway 17:8 tom 56:11 58:12 tonya 54:24 tore 48:6 total 6:18 11:1,4 11:10 totally 19:6 touch 51:25 track 13:25 tracking 24:23 traffic 4:8 44:21 trafficcom 4:7</p>	<p>transaction 5:23 7:13 49:21 transactions 5:24 transcript 59:4 transition 3:22 29:16 transmitting 5:21 transponders 5:8 24:25 transportation 1:13 18:5,14 travel 25:2,9,10 trip 5:5 49:21,24 troubled 29:11 true 59:4 truly 48:11 try 22:19 36:6 48:6 51:25 trying 49:13 ttec 7:14 two 3:18 6:25 9:17 10:24 11:3,8 12:2 14:3 19:7 21:11 21:13,18 24:8 26:7 33:25 34:8 38:14 39:8 41:9 41:13 49:10,15 53:9 type 13:25 51:2 types 2:14 typical 3:20 22:20 48:18 typically 21:23</p>	<p>unfair 36:6 unfortunately 26:15 unhappiness 15:23 united 30:10 unsure 29:12 upset 47:10,11 usa 4:7 7:2,2,3 11:16,23 54:24 use 10:6 useful 30:21 users 5:19 utah 7:22</p>
			v
			<p>valid 37:13,15 validity 35:12 value 45:10 various 12:17 veesapen 16:18,19 18:16 vehicles 4:19 vendor 6:2 13:21 15:21 18:15 19:4 19:7,20,20 29:9 41:19,25 vendors 13:20 19:8,18 34:1 veritext 59:11 versus 10:9 20:9 24:11 43:20 52:4 vetted 29:22 vice 51:20,22 54:6 55:6,13,14 56:22 56:25 57:4,8,14,15 vicente 56:13 58:14 view 34:22,23 viewpoints 35:10 violation 5:5,17,18 6:8 26:16 32:15</p>

[violation - yellow]

49:25 violations 24:23 violators 24:14 26:14 voice 5:9 8:22 vote 19:11 30:2 39:11 54:4 55:10 57:11	weigh 37:18 38:25 weight 43:1 weighted 36:15 43:1 weighting 43:4 weights 35:21 went 23:1,5,6 31:2 31:20,24 37:17 48:5 51:15 whiz 40:8 wide 50:17,17 wonder 15:25 work 11:14 12:5,8 13:16 14:15 17:5 28:15 34:1 52:7 worked 3:7 8:3 17:6 19:4 42:8 46:2 workforce 9:8 working 8:1,10 13:22 17:16 18:23 44:13 45:12 workshops 12:10 world 30:12 40:1 42:20 worth 22:22 42:16 would've 39:20,21 wound 34:22 wow 40:8 wraps 2:1 58:24 written 7:4 wrong 26:10 41:21 wsp 7:2,3,7,11,12 7:17,22 8:13 10:15,19 11:16,22 14:14,20 17:2,4,9 17:14 20:19 22:1 22:3,8,20,25 23:18 27:16 28:3,6 33:25 34:11 39:22 43:3 44:1 46:14	46:17 48:10 wsp's 8:16,18,24 9:4 y yeah 16:4 36:23 40:5 46:23 48:13 55:8 year 2:15 3:18 10:23,24 11:2,3,5 11:10 12:2,2 38:14 50:4,8 years 8:1,14,15 9:17 11:1,10 12:2 12:12 13:22 14:24 44:4 50:9,10 yellow 4:12
w		
wages 10:20 wagner 27:13,14 37:21 40:14 42:13 43:22 53:10,12 56:16,17 58:17,18 waiting 49:7 51:23 waiting's 2:17 walk 5:15 walkup 5:15 want 13:18 14:1 14:17,18 15:1 26:3 27:25 30:6,6 31:14 33:20 34:18 34:25 35:1 36:4 36:16 38:12 40:6 43:2 46:3,9 47:18 50:25 53:11 wanted 2:12 3:24 31:2 43:25 washington 7:21 15:22 16:14 18:13 18:17,19 42:2,5 way 20:14,17,18 32:9 36:6 37:17 49:20 50:7 we've 26:5 28:13 30:18 31:18 32:19 34:5,5 42:12 44:3 52:17 website 5:8 8:22 week 25:12 39:14 49:9,9		