# *Annual LAO Compliance Report for FY 2019-2020 Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA)*

# SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CHANGES

## 1.FY 2019-2020

1. Please provide a summary of all language access changes in your Department since FY 2019-2020.

SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE REPORT CHANGES & KEY BARRIERS

A.Explain changes in strategies and procedures, and indicate whether these changes have improved the Departments language access services from the previous year.

| Description of Change | Improved Language Access Services? |
|---|---|
| Began doing more open houses rather than community meetings to have better one on one communication with stakeholders, including language assistance. | Yes |
| Text message surveys in language | Yes |
| Since onset of COVID-19, established more efficient processes for development, translation and review of outreach materials by leveraging internal resources for priority outreach materials related to COVID-19. | Yes |
| More partnering with ethnic media to reach broader audience in language to communicate changes to services and programs; worked with Joint Info Comm Center in distributing multilingual materials to community groups, resulting in broader access. | Yes |

B. Indicate any key barriers that have prevented your Department from achieving your LAO goals and any proposed solutions.

| Barriers | Proposed Solutions |
|---|---|
|  |  |

| | |
|---|---|
| Increased bilingual staffing in public contact positions throughout the agency would further enhance language access for customers but challenge in getting qualified candidates with required language skills. | MTA will continue to explore venues for advertising positions and working w/ OCEIA, other city departments and CBOs for job postings. Desired language abilities in Filipino, Vietnamese, Russian and Arabic. |
| Challenges in hiring process for candidates with language skills and language certification process for current employees. | Meet internally with HR staff to identify specific issues then meet with OCEIA and other departments, like DHR, for possible solutions. |
| | |
| | |

# II. DEPARTMENTAL GOALS

## 2.Assessment of Progress in Meeting Previous Year's Goals

Please provide an update on how your department is meeting your current goals. These are the goals that your department indicated in last year's report.

> 1-Continue goal to work with OCEIA and other city departments to facilitate language certification process for employees. 2- No QMATIC software upgrades in 11 S Van Ness Customer Service Center beyond last upgrade, which incorporated Filipino.
> 3-Ongoing goal to continue reviewing important materials for language translation. 4-In response to goal of exploring increasing field of vendors who provide language assistance to improve availability of resources, SFMTA is using OCEIA contracts for local translation (non-federal). 5-For goal of looking at more direct outreach opportunities within communities or directly with customers such as pop ups, meeting in cafes and intercept surveys, SFMTA has been increasing these methods and will continue to do so. 6-For goal to assess alternative options for gathering LEP data, we're seeking to include demographic questions regarding language assistance in all surveys conducted by agency, among other options.

## 3.Goals for Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Please provide a description of your department's Language Access Ordinance goals for Fiscal Year 2020-2021 (bullet points).

> 1-Continue goal to work with OCEIA and other city departments to facilitate language certification process for employees. 2-Ongoing goal to continue reviewing important materials for language translation. 3-For goal to assess alternative options for gathering LEP data, we're seeking to include demographic questions regarding language assistance in all surveys conducted by agency. 4- Working towards more culturally appropriate messaging/translations and announcements instead of literal translations.

# III.CLIENT INFORMATION

## 4. Primary/Preferred Language Information

Do you collect and record primary/preferred language data on clients as part of your intake or application process?

| |
|---|
| No |

## 5. Data Collection Method

What method did you use to determine the number and percentage of limited English proficient (LEP) persons who actually used your department's services citywide during FY 2019-2020?

### *See OCEIA Guidance, Section I*

\* You may measure this information by: 1) analyzing information collected during the Department's intake process for all clients; or 2) conducting an annual survey of all contacts with the public made by the Department during a period of at least two weeks; or 3) analyzing and calculating the annual total number of requests for telephonic translation (interpretation) services.
If you use the survey method, please pro-rate your results to produce estimated totals for the full year. For example: data from a two-week survey should be multiplied by 26; data from a one-month survey should be multiplied by 12.

Please provide the method you used to determine the number LEP persons actually served.

a. ☐ Intake     b. ☐ Annual Survey     c. ☑ Number of telephonic interpretation requests

| Description (Optional) | MTA has multiple entry points for programs/services including over 700K daily riders pre-COVID 19, which is not captured below. QMatic Spanish, Cantonese and Filipino data are added to Language Line Data to supplement Total Client/LEP data. |
|---|---|

## 6. Number of LEP Persons who Used Department's Services During FY 2019-2020

a. Please indicate the number and percentage of LEP persons who actually used your department's services city wide during FY 2019-2020:

### *See Guidance, Section I*

\* You may measure this information by: 1) analyzing information collected during the Department's intake process for all clients; or 2) conducting an annual survey of all contacts with the public made by the Department during a period of at least two weeks; or 3) analyzing and calculating the annual total number of requests for telephonic translation (interpretation) services.
If you use the survey method, please pro-rate your results to produce estimated totals for the full year. For example: data from a two-week survey should be multiplied by 26; data from a one-month survey should be multiplied by 12.

| TOTAL CLIENTS (# ) | LEP CLIENTS (#) | LEP CLIENTS BY LANGUAGE (#) ? | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | CAN | FIL | MDRN | RUS | SPN | VIET | Other |
| 108,617 | 6,895 | 2,395 | 7 | 95 | 49 | 4,196 | 35 | 118 Other |

Key:  CAN = Cantonese        FIL = Filipino (Tagalog)        MDRN = Mandarin
        RUS = Russian        SPN = Spanish        VIET = Vietnamese

Please indicate the number of clients served in other languages:

| LANGUAGE | LEP CLIENTS (#) |
|---|---|
| Arabic | 38 |
| Japanese | 9 |
| Farsi | 11 |
| Portuguese BR | 6 |
| Korean | 14 |
| Cambodian | 4 |
| Tigrinya | 2 |
| Dari | 4 |
| Toishanese | 2 |
| Nepali | 1 |
| French | 5 |
| Yemeni | 1 |
| German | 2 |
| Mongolian | 3 |
| Indonesian | 2 |
| Turkish | 1 |

## IV. DATA ON TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION DURING FY 2019-2020

# 7. Translated Written Materials

a) Please indicate how many of the Department's materials (e.g. applications, forms, notices of rights, program material, etc.) have been translated into each of the following languages.

*See Guidance, Section II (a)*

| Language | Total Materials | CHN | FIL | RUS | SPN | VIET | Other #1 (specify) | Description |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Translated Materials | 393 | 79 | 50 | 21 | 100 | 24 | 39 | Arabic, French, Japanese, Korean, Thai |
| Number of Vital Documents | | | | | | | | |

b) Please list all of the Department's written materials(e.g. applications, forms, notices of rights, program material, etc.) that have been translated, the language(s) into which they have been translated, and the persons who have reviewed the translated materials for accuracy and appropriateness.

### *See Guidance, Section II (a)*

| | |
|---|---|
| Please upload your Translated Materials Log as an Excel file | Your file is uploaded ✔<br>[Download Blank Excel Template](#) |

# 8. Telephone-Based Interpretation Services

Describe any <u>telephone-based interpretation services</u> used for FY 2019-2020 (July 1 through June 30). Please include information on call volumes and language use. If your department uses multiple telephone-based interpretation services, which may include LanguageLine Solutions, other vendors, or internal staff, please indicate each on a separate line.

### *See Guidance, Section II (b)*

| What telephonic interpretation services were used? | Total Call Volume (LEP Clients) | Total Call Volume by Language | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | CAN | FIL | MDRN | RUS | SPN | VIET | Other #1 (Specify) | Other #2 (Specify) |
| Language Line | 2,403 | 359 | 7 | 95 | 49 | 1,740 | 35 | 118 | Arabic (38), Japanese (9), Farsi (11), Portuguese BR (6), Portuguese (13), Korean (14), Cambodian (4), Tigrinya (2), Dari (4), Toishanese (2), Nepali(1), French(5), Yemeni (1), German (2), Mongolian (3), Indonesian (2), Turkish(1) = 118 |

# 9. In-Person Interpretation Services

How many times did multilingual employees provide in-person interpretation services in FY 2019-2020(July 1 through June 30)? Please include information on the number of times in-person interpretation was provided in each language .

*See Guidance, Section II (c)*

| Total | Number of Times Interpretation Provided, by Language | | | | | | | |
| | CAN | FIL | MDRN | RUS | SPN | VIET | Other #1 (Specify) | Other #2 (Specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | | 1 | | | |

| Description (Optional) | Note: SFMTA primarily uses outside interpreters; details captured in #10 |
|---|---|

# 10. Oral Interpretation at Public Meetings

How often did your department provide oral interpretation at public meetings or hearings during FY 2019-2020? Please indicate the number of meetings/hearings and languages provided and whether vendors or multilingual employees were used.

*See Guidance, Section II (d)*

| Number of Interpreted hearings/meetings | 35 |
|---|---|
| Total Number of LEP Attendees | 320 |
| Interpretation provided by | ✔ Vendors<br>✔ multilingual Employees<br>☐ Other |
| Interpretation provided in (languages) | ✔ Cantonese<br>✔ Filipino<br>✔ Mandarin<br>✔ Russian<br>✔ Spanish<br>✔ Vietnamese<br>✔ Other      Korean |

# V.MULTILINGUAL STAFFING AND TRAINING

## 11. Multilingual Employees

a) How many multilingual public contact employees does your department have, and how many have had their multilingual skills tested and certified by the Department of Human Resources (DHR)? Indicate the language(s) spoken by certified multilingual employees and all multilingual employees.

*See Guidance, Section III (a)*

| | Total Number | Number or Multilingual Staff, by Languages | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | CAN | FIL | MDRN | RUS | SPN | VIET | Other |
| **Certified Multilingual Public Contact Employee** | 18 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total Multilingual Public Contact Employee** | 163 | 45 | 26 | 19 | 2 | 41 | 3 | 27 |
| **All Public Contact** | 284 | | | | | | | |

Description (Optional) [_____]

Please provide a roster of your department's Multilingual Employees (excluding those employees who are self-designated as competent in a language other than English). Use additional pages as needed. See Roster of Multilingual Employees from OCEIA.

| ROSTER OF MULTILINGUAL EMPLOYEES | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Name** | **Title** | **Office Location** | **Languages (other than English)** | **DHR Certified? (Y/N)** |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| Please upload your Roster of Multilingual Employees as an Excel file | Your file is uploaded ✔<br>Download Blank Excel Template |
|---|---|

b) Assess the number of additional multilingual employees needed in FY 2019-2020 and beyond to meet the requirements of the Language Access Ordinance.

*See Guidance, Section III (b)*

| Is the current number of multilingual employees adequate to meet LAO requirements? | If no, indicate the number of additional multilingual employees needed and corresponding language(s) |
|---|---|
| Yes | |

If you have indicated that the number of multilingual employees in your Department is inadequate to meet the requirements of the Language Access Ordinance, please state your Department's plans to meet those requirements

# 12. Employee Development and Training

*See Guidance, Section III (c)*

**a) Which of the following methods does your Department use to verify the quality of multilingual employees' language proficiency skills?**

| | |
|---|---|
| ✓ | DHR multilingual certification |
| ☐ | External certification process |
| ☐ | Other method (describe): |
| ☐ | Our Department does not have a method to verify the quality of multilingual employees' language proficiency skills |

**b) Does your Department offer training for public contact staff on how to provide language assistance services to LEP individuals?**

Yes

In-person Title VI and Language Assistance training is provided to public contact employees and their supervisors.

# VI.LANGUAGE SERVICE AND COMMUNICATION PROTOCOLS

## 13. Language Access Policies

Please provide a brief summary of your department's procedures for providing services to LEP persons, using the boxes below.

LANGUAGE ACCESS POLICIES AND PROTOCOLS

| | |
|---|---|
| a) Does your department have a written Language Access Policy ? | |
| b) Please provide a brief summary of the policy. | The SFMTA is committed to ensuring meaningful access to the benefits, services, information and other important aspects of its programs and activities for its LEP customers. SFMTA's policy and the methods it employs to ensure access for LEP customers is detailed in the SFMTA's 2016 Language Assistance Plan. |
| c) Please upload your department's full Language Access Policy. | Your file is uploaded ✔ |
| d) Does your department work with clients in crisis or emergency situations ? | No |
| If yes, please describe the nature of crisis or emergency situations<br>(e.g., fire, natural disaster, domestic violence, other). | |
| e) Does your department have a protocol for serving LEP persons in crisis or emergency situations? | No |
| If yes, please provide a brief summary of your Department's protocol for serving LEP persons in crisis or emergency situations, including the use of multilingual staff for assisting LEP persons and the translation of any warning signs. | SFMTA does not serve LEP persons in crisis or emergency situations in its daily operations. |

## 14. Recorded Telephonic Messages

a) Please list any recorded telephonic messages that are available in languages other than English, and describe the content of recorded messages (e.g. office hours and location; information about programs and services; other types of assistance).

| | |
|---|---|
| | **LANGUAGE** |

| CONTENT OF RECORDED MESSAGE | CAN | FIL | MDRN | RUS | SPN | VIET | Other (specify) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (Mark all boxes that apply) | | | | | | | |
| Office Hours and Location | ✔ | ✔ | ☐ | ☐ | ✔ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| Information about Programs and Services | ✔ | ✔ | ☐ | ☐ | ✔ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| Other (please describe) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | |

b) Assess the availability and quality of your department's recorded telephonic messages in languages other than English .

*See Guidance, Section IV (a)*

Adequate

**Please explain.**

# 15. Telephonic Requests for Translation or Interpretation Services

a) Describe your Department's procedures for handling telephonic requests for translation or interpretation services.

Telephonic requests for translation/interpretation services are handled either by bilingual employees, through outside vendors, via 311 and/or conferencing in Language Line telephonic interpretation services, depending on individual circumstances.

b) Assess the quality of your department's procedures for handling telephonic requests for translation or interpretation services.

*See Guidance, Section IV (b)*

Adequate

**Please explain.**

# 16. In-Person Requests for Translation or Interpretation Services

a) Describe your Department's procedures for handling in-person requests for translation or interpretation services.

> Requests for translation or interpretation services are handled either by bilingual/multilingual employees, via 311 and/or Language Line services, and via vendors or OCEIA staff, depending on circumstances.

b) Assess the quality of your department's procedures for handling in-person requests for translation or interpretation services.

*See Guidance, Section IV (c)*

> Adequate

**Please explain.**

# 17. Public Notices of Availability of Language Access Services

a) For in-person or over-the-counter contacts, please indicate whether there is a notice posted in a public place informing LEP persons of their right to request translation or interpretation, and the languages that this notices is printed in.

Public notice posted informing LEP persons of their right to request language access in the following languages:

| | |
|---|---|
| ✓ | Filipino |
| ✓ | Chinese |
| ✓ | Russian |
| ✓ | Spanish |
| ✓ | Vietnamese |
| ✓ | Other    Thai, Korean, Arabic, Japanese, French |

b) Assess the quality of your department's public notices of availability of language access services.

*See Guidance, Section IV (d)*

> Adequate

**Please explain.**

# VII. BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES FOR LANGUAGE SERVICES

## 18. Language Services Expenditures in FY 2019-2020

Please provide the following information on the annual budget and actual expenses for Language Services provisioning.

*See Guidance, Section V (a)*

| Language Access Services | FY 2019-2020 Actual Expenses |
|---|---|
| 1. Compensatory pay for multilingual employees who perform multilingual services, excluding regular annual salary expenditures. | $17,340.00 |
| 2. Telephonic interpretation services provided by vendors. | $16,067.52 |
| 3. Document translation services provided by vendors. | $132,271.39 |
| 4. On-site language interpretation services provided by vendors. | $35,447.77 |
| 5. Other costs associated with providing language access services (e.g., grants, special programs, other.) | $2,527,722.20 |
| 6. Total Language Services Budget (add columns 1-5) | $2,728,849.00 |

## 18 b. Department's Total Operating Budget

$1,200,000,000.00

## 19. Projected Language Services Budget in FY 2020-2021

What is your total projected budget to support progressive implementation of your Department's language service plan in FY 2020-2021 ?

*See Guidance, Section V (b)*

| TOTAL | 1100000.00 |
|---|---|

| Description (Optional) | SFMTA's two year budget is 1.2B. Projected FY20-21 language services budget is $1.1M. |
|---|---|