



San Bernardino Associated Governments

1170 W. 3rd Street, San Bernardino, CA 92410
Phone: (909) 884-8276 Fax: (909) 885-4407
Web: www.sanbag.ca.gov



-
- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission •San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
 - San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency •Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies
-

AGENDA

Mountain/Desert Policy Committee

June 20, 2014

9:30 a.m.

Location

**Town of Apple Valley
14975 Dale Evans Parkway
Apple Valley, CA**

Mountain/Desert Policy Committee Membership

Chair

*Ed Paget, Mayor
City of Needles*

*Julie McIntyre, Mayor
City of Barstow*

*George Huntington, Mayor Pro Tem
Town of Yucca Valley*

Vice Chair

*Ryan McEachron, Mayor Pro Tem
City of Victorville*

*Bill Jahn, Council Member
City of Big Bear Lake*

*Robert Lovingood
Board of Supervisors*

*Cari Thomas, Mayor
City of Adelanto*

*Mike Leonard, Council Member
City of Hesperia*

*James Ramos
Board of Supervisors*

*Curt Emick, Council Member
Town of Apple Valley*

*Jim Harris, Council Member
City of Twentynine Palms*

*Janice Rutherford
Board of Supervisors*

San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) is a council of governments formed in 1973 by joint powers agreement of the cities and the County of San Bernardino. SANBAG is governed by a Board of Directors consisting of a mayor or designated council member from each of the twenty-four cities in San Bernardino County and the five members of the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors

In addition to SANBAG, the composition of the SANBAG Board of Directors also serves as the governing board for several separate legal entities listed below:

The San Bernardino County Transportation Commission, which is responsible for short and long range transportation planning within San Bernardino County, including coordination and approval of all public mass transit service, approval of all capital development projects for public transit and highway projects, and determination of staging and scheduling of construction relative to all transportation improvement projects in the Transportation Improvement Program.

The San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, which is responsible for administration of the voter-approved half-cent transportation transactions and use tax levied in the County of San Bernardino.

The Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies, which is responsible for the administration and operation of a motorist aid system of call boxes on State freeways and highways within San Bernardino County.

The Congestion Management Agency, which analyzes the performance level of the regional transportation system in a manner which ensures consideration of the impacts from new development and promotes air quality through implementation of strategies in the adopted air quality plans.

As a Subregional Planning Agency, SANBAG represents the San Bernardino County subregion and assists the Southern California Association of Governments in carrying out its functions as the metropolitan planning organization. SANBAG performs studies and develops consensus relative to regional growth forecasts, regional transportation plans, and mobile source components of the air quality plans.

Items which appear on the monthly Board of Directors agenda are subjects of one or more of the listed legal authorities. For ease of understanding and timeliness, the agenda items for all of these entities are consolidated on one agenda. Documents contained in the agenda package are clearly marked with the appropriate legal entity.

**San Bernardino Associated Governments
County Transportation Commission
County Transportation Authority
Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies
County Congestion Management Agency**

AGENDA

**Mountain/Desert Policy Committee
June 20, 2014
9:30 a.m.**

**Location
Town of Apple Valley
14975 Dale Evans Parkway
Apple Valley, CA**

**CALL TO ORDER:
(Meeting Chaired by: Ed Paget)**

- I. Pledge of Allegiance
- II. Attendance
- III. Announcements
- IV. Agenda Notices/Modifications – **Melonie Donson**

Notes/Actions

- 1. **Possible Conflict of Interest Issues for the Mountain/Desert Policy Committee Meeting of June 20, 2014.** Pg. 8

Note agenda item contractors, subcontractors and agents, which may require member abstentions due to conflict of interest and financial interests. Board Member abstentions shall be stated under this item for recordation on the appropriate item.

Consent Calendar

Consent Calendar items shall be adopted by a single vote unless removed by member request.

- 2. **Attendance Register** Pg. 10

A quorum shall consist of a majority of the membership of each SANBAG Policy Committee, except that all County Representatives shall be counted as one for the purpose of establishing a quorum.

Consent Calendar Cont.....

Project Delivery

3. **Construction Contract Change Orders to on-going SANBAG Construction Contracts in the Mountain/Desert region with Skanska Civil, USA and Security Paving Company, Inc.** Pg. 12

Review and ratify change orders. **Garry Cohoe**

This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee.

Discussion Items

Administrative Matters

4. **Election of Committee Chair and Vice Chair** Pg. 17

That the Committee conduct elections for members to serve as Chair and Vice Chair of the SANBAG Mountain/Desert Policy Committee for terms to end on June 30, 2015. **Andrea Zureick**

This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee.

Project Delivery

5. **Caltrans Interstate 15 (I-15) Cajon Pass Rehabilitation Construction Project** Pg. 24

Receive information regarding upcoming pavement repair and replacement on the Cajon Pass section of I-15. **Garry Cohoe**

This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee.

6. **Interstate 15 (I-15) Ranchero Road Interchange Project** Pg. 25

Receive an update on the I-15 Ranchero Interchange Project. **Garry Cohoe**

This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee.

Discussion Calendar Cont.....**Project Delivery (Cont.)****7. Interstate 15/Interstate 215 (I-15/I-215) Devore Interchange Reconstruction Project Pg. 26**

That the Committee recommend the Board, acting as the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority:

1. Approve Amendment No. 3 to Cooperative Agreement No. C11103 with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for Right of Way activities on the I-15/I-215 Devore Interchange Reconstruction Project which reduces SANBAG's Measure I funding responsibility by \$13,229,689.00 to a new total of \$30,107,136.00.

2. Approve Amendment No. 2 to Cooperative Agreement No. C12216 with Caltrans for Design Build activities on the I-15/I-215 Devore Interchange Reconstruction Project which increases SANBAG's Measure I funding responsibility by \$14,134,136.00 to a new total of \$18,796,136.00.
Garry Cohoe

This item is also scheduled for review by the Board Metro Valley Study Session on June 12, 2014. SANBAG General Counsel has reviewed the draft amendments and this item.

Regional/Subregional Planning**8. Measure I Expenditure Plan 2015 Review Pg. 40**

That the Committee recommend the Board, acting as the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority:

1. Receive information on the results of the outreach process authorized by the SANBAG Board in March 2014 for considering amendments to the Measure I Expenditure Plan pursuant to Section XIV of San Bernardino County Transportation Authority Ordinance No. 04-01.

2. Defer further consideration of any amendments to the Measure I Expenditure Plan until the 2017-2018 timeframe.

3. Direct staff to consider recommendations made by commenters on Measure I Strategic Plan and Nexus Study policies and to bring back any recommended changes to the appropriate policy committee(s) following internal and local jurisdiction staff discussion and review. **Steve Smith**

This item is also scheduled for review by the Board of Directors Metro Valley Study Session on June 12, 2014. The information in this item was reviewed by the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee on June 2, 2014.

Discussion Calendar Cont.....

Regional/Subregional Planning (Cont.)

9. High Desert Corridor Pg. 54

Receive an update on the status of project development for the High Desert Corridor. **Tim Byrne**

This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee.

Transit/Commuter Rail

10. Review Financial Audits for Transit Operators Pg. 59

That the Committee recommend the Board review and receive Operator financial reports for Fiscal Year 2012/2013 for the City of Barstow (Barstow Area Transit). **Monica Morales**

Each Operator has taken their financial reports to their respective board. This item is scheduled for review by the Commuter Rail and Transit Policy Committee on June 12, 2014. SANBAG's Finance department has reviewed and approved this item.

Comments from Committee Members

Brief Comments from Committee Members

Public Comment

Brief Comments by the General Public

Additional Information

Acronym List

Pg.65

Complete packages of this agenda are available for public review at the SANBAG offices. Staff reports for item may be made available upon request. For additional information call (909) 884-8276.

ADJOURNMENT:

Next Mountain/Desert Policy Committee Meeting:

Friday, August 15, 2014

10:00 a.m. (Tentative Start Time)
City of Big Bear Lake – Hofert Hall
39707 Big Bear Boulevard
Big Bear Lake, CA 92315

Meeting Procedures and Rules of Conduct

Meeting Procedures

The Ralph M. Brown Act is the state law which guarantees the public's right to attend and participate in meetings of local legislative bodies. These rules have been adopted by the Board of Directors in accordance with the Brown Act, Government Code 54950 et seq., and shall apply at all meetings of the Board of Directors and Policy Committees.

Accessibility

The SANBAG meeting facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. If assistive listening devices or other auxiliary aids or services are needed in order to participate in the public meeting, requests should be made through the Clerk of the Board at least three (3) business days prior to the Board meeting. The Clerk's telephone number is (909) 884-8276 and office is located at 1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Floor, San Bernardino, CA.

Agendas – All agendas are posted at 1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Floor, San Bernardino at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. Staff reports related to agenda items may be reviewed at the SANBAG offices located at 1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Floor, San Bernardino and our website: www.sanbag.ca.gov.

Agenda Actions – Items listed on both the "Consent Calendar" and "Items for Discussion" contain suggested actions. The Board of Directors will generally consider items in the order listed on the agenda. However, items may be considered in any order. New agenda items can be added and action taken by two-thirds vote of the Board of Directors.

Closed Session Agenda Items – Consideration of closed session items *excludes* members of the public. These items include issues related to personnel, pending litigation, labor negotiations and real estate negotiations. Prior to each closed session, the Chair will announce the subject matter of the closed session. If action is taken in closed session, the Chair may report the action to the public at the conclusion of the closed session.

Public Testimony on an Item – Members of the public are afforded an opportunity to speak on any listed item. Individuals wishing to address the Board of Directors or Policy Committee Members should complete a "Request to Speak" form, provided at the rear of the meeting room, and present it to the Clerk prior to the Board's consideration of the item. A "Request to Speak" form must be completed for *each* item an individual wishes to speak on. When recognized by the Chair, speakers should be prepared to step forward and announce their name and address for the record. In the interest of facilitating the business of the Board, speakers are limited to three (3) minutes on each item. Additionally, a twelve (12) minute limitation is established for the total amount of time any one individual may address the Board at any one meeting. The Chair or a majority of the Board may establish a different time limit as appropriate, and parties to agenda items shall not be subject to the time limitations.

The Consent Calendar is considered a single item, thus the three (3) minute rule applies. Consent Calendar items can be pulled at Board member request and will be brought up individually at the specified time in the agenda allowing further public comment on those items.

Agenda Times – The Board is concerned that discussion take place in a timely and efficient manner. Agendas may be prepared with estimated times for categorical areas and certain topics to be discussed. These times may vary according to the length of presentation and amount of resulting discussion on agenda items.

Public Comment – At the end of the agenda, an opportunity is also provided for members of the public to speak on any subject within the Board's authority. *Matters raised under "Public Comment" may not be acted upon at that meeting. "Public Testimony on any Item" still apply.*

Disruptive Conduct – If any meeting of the Board is willfully disrupted by a person or by a group of persons so as to render the orderly conduct of the meeting impossible, the Chair may recess the meeting or order the person, group or groups of person willfully disrupting the meeting to leave the meeting or to be removed from the meeting. Disruptive conduct includes addressing the Board without first being recognized, not addressing the subject before the Board, repetitiously addressing the same subject, failing to relinquish the podium when requested to do so, or otherwise preventing the Board from conducting its meeting in an orderly manner. *Please be aware that a NO SMOKING policy has been established for meetings. Your cooperation is appreciated!*

**SANBAG General Practices for Conducting Meetings
of
Board of Directors and Policy Committees**

Attendance.

- The Chair of the Board or a Policy Committee (Chair) has the option of taking attendance by Roll Call or Self-Introductions. If attendance is taken by Roll Call, the Clerk of the Board will call out by jurisdiction or supervisorial district. The Member or Alternate will respond by stating his/her name. If attendance is by Self-Introduction, the Member or Alternate will state his/her name and jurisdiction or supervisorial district.
- A Member/Alternate, who arrives after attendance is taken, shall announce his/her name prior to voting on any item.
- A Member/Alternate, who wishes to leave the meeting after attendance is taken but before remaining items are voted on, shall announce his/her name and that he/she is leaving the meeting.

Basic Agenda Item Discussion.

- The Chair announces the agenda item number and states the subject.
- The Chair calls upon the appropriate staff member or Board Member to report on the item.
- The Chair asks members of the Board/Committee if they have any questions or comments on the item. General discussion ensues.
- The Chair calls for public comment based on "Request to Speak" forms which may be submitted.
- Following public comment, the Chair announces that public comment is closed and asks if there is any further discussion by members of the Board/Committee.
- The Chair calls for a motion from members of the Board/Committee.
- Upon a motion, the Chair announces the name of the member who makes the motion. Motions require a second by a member of the Board/Committee. Upon a second, the Chair announces the name of the Member who made the second, and the vote is taken.
- The "aye" votes in favor of the motion shall be made collectively. Any Member who wishes to oppose or abstain from voting on the motion, shall individually and orally state the Member's "nay" vote or abstention. Members present who do not individually and orally state their "nay" vote or abstention shall be deemed, and reported to the public, to have voted "aye" on the motion.

The Vote as specified in the SANBAG Bylaws.

- Each Member of the Board of Directors shall have one vote. In the absence of the official representative, the alternate shall be entitled to vote. (Board of Directors only.)
- Voting may be either by voice or roll call vote. A roll call vote shall be conducted upon the demand of five official representatives present, or at the discretion of the presiding officer.

Amendment or Substitute Motion.

- Occasionally a Board Member offers a substitute motion before the vote on a previous motion. In instances where there is a motion and a second, the maker of the original motion is asked if he/she would like to amend the motion to include the substitution or withdraw the motion on the floor. If the maker of the original motion does not want to amend or withdraw, the substitute motion is not addressed until after a vote on the first motion.
- Occasionally, a motion dies for lack of a second.

Call for the Question.

- At times, a Member of the Board/Committee may "Call for the Question."
- Upon a "Call for the Question," the Chair may order that the debate stop or may allow for limited further comment to provide clarity on the proceedings.
- Alternatively and at the Chair's discretion, the Chair may call for a vote of the Board/Committee to determine whether or not debate is stopped.
- The Chair re-states the motion before the Board/Committee and calls for the vote on the item.

The Chair.

- At all times, meetings are conducted in accordance with the Chair's direction.
- These general practices provide guidelines for orderly conduct.
- From time-to-time circumstances require deviation from general practice.
- Deviation from general practice is at the discretion of the Chair.

Courtesy and Decorum.

- These general practices provide for business of the Board/Committee to be conducted efficiently, fairly and with full participation.
- It is the responsibility of the Chair and Members to maintain common courtesy and decorum.

*Adopted by the SANBAG Board of Directors January 2008
Revised March 2014*



- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
- San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 1

Date: June 20, 2014

Subject: Information Relative to Possible Conflict of Interest

Recommendation*: Note agenda items and contractors/subcontractors which may require member abstentions due to possible conflicts of interest.

Background: In accordance with California Government Code 84308, members of the Board may not participate in any action concerning a contract where they have received a campaign contribution of more than \$250 in the prior twelve months from an entity or individual. This agenda contains recommendations for action relative to the following contractors:

Item No.	Contract No.	Contractor/Agents	Subcontractors
3	C13001	Security Paving Company, Inc. <i>Joseph Ferndino</i>	Cal-Stripe, Inc. Pacific Restoration Group Statewide Traffic Safety and Signs Flatiron Electric Group, Inc. Tahlequah Steel, Inc. DYWIDAG Systems International Crown Fence Company Tipco Engineering, Inc.

*

Approved
 Mountain/Desert Policy Committee

Date: _____

Moved: _____ Second: _____

In Favor: _____ Opposed: _____ Abstained: _____

Witnessed: _____

COG	<input type="checkbox"/>	CTC	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	CTA	X	SAFE	<input type="checkbox"/>	CMA	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	-----	--------------------------	---	-----	---	------	--------------------------	-----	--------------------------

Check all that apply.

Mountain/Desert Policy Committee Agenda Item

June 20, 2014

Page 2

3	C13149	Skanska Civil, USA <i>Jeffery Langvin</i>	Ace Fence Company Austin Enterprises BC Traffic Specialist Diversified Landscape Company DYWIDAG System International Ferreira Construction Company, Inc. Stroer & Graf Hard Hat Sweeping Statewide Traffic Safety & Signs Tahelquah Steel, Inc. Techno Coatings Under Ground Manholes
---	--------	--	--

Financial Impact: This item has no direct impact on the budget.

Reviewed By: This item is prepared monthly for review by the Board of Directors and Policy Committee members.

AGENDA ITEM #2

MOUNTAIN/DESERT POLICY COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE RECORD – 2014

Name	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Cari Thomas + City of Adelanto	**	X	X	**	**							
Curt Emick Town of Apple Valley	**	X*	X	**	**							
Julie McIntyre City of Barstow	**	X	X	**	**							
Bill Jahn City of Big Bear Lake	**	X*	X	**	**							
Mike Leonard City of Hesperia	**	X	X	**	**							
Ed Paget City of Needles	**	X	X	**	**							
Jim Harris City of Twentynine Palms	**	X	X	**	**							
Ryan McEachron City of Victorville	**	X	X	**	**							
George Huntington Town of Yucca Valley	**	X	X	**	**							
Robert Lovingood County of San Bernardino	**	X	X	**	**							
Janice Rutherford County of San Bernardino	**			**	**							
James Ramos County of San Bernardino	**			**	**							

*Non-voting City Representative attended
+ Measure I Committee representative

**The Mountain/Desert Committee did not meet
x*Alternate Attended

*** New SANBAG Board Member

X = Member attended meeting.
MDCart14.doc

Empty box = Member did not attend meeting

Crossed out box = Not a Board Member at the time.

AGENDA ITEM #2
MOUNTAIN/DESERT POLICY COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE RECORD – 2013

Name	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Cari Thomas + City of Adelanto	**	X	X	X	X	X	**	X	X	X	X	**
Curt Emick Town of Apple Valley	**	X	X	X	X	X	**	X*	X*	X	X*	**
Julie McIntyre City of Barstow	**	X	X	X	X	X	**	X	X	X	X	**
Bill Jahn City of Big Bear Lake	**	X		X	X	X	**	X	X	X	X	**
Mike Leonard City of Hesperia	**	X	X	X		X	**				X	**
Ed Paget City of Needles	**	X	X	X	X	X	**	X	X	X	X	**
Jim Harris City of Twentynine Palms	**	X	X	X	X	X	**	X	X	X	X	**
Ryan McEachron City of Victorville	**	X	X	X			**	X		X	X	**
George Huntington Town of Yucca Valley	**	X	X	X	X*	X	**	X	X	X	X	**
Robert Lovingood County of San Bernardino	**	X			X	X	**	X		X	X	**
Janice Rutherford County of San Bernardino	**						**					**
James Ramos County of San Bernardino	**						**					**

*Non-voting City Representative attended
+ Measure I Committee representative

**The Mountain/Desert Committee did not meet
x*Alternate Attended

*** New SANBAG Board Member

X = Member attended meeting.
MDCatt13.doc

Empty box = Member did not attend meeting

Crossed out box = Not a Board Member at the time.



- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
- San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 3

Date: June 20, 2014

Subject: Construction Contract Change Orders to on-going SANBAG Construction Contracts in the Mountain/Desert region with Skanska Civil, USA and Security Paving Company, Inc.

Recommendation:* Review and ratify change orders.

Background: Of SANBAG's three on-going Construction Contracts in the Mountain Desert region, two have had Construction Change Orders (CCO's) approved since the last reporting to the Mountain Desert Policy Committee. The CCO's are listed below.

- A. CN C13149 with Skanska Civil, USA for construction of the Lenwood Road Grade Separation project: CCO No. 7 (\$ 3,657.76 decrease for changes to Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) aesthetic treatment and adding Fractured Finish treatment for abutment walls of bridge as approved by the City of Barstow) and CCO No. 8 (\$6,000.00 increase for removal and disposal of unanticipated nonfriable asbestos-containing duct system found during excavation for bridge footings).
- B. CN C13001 with Security Paving Company for construction of the I-15 Ranchero Road Interchange project: CCO No. 69 (\$20,000.00 increase to compensate contractor for slope repair due to damage from storm event while waiting for Caltrans approval of change order for additional SWPPP BMP's).

Approved
 Mountain/Desert Policy Committee

Date: _____

Moved: Second:

In Favor: Opposed: Abstained:

Witnessed: _____

COG	CTC	X	CTA	X	SAFE	CMA
-----	-----	---	-----	---	------	-----

Check all that apply.
 MDC1406a-tjk
 Attachment: MDC1406a1-tjk

- Financial Impact:*** This item imposes no financial impact, as all CCOs are within previously approved contingency amounts under Task No. 0881 and 0890.
- Reviewed By:*** This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee.
- Responsible Staff:*** Garry Cohoe, Director of Project Delivery

Lenwood Road Grade Separation - Executed Change Orders		
Number	Description	Amount
1	Partnership Workshop	\$ 12,000.00
2	Establish DRB	\$ 15,000.00
3	Revisions to Staging of Work	\$ 0.00
4	Specification change for HMA	\$ 0.00
5	Traffic Control	\$ 10,000.00
6	Revisions to City Sewer	\$ 14,962.60
7	Revisions to MSE and Abutment Aesthetic Treatments	(\$ 3,657.76)
8	Removal of nonfriable asbestos-containing Duct System	\$ 6,000.00
CCO TOTAL		\$ 54,304.84
TOTAL CONTINGENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL		\$ 1,830,859.40

I-15 Ranchero Road Interchange – Executed Change Orders		
Number	Description	Amount
1	Traffic Control	\$30,000.00
1 S-1	Traffic Control	\$200,000.00
2	Partnering	\$20,600.00
3	Dust Palliative	\$5,000.00
4	Apprentice Program	\$8,000.00
5	Dispute Resolution	\$15,000.00
6	Relocate Additional Joshua Trees	\$42,500.00
7	Temporary Silt Fence, Item 8	\$16,352.00
8	Shared Water Pollution Control Maintenance	\$8,000.00
8 S-1	Shared Water Pollution Control Maintenance	\$10,000.00
9	Relocate Right of Way Fence	\$63,520.00
10	Additional Drainage Work	\$6,942.86
11	VOID – County Water Line	\$0.00
13	Maintain Existing Electrical System	\$8,500.00
14	Edison Electrical Service	\$5,000.00
15	Removal 96” Pipe End Sections	\$1,500.00
16	Credit for Agency Survey of ADL Burial	(\$6,602.00)
16 S-1	Credit for Agency Survey of ADL Burial	(\$690.50)
17	Temporary Relocation of Verizon Line @ Ranchero Road	\$6,000.00

Bolded Construction Change Orders approved since the last reporting to the Mountain Desert Policy Committee. Amounts shown in parentheses represent a credit to the Agency

17 S-1	Temporary Relocation of Verizon Line @ Ranchero Road	\$3,065.04
18	Revised Access Road to 96" Pipe	\$47,833.50
19	VOID – Relocate Temp Concrete Barrier	\$0.00
20	Contractor's Proposed Detour Ranchero Road	\$69,700.00
21	Signal Pole Change at Ranchero Road/Caliente Road	\$19,144.03
22	Drainage Changes on Sheet SD-9	(\$5,334.78)
23	Remove & Reconstruct MBGR S/B I-15	\$4,183.00
25	Changing Grades N/B & S/B I-15	\$0.00
26	Change in Structural Section – Mariposa Road	\$139,277.10
27	Change Street Lights from HPS to LCD	\$18,851.08
28	Roadway Excavation – Item 159	\$363,000.00
29	VOID – Pothole Utilities	\$0.00
30	City Traffic Signal Cabinets – Type R	\$38,526.84
31	Closure of Caliente Road	\$5,000.00
32	Drainage System #16	\$8,586.30
32 S-1	Drainage System #16	\$11,311.40
33	Fence & Core U-Channel	\$25,735.52
34	Rotating Signal Pole Modification	\$2,167.53
35	VOID-Temp Realignment of Mariposa Road/Ranchero Road	\$0.00
36	VOID-Pull Box Lids	\$0.00
37	Revise Girder Curve Data	\$0.00
38	Cooper Ground Wire for SCE	\$5,471.25
39	Gravel Ditch Revision to Line R-6	\$2,013.00
40	JPCP End Anchors, Remove LCB	\$40,527.51
41	Conflicting Signal Pole @ Caliente Road/Ranchero Road	(\$2,270.41)
42	Closure of North Mariposa Road	\$43,000.00
43	Utility Access West of Caliente Road/Ranchero Road	\$4,878.00
44	Additional Drainage Improvements Mariposa Road	\$44,397.48
45	Abandon Vaults	\$2,000.00
46	Additional Hydroseeding in City Right of Way	\$95,200.00
47	Grade Ditch Caliente Road	\$3,000.00
48	Additional Traffic Striping on Mariposa	\$ 17,667.27
49	VOID – Revise Lane Closure Charts	\$0.00
51	Extend HDPE S/W Corner Caliente Road/Ranchero Road	\$1,320.00
52	Additional Sign and Markers (City)	\$2,436.00
53	PCCP Dike on JPCP	\$35,000.00
54	VOID – Detour for Falsework	\$0.00
55	Drainage S/W Mariposa Road	\$10,362.20
57	In Ground Concrete Washout	\$0.00

Bolded Construction Change Orders approved since the last reporting to the Mountain Desert Policy Committee.
Amounts shown in parentheses represent a credit to the Agency

58	Elimination of Redwood Header along Frontage Road	(\$5,039.00)
59	MVP Re-grading per Caltrans Design	\$ 15,000.00
62	Additional BMP on Slopes in Caltrans R/W	\$ 35,000.00
64	Revise Detour for Falsework	\$ 0.00
69	Slope Repair from Storm Damage	\$ 20,000.00
CCO TOTAL		\$1,560,632.22
TOTAL CONTINGENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL		\$3,172,925.63

Bolded Construction Change Orders approved since the last reporting to the Mountain Desert Policy Committee. Amounts shown in parentheses represent a credit to the Agency



- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission
- San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
- San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency
- Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 4

Date: June 20, 2014

Subject: Election of Committee Chair and Vice Chair

Recommendation:* That the Committee conduct elections for members to serve as Chair and Vice Chair of the SANBAG Mountain/Desert Policy Committee for terms to end June 30, 2015.

Background: Terms for the Chair and Vice Chair of each of the SANBAG policy committees expire on June 30, 2014. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for each of the policy committees is scheduled to immediately follow the annual election of SANBAG Officers, which occurred at the June Board of Directors meeting.

The duties of the Chair include participation in legislative advocacy efforts; serving on the General Policy Committee; representing SANBAG at public events; and representing Policy Committee recommendations at SANBAG Board meetings.

This item provides for an election to be conducted, which will identify the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee to serve until June 30, 2015. A complete listing of SANBAG policy committees, membership, and chairs is attached to this item for reference.

Financial Impact: This item has no financial impact on the adopted SANBAG Budget.

Reviewed By: This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee.

Responsible Staff: Andrea Zureick, Director of Fund Administration and Programming

*

Approved
 Mountain/Desert Policy Committee

Date: _____

Moved: Second:

In Favor: Opposed: Abstained:

Witnessed: _____

COG	X	CTC	X	CTA	X	SAFE	X	CMA	X
-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	------	---	-----	---

Check all that apply.

MDC1406a-az

<http://portal.sanbag.ca.gov/mgmt/committee/desert/mdc2014/mdc1406/AgendaItems/MDC1406a1-az.docx>

SANBAG Policy Committee Membership

COMMITTEE	PURPOSE	MEMBERSHIP	TERMS
<p>General Policy Committee Membership consists of the following: SANBAG President, Vice President, and Immediate Past President 4 East Valley (3 City, 1 County) 4 West Valley (3 City, 1 County) 4 Mt/Desert (3 City, 1 County) City members shall be SANBAG Board Members elected by caucus of city SANBAG Board Members within the subarea. All Policy Committee and Board Study Session Chairs are included in this policy committee. All City members serving as Board officers, Committee chairs, or Board Study Session Chair, are counted toward their subareas City membership. Supervisors collectively select their representatives. The SANBAG Vice President shall serve as Chair of the General Policy Committee.</p>	<p>Makes recommendations to Board of Directors and: (1) Provides general policy oversight which spans the multiple program responsibilities of the organization and maintains the comprehensive organization integrity; (2) Provides policy direction with respect to administrative issues, policies, budget, finance, audit, and personnel issues for the organization; (3) Serves as policy review committee for any program area that lacks active policy committee oversight. Committee has authority to approve contracts in excess of \$25,000 with notification to the Board of Directors.</p>	<p>L. Dennis Michael, Rancho Cucamonga, Vice President (Chair) Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake, President (Vice Chair) Janice Rutherford, Supervisor, Past President</p> <p><u>West Valley</u> Paul Eaton, Montclair (Chair – CRTC) L. Dennis Michael, Rancho Cucamonga Ed Graham, Chino Hills Dennis Yates, Chino Gary Ovitt, Supervisor</p> <p><u>East Valley</u> R. Carey Davis, San Bernardino Richard Riddell, Yucaipa (Chair – MVSS) Larry McCallon, Highland James Ramos, Supervisor</p> <p><u>Mountain/Desert</u> Edward Paget, Needles (Chair - MDC) Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake Jim Harris, Twentynine Palms Robert Lovingood, Supervisor</p>	<p>6/30/2014 6/30/2014 6/30/2014</p>
<p>Commuter Rail & Transit Committee Membership consists of 11 SANBAG Board Members: 9 Valley-members, two being Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) primary (*) and two being SCRRA alternate (**) members. 2 Mountain/Desert Board Members who serve on the Board of a Mountain/Desert transit agency. SCRRA members and alternates serve concurrent with their term on the SCRRA Board of Directors as appointed by the SANBAG Board. Other members are appointed by the SANBAG President for 2-year terms.</p>	<p>Provides policy guidance and recommendations to the SANBAG Board of Directors and Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) delegates with respect to commuter rail and transit service.</p> <p>* SCRRA Primary Member ** SCRRA Alternate Member</p>	<p>Paul Eaton, Montclair* (Chair) James Ramos, Supervisor**(Vice Chair) Pete Aguilar, Redlands Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake Mike Leonard, Hesperia Larry McCallon, Highland* L. Dennis Michael, Rancho Cucamonga Vacant (Pat Morris, San Bernardino) Ray Musser, Upland Richard Riddell, Yucaipa Alan Wapner, Ontario**</p>	<p>Indeterminate (6/30/2014) Indeterminate (6/30/2014) 12/31/2014 12/31/2015 12/31/2015 Indeterminate 12/31/2015 12/31/2014 12/31/2015 12/31/2014 Indeterminate</p>

SANBAG Policy Committee Membership

COMMITTEE	PURPOSE	MEMBERSHIP	TERMS
Mountain/Desert Committee Membership consists of 11 SANBAG Board Members from each Mountain/Desert jurisdiction and County Supervisors representing the First, Second, and Third Districts.	Provides ongoing policy level oversight related to the full array of SANBAG responsibilities as they pertain specifically to the Mountain/Desert subregion. The Committee also meets as the Mountain/Desert Measure I Committee as it carries out responsibilities for Measure I Mountain/Desert Expenditure Plan.	Edward Paget, Needles (Chair) Ryan McEachron, Victorville, (Vice Chair) Curt Emick, Apple Valley Jim Harris, Twentynine Palms George Huntington, Yucca Valley Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake Mike Leonard, Hesperia Robert Lovingood, Supervisor Julie McIntyre, Barstow James Ramos, Supervisor Janice Rutherford, Supervisor Cari Thomas, Adelanto	Indeterminate (6/30/2014) Indeterminate (6/30/2014) Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate

Policy Committee Meeting Times

General Policy Committee Second Wednesday, 9:00 a.m., SANBAG Office
 Commuter Rail & Transit Committee Third Thursday, 12:00 noon, SANBAG Office
 Mountain/Desert Committee Third Friday, 9:30 a.m., Apple Valley
 NOTE: Policy Committee meetings will not be held in July of each year (effective 9/5/12).

19

Board of Directors Study Sessions for Metro Valley Issues

STUDY SESSION	PURPOSE	MEMBERSHIP	TERMS
Board of Directors Study Sessions for Metro Valley Issues Refer to SANBAG Policy 10007.	To review, discuss, and make recommendations for actions to be taken at regular meetings of the Board on issues relating to Measure I Projects in the Valley.	Board of Directors Richard Riddell, Yucapa (Chair) Michael Tahan, Fontana (Vice Chair)	6/30/2014 6/30/2014

Meeting Time: Second Thursday, 9:00 a.m., SANBAG Office

Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) Review of Measure I Expenditure Plan

COMMITTEE	PURPOSE	MEMBERSHIP	TERMS
Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) Review of Measure I Expenditure Plan The ITOC shall provide citizen review to ensure that all Measure I funds are spent by the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (hereby referred to as the Authority) in accordance with provision of the Expenditure Plan and Ordinance No. 04-01.	The ITOC shall review the annual audits of the Authority; report findings based on the audits to the Authority; and recommend any additional audits for consideration which the ITOC believes may improve the financial operation and integrity of program implementation. The Authority shall hold a publicly noticed meeting, which may or may not be included on the agenda of a regularly scheduled Board meeting, with the participation of the ITOC to consider the findings and recommendations of the audits.	Richard Haller Rod Johnson Norman Orfall Craig Scott Larry Sharp Ray Wolfe, Ex-Officio In addition to the appointed members, the SANBAG Executive Director will serve as an ex officio member.	12/31/16 12/31/16 12/31/14 12/31/14 12/31/14

SANBAG Ad Hoc Committees

COMMITTEE	PURPOSE	MEMBERSHIP
<p>Audit Subcommittee of the General Policy Committee In November 2008, the Board approved the creation of an Audit Subcommittee of the General Policy Committee to strengthen the financial oversight function of the Board. Additional SANBAG Board Members may be appointed annually at the discretion of the Board President.</p>	<p>The responsibilities of the Audit Subcommittee shall be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a direct contact between the independent auditor and the Board of Directors before, during and after the annual audit. • Work with the auditor and SANBAG staff on reviewing and implementing practices and controls identified in the annual audit. 	<p>Audit Subcommittee (for FY 2012-2013 Audit)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SANBAG President – Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake - Vice President – L. Dennis Michael, Rancho Cucamonga - Immediate Past President – Janice Rutherford, Supervisor - Presidential Appointment – Walt Stanckiewicz, Grand Terrace
<p>Ad Hoc Committee on Litigation with San Bernardino County Flood Control District In January 2007, the SANBAG President was authorized to appoint an ad hoc review committee of SANBAG Board Members who do not represent local jurisdictions party to the San Bernardino County Flood Control District vs. SANBAG litigation relative to the Colonies Development. In April 2008, the role of this committee was expanded to include the Cactus Basin litigation.</p>	<p>Review and provide guidance on litigation with San Bernardino County Flood Control District regarding the Colonies Development and the Cactus Basin in Rialto.</p>	<p>Pat Morris, San Bernardino, Chair Larry McCallon, Highland Richard Riddell, Yucaipa</p>
<p>Bylaws In July 2012, the SANBAG Board President appointed this ad hoc committee to review SANBAG’s bylaws and recommend changes to modernize SANBAG’s governance document.</p>	<p>Review SANBAG’s bylaws and make recommendations to the Board on any necessary changes.</p>	<p>Rhodes “Dusty” Rigsby, Loma Linda - Chair Mike Leonard, Hesperia Larry McCallon, Highland Pat Morris, San Bernardino</p>
<p>Budget Process In July 2012, the SANBAG Board President appointed this ad hoc committee to review SANBAG’s budget preparation process and final budget document and make recommendations to help improve communication and transparency of SANBAG’s budget to elected officials and the general public.</p>	<p>Review SANBAG’s budget adoption process and final budget document and make recommendations on changes to improve the process and the final budget document to make them more useful and informative to Board Members and the public.</p>	<p>Ray Musser, Upland – Chair Mike Podegracz, P.E. – City Manager, City of Hesperia Sam Racadio – Council Member, City of Highland Kevin Ryan - Principal Transportation Planner, City of Fontana</p>
<p>Contracting Process In July 2012, the SANBAG Board President appointed this ad hoc committee to strengthen SANBAG’s procurement policies and procedures.</p>	<p>Review SANBAG’s contracting policies and procedures and make recommendations to improve them.</p>	<p>Michael Tahan, Fontana - Chair Robert Lovingood, Supervisor Julie McIntyre, Barstow Walt Stanckiewicz, Grand Terrace Alan Wapner, Ontario Dennis Yates, Chino</p>

SANBAG Ad Hoc Committees

COMMITTEE	PURPOSE	MEMBERSHIP
<p>Express Lanes Ad Hoc Committee In November 2013, the SANBAG Board President appointed this ad hoc committee.</p>	<p>The purpose is to consider uses for anticipated toll revenue in excess of that needed to cover bond debt over the long-term.</p>	<p>Alan Wapner, Ontario – Chair Josie Gonzales, Supervisor Mike Leonard, Hesperia Robert Lovingood, Supervisor Larry McCallon, Highland Ryan McEachron, Victorville L. Dennis Michael, Rancho Cucamonga Frank Navarro, Colton Dusty Rigsby, Loma Linda Deborah Robertson, Rialto Janice Rutherford, Supervisor Michael Tahan, Fontana</p>
<p>Legislative In March 2013, the SANBAG Board President appointed this ad hoc committee. This committee will consist of the SANBAG Board Officers.</p>	<p>Review proposed legislation at the state and federal level. Provide direction to staff on positions consistent with the Board-adopted legislative platform.</p>	<p>President – Bill Jahn, City of Big Bear Lake Vice President – L. Dennis Michael, Rancho Cucamonga Immediate Past President – Janice Rutherford, Supervisor</p>
<p>Right of Way In February 2013, the SANBAG Board President appointed this ad hoc committee.</p>	<p>Review Right of Way policies and make recommendations on changes and signature authority limits.</p>	<p>Curt Emick, Apple Valley James Ramos, Supervisor Deborah Robertson, Rialto Michael Tahan, Fontana</p>
<p>Transit Review Ad Hoc Committee In July 2013, the SANBAG Board President appointed this ad hoc committee.</p>	<p>Review transit agency efficiencies and maximize transit funding.</p>	<p>Janice Rutherford, Supervisor – Chair Jim Harris, Twentynine Palms Robert Lovingood, Supervisor Ryan McEachron, Victorville L. Dennis Michael, Rancho Cucamonga Dusty Rigsby, Loma Linda Alan Wapner, Ontario</p>

SANBAG Technical Advisory Committees

COMMITTEE	PURPOSE	MEETING SCHEDULE
<p>Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) Committee membership consists of a primary staff representative of each SANBAG member agency designated by the City Manager or County Administrative Officer.</p>	<p>SANBAG's Transportation Technical Advisory Committee was formed by SANBAG management to provide input to SANBAG staff on technical transportation-related matters and formulation of transportation-related policy recommendations to the SANBAG Board of Directors.</p> <p>The TTAC is not a Brown Act committee.</p>	<p>Generally meets on the first Monday of each month at 1:30 PM, at SANBAG.</p>
<p>City/County Manager's Technical Advisory Committee (CCM TAC) The committee is made up of up to two representatives of the County Administrator's Office and the city manager or administrator from each city and town in the County.</p>	<p>SANBAG's City/County Manager's Technical Advisory Committee was established in the Joint Powers Authority that established SANBAG. The primary role of the committee is to provide a forum for the chief executives of SANBAG's member agencies to become informed about and discuss issues facing SANBAG. It also provides a forum for the discussion of items of mutual concern and a way to cooperate regionally in addressing those concerns.</p> <p>The CCM TAC is a Brown Act Committee.</p>	<p>Meets on the first Thursday of each month at 10:00 AM, at SANBAG.</p>
<p>Public and Specialized Transportation Advisory and Coordinating Council (PASTACC) Membership consists of 13 members appointed by the SANBAG Board of Directors 6 representing Public Transit Providers 1 representing County Dept. of Public Works 1 representing the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency 5 representing Social Service Providers</p>	<p>Subject to the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Section 99238 – establishes PASTACC's statutory responsibilities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Review and make recommendations to SANBAG on annual Unmet Transit Needs, Federal Transit Administration and Measure I Program applications and reports. (2) Assist SANBAG in developing public outreach approach on updating the Coordinated Public Transit/Human Services Transportation Plan and disseminate information in reference to State law and recommendations as they relate to transit and specialized transit. (3) Monitor and make recommendations on Federal regulatory processes as they relate to transit and specialized transit. (4) Address any special issues of PASTACC voting and non-voting members. <p>The PASTACC is a Brown Act committee.</p>	<p>Meets the second Tuesday every other even month at 10:00 AM, at SANBAG.</p>
<p>Planning and Development Technical Forum (PDTF) Committee membership consists of a primary staff representative of each SANBAG member agency designated by the City Manager or County Chief Executive Officer.</p>	<p>The SANBAG Planning and Development Technical Forum was formed by SANBAG management to provide an opportunity for interaction among planning and development representatives of member agencies on planning issues of multijurisdictional importance.</p> <p>The PDTF is not a Brown Act Committee.</p>	<p>Meets the 4th Wednesday of each month at 2:00 p.m. at the Depot (in the SCAG Office).</p>

SANBAG Technical Advisory Committees

COMMITTEE	PURPOSE	MEETING SCHEDULE
<p>Project Development Teams</p>	<p>Project Development Teams (PDTs) are assembled for all major project development activities by SANBAG staff.</p> <p>Teams are generally composed of technical representatives from SANBAG, member jurisdictions appropriate to the project, Caltrans, and other major stakeholder entities that have significant involvement in the project.</p> <p>PDTs make recommendations related to approaches to project development, evaluation of alternatives, and technical solutions.</p> <p>PDTs meet on a regular basis throughout the project phase to review progress and to provide technical input required for project development.</p> <p>The PDTs are not Brown Act Committees.</p>	<p>Varies with the PDT, at SANBAG.</p>



- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
- San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 5

Date: June 20, 2014

Subject: Caltrans Interstate 15 (I-15) Cajon Pass Rehabilitation Construction Project

Recommendation:* Receive information regarding upcoming pavement repair and replacement on the Cajon Pass section of I-15.

Background: The I-15 Cajon Pass Rehabilitation Project consists of roadway pavement resurfacing and restoration. The project will extend pavement service life with minimal maintenance expenditures on I-15 between the Kenwood Avenue exit to the south and West Hesperia Overhead to the north. Additionally, the project will upgrade and install roadside safety features. Construction has recently commenced, with completion scheduled for summer 2016. Caltrans staff will be making a presentation on the project.

Financial Impact: This item imposes no financial impact on the Fiscal Year 2013/2014 budget.

Reviewed By: This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee.

Responsible Staff: Garry Cohoe, Director of Project Delivery

*

Approved
 Mountain/Desert Policy Committee

Date: _____

Moved: _____ *Second:* _____

In Favor: _____ *Opposed:* _____ *Abstained:* _____

Witnessed: _____

COG	CTC	CTA	X	SAFE	CMA
-----	-----	-----	---	------	-----

Check all that apply.



- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission
- San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
- San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency
- Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 6

Date: June 20, 2014

Subject: Interstate 15 (I-15) Ranchero Road Interchange Project

Recommendation:* Receive an update on the I-15 Ranchero Interchange Project.

Background: The I-15 Ranchero Intechange project had a major setback when the falsework was destroyed by fire. A plan to complete the project has been developed. The plan and photos of the fire, and the progress of the project will be shared during the Mountain/Desert Policy Committee meeting.

Financial Impact: This item imposes no financial impact on the Fiscal Year 2013/2014 budget.

Reviewed By: This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee.

Responsible Staff: Garry Cohoe, Director of Project Delivery

*

Approved
 Mountain/Desert Policy Committee

Date: _____

Moved: _____ Second: _____

In Favor: _____ Opposed: _____ Abstained: _____

Witnessed: _____

COG	CTC	CTA	X	SAFE	CMA
-----	-----	-----	---	------	-----

Check all that apply.



- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission
- San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
- San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency
- Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 7

Date: June 20, 2014

Subject: Interstate 15/Interstate 215 (I-15/I-215) Devore Interchange Reconstruction Project

Recommendation:* That the Committee recommend the Board, acting as the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority:

1. Approve Amendment No. 3 to Cooperative Agreement No. C11103 with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for Right of Way activities on the I-15/I-215 Devore Interchange Reconstruction Project which reduces SANBAG's Measure I funding responsibility by \$13,229,689.00 to a new total of \$30,107,136.00.
2. Approve Amendment No. 2 to Cooperative Agreement No. C12216 with Caltrans for Design Build activities on the I-15/I-215 Devore Interchange Reconstruction Project which increases SANBAG's Measure I funding responsibility by \$14,134,136.00 to a new total of \$18,796,136.00.

Background: Amend two existing Cooperative Agreements. Currently, design on the I-15/I-215 Devore Interchange Improvements Project is over 85% complete and construction is about 14% complete. All of the project right of way has been secured for the project, with some minor exceptions, however, condemnation activities are ongoing on approximately 25 parcels.

*

Approved
 Mountain/Desert Policy Committee

Date: _____

Moved _____ Second: _____

In Favor: _____ Opposed: _____ Abstained: _____

Witnessed: _____

COG	CTC	CTA	X	SAFE	CMA
-----	-----	-----	---	------	-----

Check all that apply.

MDC1406c-ds

<http://portal.sanbag.ca.gov/mgmt/APOR-Mgmt/ContractsWorkInProgress%20Files%20%202014/C1110303.docx>

<http://portal.sanbag.ca.gov/mgmt/APOR-Mgmt/ContractsWorkInProgress%20Files%20%202014/C1221602.doc>

SANBAG currently has two active cooperative agreements for ongoing work on the Devore Interchange Reconstruction Project. The following is the history of these cooperative agreements:

Right of Way cooperative agreement C11103:

Original Agreement- Approved June, 2011 Board

Amount: \$2,500,000 in Measure I Cajon Pass funds

Scope: initial study, early acquisitions, and right of way engineering.

Amendment 1- Approved March, 2012 Board

Amount: Increase SANBAG funding responsibility by \$47,853,825 to a new total of \$50,353,825 including \$40,836,825 in additional Measure I Cajon Pass funds and \$7,017,000 in utility costs to be paid by the utility companies directly

Scope: fund all anticipated project right of way capital costs and Caltrans support costs.

Amendment 2 - Approved April, 2013 Board

Amount: No net change in cost. Shifted \$500,000 from right of way capital to Caltrans support

Scope: Specify that Caltrans will handle most of the eminent domain activities instead of SANBAG.

Design-Build cooperative agreement C12216:

Original Agreement - Approved April, 2012 Board

Amount: \$8,011,000 in Measure I Cajon Pass fund contribution

Scope: Designate agency roles and responsibilities during the design-build phase and specify funding sources for this phase.

Amendment 1- Approved September, 2012 Board

Amount: Reduced Measure I fund contribution down to \$4,662,000

Scope: Reduce Measure I funding due to utilizing newly available additional federal funding on the project.

At its April 11, 2013, Board Meeting, SANBAG approved proceeding with negotiating two large construction change orders related to accommodation of the ultimate corridor on I-15 through the Devore Interchange and construction of retaining walls to minimize right of way impacts on the project. It was anticipated that most, if not all, of these additional costs would be recovered through anticipated cost savings in the right of way phase. Based on Board direction, staff has been working with Caltrans to define the work required to address these changes and negotiate with Caltrans and Atkinson Contractors, the

Design Builder, construction change orders for this work. The negotiated cost of the construction change orders is \$14,134,136.00. This includes work for modification of the design and additional construction work for accommodating the ultimate corridor on I-15 through the I-15/I-215 Interchange, the addition of several large retaining walls to minimize or eliminate property takes, and it also includes \$222,479 in utility protection work originally anticipated to be completed by the utility companies and paid for by SANBAG as part of the utility costs. These additional costs are reflected in the Design Build cooperative agreement amendment that is submitted for approval.

In conjunction with the increase in cost for the project construction work, there is an anticipated savings in the right of way costs for the project. These savings are anticipated based on several factors. With the addition of the new retaining walls, three large parcels that were occupied, potential full takes are now being completely avoided and significant utility relocation work adjacent to these parcels has also been eliminated. The Design Builder's design alternative which impacts the ultimate corridor footprint requiring the large construction change order, also eliminated about 13 partial or full acquisitions by utilizing a smaller footprint and working with Caltrans and SANBAG to minimize right of way impacts. Another factor in the right of way cost reduction is that some of the utility relocation work and protection of existing utility facilities is now being done more cost effectively by the Design Build contractor. Currently, these savings are conservatively anticipated to be \$13,229,689.00. At this point, there are properties which are still in condemnation, so the final settlement costs could be somewhat different than estimated. A 25% contingency has been included in this savings amount. In addition, all the utility relocation work has not been completed. The anticipated savings indicated in the figure above is based on the estimated cost plus a 25% contingency. Actual final costs may vary which would affect what the final savings might be. The savings reflected in the agreement amendment is based on the latest estimates currently available.

The right of way cooperative agreement would be amended to reduce SANBAG's Measure I contribution by \$13,229,689.00. The design build cooperative agreement would be amended to increase SANBAG's Measure I contribution by \$14,134,136.00. There are several factors that are anticipated to decrease the final differential between the two agreements. First, SANBAG has five excess parcels which will be sold over the next few years. Our current estimate for net proceeds from the sale of these is roughly \$800,000. In addition, SANBAG will receive \$928,000 back from one utility company for betterment costs they are responsible for reimbursing. Based on these factors, it is anticipated that the final net differential will reflect a savings in Measure I expenditures. These amendments reflect the current cost estimates and the cooperative agreements may be amended again, if necessary, once final costs are determined. Staff recommends approval of these two cooperative agreement amendments.

Mountain/Desert Policy Committee Agenda Item

June 20, 2014

Page 4

Financial Impact: This item is consistent with the adopted SANBAG Fiscal Year 2014/2015 budget under Task No. 0880. The funding source is Measure I 2010-2040 Cajon Pass Fund.

Reviewed By: This item is also scheduled for review by the Board Metro Valley Study Session on June 12, 2014. SANBAG General Counsel has reviewed the draft amendments and this item.

Responsible Staff: Garry Cohoe, Director of Project Delivery

CONTRACT SUMMARY SHEET

Contract No. C 11103 Amendment No. 3

By and Between

San Bernardino County Transportation Authority and California Department of Transportation

Contract Description Cooperative Agreement for I-15/I-215 Devore Interchange Right of Way

Board of Director's Meeting Date: 7/2/14
Overview of BOD Action: Approve cooperative agreement amendment to reduce cost responsibility consistent with project r/w savings

Is this a Sole-Source procurement? Yes No

CONTRACT OVERVIEW

Original Contract Amount	\$	2,500,000.00	Original Contingency Amount	\$	
Revised Contract Amount <i>Inclusive of prior amendments</i>	\$	43,336,825.00	Revised Contingency Amount <i>Inclusive of prior amendments</i>	\$	
Current Amendment Amount	\$	(13,229,689.00)	Contingency Amendment	\$	
TOTAL CONTRACT VALUE	\$	30,107,136.00	TOTAL CONTINGENCY VALUE	\$	
TOTAL BUDGET AUTHORITY (contract value + contingency)				\$	30,107,136.00

Contract Start Date 6/1/11	Current Contract Expiration Date 12/31/19	Revised Contract Expiration Date
Has the contract term been amended? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - please explain.		

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Budget authority for this contract currently exists in Task No. 0880.
 A Budget Amendment is required.

How are we funding current FY? Measure I 2010-2040 Cajon Pass Funds

Federal Funds State Funds Local Funds TDA Funds Measure I Funds

Provide Brief Overview of the Overall Funding for the duration of the Contract:
 All SANBAG funding from Measure I 2010-2040 Cajon Pass funds. Other funding by utilities for their share.

Payable Receivable

CONTRACT MANAGEMENT INFORMATION

Check all applicable boxes:

Retention? If yes, indicate % _____.

Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Goal _____ %

Dennis Saylor		5/29/14	
Project Manager (Print Name)	Signature	Date	
		5-29-14	
Task Manager (Print Name)	Signature	Date	
Andrea Zureick		6/3/14	
Dir. of Fund Admin. & Programming (Print Name)	Signature	Date	
		6/3/14	
Contract Administrator (Print Name)	Signature	Date	
Chief Financial Officer (Print Name)	Signature	Date	

AMENDMENT NO. 3 TO AGREEMENT 1473

THIS AMENDMENT No. 3 (AMENDMENT), entered into and effective on _____, is between the State of California, acting through its Department of Transportation, referred to as CALTRANS, and

San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, a public entity referred to as AUTHORITY.

RECITALS

1. CALTRANS and AUTHORITY collectively referred to as PARTNERS, entered into Agreement No. 08-1473, (AGREEMENT) on June 16, 2011, defining the terms and conditions to define and stipulate their respective responsibilities towards project on Interstate 15 (I-15) from south of Glen Helen Parkway Interchange (IC) to north of Kenwood IC and on Interstate 215 (I-215) from south of Devore IC through I-15 IC, referred to herein as "PROJECT." In the Agreement the parties stipulated as to their respective Right of Way responsibilities only through the initial PA&ED phase for PROJECT.
2. PARTNERS entered into Amendment No. 1 to AGREEMENT on March 27, 2012, to restate in its entirety Agreement No. 08-1473 to define and stipulate on the terms of all the Right of Way (R/W) activities including the ones not included in the Original Agreement.
3. PARTNERS entered into Amendment No. 2 to AGREEMENT on April 18, 2013, to reallocate funds in the FUNDING SUMMARY and increase the amount allocated to "R/W Support Reimbursed" by \$500,000 and reduce the amount allocated to "R/W Capital" by \$500,000 to support costs for CALTRANS legal services through the condemnation process. Such reallocation will likely need to be adjusted upwards once the number of cases and extent of legal work required for these specific properties are more defined. PARTNERS also revise the SCOPE SUMMARY to clarify some roles and responsibilities that were not clearly defined previously.
4. PARTNERS now seek to revise the funding summary as the right of way needs were reduced due to design refinements and by adding retaining wall systems

thereby reducing the right of way capital costs by \$13,229,689. This saving will be used on the Project for Design-Build Agreement 1513.

5. A revised FUNDING SUMMARY is attached to and is a part of this AMENDMENT.

IT IS THEREFORE MUTUALLY AGREED:

1. A revised FUNDING SUMMARY, dated April 22, 2014 is attached to and made part of this AMENDMENT. Any reference to the FUNDING SUMMARY in the AGREEMENT is deemed to refer to the revised FUNDING SUMMARY, dated April 22, 2014, attached herein.
2. All other terms and conditions of the AGREEMENT shall remain in full force and effect.
3. This AMENDMENT is deemed to be included and made part of the AGREEMENT.

-----SIGNATURES ON FOLLOWING PAGE-----

SIGNATURES

PARTNERS declare that:

1. Each PARTNER is an authorized legal entity under California state law.
2. Each PARTNER has the authority to enter into this agreement.
3. The people signing this agreement have the authority to do so on behalf of their public agencies.

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**

APPROVED

APPROVED

By: _____
Basem E. Muallem, P.E.
District Director

By: _____
L. Dennis Michael
Board President

**APPROVED AS TO FORM AND
PROCEDURE:**

ATTEST:

By: _____
Attorney,
Department of Transportation

By: _____
Vicki Watson
Board Clerk

CERTIFIED AS TO FUNDS:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

By: _____
Lisa Pacheco
District Budget Manager

By: _____
Eileen Monaghan Teichert
General Counsel

**CERTIFIED AS TO FINANCIAL
TERMS AND POLICIES:**

By: _____
Accounting Administrator

FUNDING SUMMARY

Dated April 22, 2014

Funding Source	Funding Partner	Fund Type	R/W Capital (Mitigation)	R/W Capital	R/W Support Reimbursed	Subtotal Support	Subtotal Capital	Subtotal Funds Type
LOCAL	AUTHORITY	Measure I	\$14,720,700	\$18,350,611	\$2,035,825	\$2,035,825	\$28,071,311	\$30,107,136
LOCAL	AUTHORITY	Utility Companies		\$7,017,000			\$7,017,000	\$7,017,000
		Subtotals by Component	\$14,720,700	\$20,367,611	\$2,035,825	\$2,035,825	\$35,088,311	\$37,124,136

CONTRACT SUMMARY SHEET

Contract No. C 12216 Amendment No. 2

By and Between

San Bernardino County Transportation Authority and California Department of Transportation

Contract Description Cooperative Agreement for I-15/I-215 Devore Interchange Design-Build

Board of Director's Meeting Date: 7/2/14

Overview of BOD Action: Approve cooperative agreement amendment reflecting incorporation of project change orders being executed which result in r/w savings as well as other items

Is this a Sole-Source procurement? Yes No

CONTRACT OVERVIEW

Original Contract Amount	\$	8,011,000.00	Original Contingency Amount	\$	
Revised Contract Amount <i>Inclusive of prior amendments</i>	\$	4,662,000.00	Revised Contingency Amount <i>Inclusive of prior amendments</i>	\$	
Current Amendment Amount	\$	14,134,136.00	Contingency Amendment	\$	
TOTAL CONTRACT VALUE	\$	18,796,136.00	TOTAL CONTINGENCY VALUE	\$	
TOTAL BUDGET AUTHORITY (contract value + contingency)				\$	18,796,136.00

Contract Start Date 4/4/12	Current Contract Expiration Date 12/31/17	Revised Contract Expiration Date
-------------------------------	--	----------------------------------

Has the contract term been amended? No Yes - please explain.

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Budget authority for this contract currently exists in Task No. 0890.

A Budget Amendment is required.

How are we funding current FY? Measure I 2010-2040 Cajon Pass funds

Federal Funds State Funds Local Funds TDA Funds Measure I Funds

Provide Brief Overview of the Overall Funding for the duration of the Contract:

SANBAG payable portion is from Measure I 2010-2040 Cajon Pass funds, other Fed and State funds are self-reimbursed by Caltrans

Payable Receivable

CONTRACT MANAGEMENT INFORMATION

Check all applicable boxes:

Retention? If yes, indicate % _____.

Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Goal _____ %

Dennis Saylor

Project Manager (Print Name)

Garry Choe

Task Manager (Print Name)

Andrea Zureick

Dir. of Fund Admin. & Programming (Print Name)

Jeffery Hill

Contract Administrator (Print Name)

William Stawarski

Chief Financial Officer (Print Name)

<i>Dennis Saylor</i>	5/29/14	
Signature		Date
<i>Garry Choe</i>	5-29-14	
Signature		Date
<i>Andrea Zureick</i>	5/2/14	
Signature		Date
<i>Jeffery Hill</i>	6/2/14	
Signature		Date
<i>William Stawarski</i>	6/3/14	
Signature		Date

AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO AGREEMENT 1513

THIS AMENDMENT No. 2 (AMENDMENT), entered into and effective on _____, is between the State of California, acting through its Department of Transportation, referred to as CALTRANS, and

San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, a public entity, referred to as AUTHORITY.

RECITALS

- 1. CALTRANS and AUTHORITY, collectively referred to as PARTNERS, entered into Agreement No. 1513, (AGREEMENT) on April 27, 2012, defining the terms and conditions to complete the DESIGN-BUILD phase for improvements on Interstate 15 (I-15) from south of Glen Helen Parkway Interchange (IC) to north of Kenwood IC and on Interstate 215 (I-215) from south of Devore IC through the I-15 IC, referred to as PROJECT.**
- 2. PARTNERS entered into Amendment No. 1 to AGREEMENT on September 13, 2012 to increase SHOPP funding to \$118,008,000, add \$3,341,000 in IMD funds and reduce Measure funding to \$4,662,000.**
- 3. AGREEMENT established that the Design-Build Capital funds to be used were SHOPP \$118,008,000; SHOPP Rehab \$19,600,000; STIP/RIP \$18,594,000; Earmarks \$2,000,000; STP \$59,323,000; Measure \$4,662,000; IMD funds \$3,341,000, and that the Design-Build Support funds to be used were STIP/RIP \$26,551,000.**
- 4. PARTNERS now seek to decrease the Design-Build Capital funds SHOPP to \$83,865,000; eliminate the SHOPP Rehab funds; add CMIA funds of \$53,743,000; increase the Measure funding to \$18,796,136 to cover Contract Change Orders (CCO) for design and construction for future facility revisions and retaining wall system in lieu of right of way take and some utility protection costs previously budgeted within the right of way cooperative agreement. This**

budgeted cost from the Right of Way agreement (1473) will be a saving from Right of Way Capital and will be transferred to this Design Build Agreement.

5. CALTRANS shall deduct from the Design-Build Contractor, the cost for Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) which the latter is availing in accordance to the Design-Builder Contract. A CCO will be approved upon final reconciliation of costs for the FSP upon completion of work. Since SANBAG is incurring the cost for the FSP, a final adjustment in the Measure contribution to the PROJECT will be done upon the approval of the CCO whereby all deductions for FSP from the progress payments will be credited against SANBAG's share shown in FUNDING SUMMARY A/2.
6. Utility relocation Work for San Bernardino Municipal Water (SBMW) is funded through Measure funding and is included in the FUNDING SUMMARY A/2.
7. A revised FUNDING SUMMARY A/2 is attached to and made part of this AMENDMENT.

IT IS THEREFORE MUTUALLY AGREED:

1. A revised FUNDING SUMMARY A/2 is attached to and made part of the AMENDMENT. Any reference to the FUNDING SUMMARY in the AGREEMENT is deemed to refer to the revised FUNDING SUMMARY A/2 attached herein.
2. CALTRANS shall deduct from the Design-Build Contractor, the cost for Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) which the latter is availing, in accordance to the Design-Builder Contract. A CCO will be approved upon final reconciliation of costs for the FSP upon completion of work. Since the cost for FSP is being debited from SANBAG's Measure funds, a final adjustment in the Measure contribution to the PROJECT will be done upon the approval of the CCO. All deductions for FSP from the progress payments will be credited against SANBAG's share shown in FUNDING SUMMARY A/2. CALTRANS will refund to SANBAG the actual cost of FSP upon final accounting in accordance with paragraph 3 of article 93 of the AGREEMENT.
3. All other terms and conditions of the AGREEMENT shall remain in full force and effect.
4. This AMENDMENT is deemed to be included and made part of the AGREEMENT.

SIGNATURES

PARTNERS declare that:

1. Each PARTNER is an authorized legal entity under California state law.
2. Each PARTNER has the authority to enter into this agreement.
3. The people signing this agreement have the authority to do so on behalf of their public agencies.

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**

APPROVED

APPROVED

By: _____
Basem E. Muallem, P.E.
District Director

By: _____
L. Dennis Michael
Board President

**APPROVED AS TO FORM AND
PROCEDURE:**

ATTEST:

By: _____
Attorney,
Department of Transportation

By: _____
Vicki Watson
Board Clerk

CERTIFIED AS TO FUNDS:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

By: _____
Lisa Pacheco
District Budget Manager

By: _____
Eileen Monaghan Teichert
General Counsel

**CERTIFIED AS TO FINANCIAL
TERMS AND POLICIES:**

By: _____
Accounting Administrator

FUNDING SUMMARY A/2

Funding Source	Funding Partner	Funding Type	DB Support	DB Capital	Subtotal Funds Type
STATE	CALTRANS	SHOPP	\$0	\$83,865,000	\$83,865,000
STATE	CALTRANS	CMIA	\$0	\$53,743,000	\$53,743,000
STATE	AUTHORITY	STIP/RIP	\$26,551,000	\$18,594,000	\$45,145,000
FEDERAL	AUTHORITY	Earmarks	\$0	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
FEDERAL	AUTHORITY	STP	\$0	\$59,323,000	\$59,323,000
FEDERAL	AUTHORITY	IMD	\$0	\$3,341,000	\$3,341,000
LOCAL	AUTHORITY	Measure	\$0	\$3,434,000	\$3,434,000
LOCAL	AUTHORITY	Measure	\$0	(COO) \$14,134,136	\$14,134,136
LOCAL	AUTHORITY	Measure	\$0	(SBMW) \$1,228,000	\$1,228,000
		Subtotals by Component	\$26,551,000	\$239,862,136	\$266,213,136



- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
- San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 8

Date: June 20, 2014

Subject: Measure I Expenditure Plan 2015 Review

Recommendation:* That the Committee recommend the Board, acting as the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority:

1. Receive information on the results of the outreach process authorized by the SANBAG Board in March 2014 for considering amendments to the Measure I Expenditure Plan pursuant to Section XIV of San Bernardino County Transportation Authority Ordinance No. 04-01.
2. Defer further consideration of any amendments to the Measure I Expenditure Plan until the 2017-2018 timeframe.
3. Direct staff to consider recommendations made by commenters on Measure I Strategic Plan and Nexus Study policies and to bring back any recommended changes to the appropriate policy committee(s) following internal and local jurisdiction staff discussion and review.

Background: The purpose of this agenda item is to report back on the outreach process authorized by the SANBAG Board in March 2014 for considering amendments to the Measure I Expenditure Plan pursuant to Section XIV of San Bernardino County Transportation Authority Ordinance No. 04-01. The ordinance requires a review of the Expenditure Plan in 2015. Section XIV states:

*

Approved
 Mountain/Desert Policy Committee

Date: _____

Moved: _____ Second: _____

In Favor: _____ Opposed: _____ Abstained: _____

Witnessed: _____

COG	<input type="checkbox"/>	CTC	<input type="checkbox"/>	CTA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SAFE	<input type="checkbox"/>	CMA	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	-----	--------------------------	-----	-------------------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----	--------------------------

Check all that apply.

MDC1406a-ss

<http://portal.sanbag.ca.gov/mgmt/committee/desert/mdc2014/mdc1406/AgendaItems/MDC1406a1-ss.pdf>

SECTION XIV. EXPENDITURE PLAN AMENDMENTS. *The Expenditure Plan may only be amended by the following process:*

- 1. Beginning in 2015, and at least every ten years thereafter, the Authority shall review and, where necessary, propose revision to the Expenditure Plan. Such review shall consider recommendations from local governments, transportation agencies and interest groups, and the general public.*
- 2. The Authority shall notify the cities/towns and Board of Supervisors of the proposed revision and initiation of an amendment, reciting findings of necessity.*
- 3. Actions of the city/town councils and Board of Supervisors to approve or to oppose the amendment shall be formally communicated to the Authority within 60 days of notice of initiation of amendment.*
- 4. The boundaries of subareas shall be amended only by unanimous approval of all the jurisdictions in the subareas where an amendment is proposed to include or exclude territory.*
- 5. Approval of the amendment by a majority of the cities/towns constituting a majority of the incorporated population provided, however, that any amendment of the Victor Valley Expenditure Plan (Schedule E) shall also require a two-thirds vote of the jurisdictions within the Victor Valley subarea.*
- 6. Approval of the amendment by the Board of Supervisors.*
- 7. Approval of the amendment by the Authority.*

The Measure I Expenditure Plan can be referenced at the following link on the SANBAG website: http://www.sanbag.ca.gov/planning2/plan_measure-i.html. See the "Appendices" at the bottom of the Measure I Strategic Plan page. The Transportation Expenditure Plan sets forth requirements for how Measure I revenue is to be allocated by subarea and program and how the revenue is to be expended. Modifications to this allocation and expenditure process are subject to the amendment procedures described above.

Public Outreach and Comments Received

Following the March 5, 2014 authorization to proceed with the public outreach in response to paragraph 1 of Section XIV, staff posted information to the SANBAG website regarding the Expenditure Plan amendment opportunity and e-mailed information to several of SANBAG's mailing lists that included both public agency representatives and non-agency interested parties. Responses were received from four city representatives and one private citizen. The communications received from these individuals are provided in Attachment A.

Of the referenced communications, only the e-mail from the private citizen addressed issues that could potentially require amendment to the Measure I Expenditure Plan. The communications from the cities feature issues that can be addressed through Measure I Strategic Plan policy changes or modifications to the 10-Year Delivery Plan, both of which can occur through Board action without

going through the rigorous Expenditure Plan amendment process. For each communication, the comments are summarized and a response is provided.

- City of Montclair – Council Member Bill Ruh
 - Summary of comment: The Foothill Gold Line between Azusa and Montclair should be funded for construction before the next Measure I review period in 2017-2018. Concern was expressed that insufficient funds were designated for conceptual engineering work (based on a February 2014 SANBAG staff report on rail priorities). Concern was also expressed about the inclusion of \$680 million in future funding need for a potential Gold Line extension to Ontario Airport, as this segment was not included in Measure I Expenditure Plan.
 - Response: The Measure I Expenditure Plan includes the Gold Line extension to Montclair, but did not identify project-level funding commitments. The SANBAG Board set three implementation priorities for rail projects in San Bernardino County on February 5, 2014 to include: Redlands Passenger Rail Project; double tracking portions of the San Bernardino Metrolink Line; and extension of Gold Line to Montclair. While all the projects are important, and included in the Expenditure Plan, funding needed to be prioritized. Near term funding priorities are established through the SANBAG 10-Year Delivery Plan, and \$3 million has been designated in the 2014 10-Year Plan update to support environmental clearance and design for the Gold Line extension to Montclair, to be available if and when Los Angeles County advances the project.
- City of Ontario – Tom Danna
 - Summary of comment: Suggested specific changes to Measure I Strategic Plan Policies 40001, 40005, 40006, and 40007, as referenced in the attachment.
 - Response: These policies may be modified by the SANBAG Board and do not require an amendment to the Measure I Expenditure Plan. In addition, the comment concerning the Holt Boulevard Bus Rapid-Transit can be addressed outside of the Expenditure Plan amendment process. Follow-up discussions with technical and policy committees would be held on these issues if the Board concurs with Recommendation No. 3 above.
- City of Redlands – Melissa Saavedra
 - Summary of comment: The City concurs that it is premature to entertain Expenditure Plan amendments at this time.
 - Response: Comment noted.
- City of Yucaipa – Bill Hemsley (in response to a Measure I Expenditure Plan item on the December 2, 2013 agenda of the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee)

- Summary of comments: 1) SANBAG should not consider use of freeway program dollars to fund congestion relief projects on interchanges or arterials; 2) higher priority should be given to interchanges in less developed areas in order to spur growth; and 3) the Valley interchange phasing study should include discussion of incentives for jurisdictions to endorse phasing rather than full interchange improvements.
- Response: These are policy issues that may be addressed by the SANBAG Board and do not require an amendment to the Measure I Expenditure Plan. Follow-up discussions with technical and policy committees would be held on these issues if the Board concurs with Recommendation No. 3 above.
- Private citizen – Brent Merideth, Highland
 - Summary of comments: The e-mail from Mr. Merideth calls for substantially increased Measure I funding for bicycle facilities in San Bernardino County for mobility, safety, and environmental reasons. Specific bicycle path/trails projects are mentioned, and concern is expressed about missing opportunities because of inadequate bicycle, pedestrian, and transit funding. Residents need viable options for travel other than their cars.
 - Response: Certain improvements for bicycle and pedestrian travel may be funded through each jurisdiction's Local Street Program of Measure I (the "Pass-Through" program). However, Policies 40003 (Valley Local Street Program), 40012 (Victor Valley) and 400016 (Rural Mountain/Desert Subareas) all state that eligible expenses include "Construction of bikeways when they are an integral part of the Public Streets and Highways System." In other words, off-roadway bicycle improvements such as trails (Class I bicycle paths) would not normally be eligible. The wording in the Measure I Expenditure Plan could be interpreted to allow for off-roadway facilities, however, and the Local Street policies could be modified. However, much of the Local Street Program funding goes toward roadway maintenance needs so that substantial funding for bicycle projects may or may not be available, depending on each jurisdiction's needs.

Another potential source for Measure I bicycle and pedestrian funding would be the Valley Major Street Program (MSP) and both the Victor Valley and Rural Mountain/Desert Major/Local Highway Programs (MLHP). The Expenditure Plan wording in the MSP and MLHP does not directly address bicycle and pedestrian projects. However, bicycle and sidewalk improvements can be eligible expenditures when the roadway projects are being constructed. To authorize the construction of stand-alone bicycle and pedestrian improvements, the SANBAG Board would need to interpret certain stand-alone bicycle and pedestrian projects as

“providing congestion relief and safety improvements to major streets” To use an example, the construction of the Pacific-Electric Trail may have had a safety benefit to some of the parallel major roadways by keeping cyclists on their own right-of-way. In addition to this interpretation, any MSP projects for the Valley or MLHP projects for the Victor Valley must have a development share of funding, so that the costs of construction would need to be added to the Development Impact Fee pool for each jurisdiction. Thus, the options open to the Board for stand-alone bicycle and pedestrian funding for these programs would be to:

1. Continue as is, without allowing stand-alone bicycle and pedestrian projects as eligible for Measure I reimbursement
2. Determine that it is in the interest of the jurisdictions to allow stand-alone bicycle and pedestrian improvements to be eligible expenses and interpret the Expenditure Plan liberally, as indicated above.
3. Go through the Measure I Expenditure Plan amendment process to directly allow stand-alone bicycle and pedestrian improvements to be eligible expenses. The amount of effort for Option 3 would likely only be justified if the Expenditure Plan were being amended for some other purpose.

It should be noted that more funding is becoming available for bicycle and pedestrian improvements outside of Measure I. The State’s Active Transportation Program (ATP) has received its first round of applications for the both the statewide and regional competition. Article 3 of the Transportation Development Act has provided an ongoing source of revenue for bicycle and pedestrian projects, though not on a large scale. Issues surrounding the broader eligibility of Measure I funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects will be examined along with the other possible changes to Measure I policy. However, staff recommends that the Board defer any amendments of the Expenditure Plan, including any amendments involving bicycle funding, until the 2017/2018 timeframe.

In the meantime, if directed by the Board, staff would proceed to evaluate the policy change recommendations obtained through the public outreach. The suggested policy changes will require review from both technical and policy committees, and each suggestion has pros and cons that must be carefully considered. Staff would bring back any recommended changes to the appropriate policy committee(s) following internal and local jurisdiction staff discussion and review. It is not the intent of this agenda item to discuss the pros and cons here, but just to identify the issues that need further investigation.

Financial Impact: This item has no financial impact on the SANBAG Fiscal Year 2013/2014 Budget.

Mountain/Desert Policy Committee Agenda Item
June 20, 2014
Page 6

Reviewed By: This item is also scheduled for review by the Board of Directors Metro Valley Study Session on June 12, 2014. The information in this item was reviewed by the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee on June 2, 2014.

Responsible Staff: Steve Smith, Director of Planning



MONTCLAIR

RECEIVED

APR 23 2014

SAN BERNARDINO
ASSOCIATED

April 17, 2014

Mr. Steve Smith
Director of Planning
SANBAG
1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92410-1715

RE: Measure I Expenditure Plan Comments

Dear Mr. Smith:

As a life-time resident of San Bernardino County, 16-year member of the Montclair City Council, and a local businessman, I am writing to request that the Measure I Expenditure Plan be amended as soon as possible to address the likelihood that the Foothill Gold Line between Azusa and Montclair will be funded for construction through Los Angeles County before the next review period in 2017-18. This is a critical issue that must be addressed in the coming months or else we may have to sacrifice the inclusion of San Bernardino County in this next segment of the Gold Line light rail system - possibly resulting in the line terminating well west of San Bernardino County. I believe this would be a tremendous lost opportunity for our county, and leave a Measure I promise and commitment unfulfilled.

The Foothill Gold Line Construction Authority will begin the two-year advanced conceptual engineering work for the 12.3-mile light rail extension later this year. They will be ready to advance to a design-build construction process in 2017 (with a four-year anticipated construction completion schedule). This schedule anticipates the likely scenario that the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) will go back to county voters in November 2016 with either an extension of the Measure R 1/2-cent sales tax or a new tax for transportation improvements. Either way, according to Metro staff reports and recent Metro board member comments, the completion of the Foothill Gold Line to the county line will be included in any future tax. San Bernardino County must be ready.

The current Expenditure Plan anticipates only \$4 million for the Foothill Gold Line to Montclair project, for conceptual engineering work. It does not anticipate the reality of the project moving forward to final design, construction and operations in the next seven years. I urge the board to update the Expenditure Plan to anticipate this reality.

In the February 2014 Rail Priorities staff report, staff provided the attached (Table 1) estimated capital and operations revenue and cost table for the SB Valley Subarea. This table shows the appropriate capital cost for the extension of the Gold Line to the

CITY OF MONTCLAIR

5111 Benito Street, P.O. Box 2308, Montclair, CA 91763 (909) 626-8571 FAX (909) 621-1584

Mayor Paul M. Eaton • Mayor Pro Tem Bill Ruh • Council Members Leonard Paulitz, Carolyn Raft, J. John Dutrey • City Manager Edward C. Starr

MDC1406a1-ss

Mr. Steve Smith
April 17, 2014
Page 2

Montclair Trans Center, as well as showing an anticipated operating cost; however the timeline for those expenditures will likely need to be expedited based on the reality of Los Angeles County's future tax. I am unclear why Table 1 also includes \$680 million in capital and operating costs for the Foothill Gold Line from Montclair to the Ontario Airport, when that project is not in the Measure I program or in SANBAG's current Interim Long Range Transit Plan. Inclusion of the Ontario Airport extension project results in a nearly \$400 million deficit for the Measure I program, which should be eliminated until county voters or SANBAG identify the project for funding. As much as I support the Ontario Airport Extension of the Gold Line, I do not want that future project to compromise the possibility of the Foothill Gold Line getting to Montclair in the near term. SANBAG's financial models should be revised accordingly to better address the true revenue/cost for the Valley's rail priority projects, allowing for the necessary construction and operations dollars for the Montclair Extension.

I therefore strongly request that the SANBAG board amend the Measure I Expenditure Plan to allow for the necessary construction and operations funding for the Foothill Gold Line to Montclair starting in FY2017, contingent on Los Angeles County providing their majority funding for the project. Please do not let the significant benefit that the Gold Line will bring to our residents and workers, local economy, and our environment get away from us by not making this important change.

Truly yours,



Bill Ruh
Councilman
City of Montclair

Attachment

Table 1 - Fiscal Years 2014-2040 Estimated Rail Capital & Operations Revenue and Costs

Eligible Use	Fiscal Year			Total Capital Pending	Total Operations Pending	Total Capital/Operations Pending	Total Combined Funding
	2014-2023	2024-2030	2031-2040				
Estimated Revenue Source							
FIA Formula	\$ 151,062,444	\$ 99,830,477	\$ 129,543,540	\$ 371,236,461	\$ -	\$ 371,236,461	\$ 371,236,461
Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality	\$ 40,865,000	\$ -	\$ 40,000,000	\$ 80,865,000	\$ -	\$ 80,865,000	\$ 80,865,000
State Propositions 1B	\$ 34,500,178	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 34,500,178	\$ -	\$ 34,500,178	\$ 34,500,178
Local Measure J Bond & Digs	\$ 17,321,105	\$ 20,241,574	\$ 56,542,205	\$ 94,104,885	\$ -	\$ 94,104,885	\$ 94,104,885
Local Valley State Transit Assistance Funds	\$ 70,833,364	\$ 47,170,539	\$ 67,355,690	\$ 147,359,593	\$ 38,039,688	\$ 185,399,281	\$ 185,399,281
Local Measure J Valley Metropolitan and Passenger Rail	\$ 95,072,831	\$ 88,439,739	\$ 162,745,268	\$ 346,247,838	\$ -	\$ 346,247,838	\$ 346,247,838
Local Ball Assets	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 6,000,000	\$ -	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 6,000,000
Local Valley Local Transportation Funds	\$ 121,040,816	\$ 109,563,937	\$ 212,981,990	\$ 443,586,743	\$ -	\$ 443,586,743	\$ 443,586,743
Total Estimated Revenue	\$ 522,692,059	\$ 377,716,539	\$ 672,191,944	\$ 1,572,590,544	\$ 481,039,611	\$ 2,053,630,155	\$ 2,053,630,155

Required Costs	Fiscal Year			Capital Needs	Operations Needs	Total Combined Needs	Estimated Difference between Revenue and Costs
	2014-2023	2024-2030	2031-2040				
Railroads Passenger Rail Implementation	\$ 240,400,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 240,400,000	\$ -	\$ 240,400,000	\$ -
Railroads Passenger Rail O&M	\$ 6,753,053	\$ 58,297,364	\$ 90,048,548	\$ -	\$ 156,118,923	\$ 162,871,976	\$ -
Gold Line Extension to Merced/Altamont	\$ 2,100,000	\$ 802,300,000	\$ -	\$ 804,400,000	\$ -	\$ 804,400,000	\$ -
Gold Line Extension to Merced/C&D	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,000,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 20,000,000	\$ -
Gold Line Extension to Ontario/Altamont/C&D	\$ -	\$ 450,000,000	\$ -	\$ 450,000,000	\$ -	\$ 450,000,000	\$ -
Merced/Altamont Double Tracking (1 segment) O&M	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 882,000,000	\$ 230,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 232,000,000	\$ 234,000,000	\$ -
Merced/Altamont Double Tracking (2 segment) O&M	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19,000,000	\$ -	\$ 19,000,000	\$ 19,000,000	\$ -
Merced/Altamont Capital Subsidy	\$ 81,677,342	\$ 56,000,000	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 147,677,342	\$ -	\$ 147,677,342	\$ -
Merced/Altamont Operations Subsidy	\$ 131,169,707	\$ 117,696,530	\$ 216,003,940	\$ -	\$ 464,869,177	\$ 464,869,177	\$ -
Downtown San Bernardino Passenger Rail O&M	\$ 4,291,485	\$ 4,355,254	\$ 7,548,441	\$ -	\$ 16,015,180	\$ 16,015,180	\$ -
Total Estimated Costs	\$ 468,391,487	\$ 1,418,753,697	\$ 672,240,483	\$ 1,549,385,167	\$ 699,533,700	\$ 2,248,918,867	\$ -

- Notes:**
1. Within in each funding source there may be additional funding eligibility requirements. Federal funds, Proposition 1B Bonds and State Transit Assistance Funds are not included. LTR and Measure J are included annually at 3% Rail Assets is held at \$200,000/year. This analysis does not include any bonding.
 2. FIA Formula Funds allocated specifically to the Los Angeles (LA) and San Bernardino (SB) Urbanized Areas (UA). LA UA funds must be in excess of Fontana, SB UA funds must be spent in Fontana and access to the rest.
 3. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funds may be used to fund the first 3 years of new service operation costs. SB/BAO's practice has been to use CMAQ for Capital expenses.
 4. Capital/Operations indicates that both Capital and Operations are eligible uses of this fund source.
 5. During the Consultant COA process there was a commitment to only use Valley Local Transportation Funds for operations (Consultant and Merced/Altamont) after implementation of the Downtown San Bernardino Passenger Rail Project and Transit Center.
 6. Capital Implementation Costs are in current year dollars.
 7. Approximately \$9.6 million has been spent prior to FY2014, the amount here reflects what is remaining to be funded.
 8. Railroads Passenger Rail O&M costs assume O&M starts in FY2023 at an initial cost of \$6.7m/year and a 3% annual escalation rate.
 9. O&M costs for Merced/Altamont Extension, Ontario Airport Extension and Double Tracking assumes 10 years of O&M and are not included.
 10. The estimated cost for Merced/Altamont Capital Subsidy assumes an annual \$8 million contribution held constant through 2040. In addition to the \$8 million for each year, the Capital Subsidy includes the \$5 million for each year repayment.
 11. The estimated cost for Merced/Altamont Operations Subsidy assumes an annual escalation of 3%.
 12. Downtown San Bernardino Passenger Rail O&M costs assume O&M starts in FY2016 at an initial cost of \$900,000 and a 3% annual escalation rate.

Source: Tom Danna

March 24, 2014
 2010-2040 Measure I Year 2015 Expenditure Plan and Strategic Plan
 City of Ontario Amendments to be Considered

Strategic Plan Policy	Description	Existing Policy	Recommended Change
40001, Section IV.I., VS-30	Cost Buy-down for Projects with a Development Share Contribution	Private railroad contributions buy-down the total project cost	Private railroad contributions should buy-down the local development share because they are private funds not traditional transportation funds
40001, Section IV.I., VS-30	Cost Buy-down for Projects with a Development Share Contribution	Not addressed	SCE Rule 20 funds or any other utility funds should buy down the local development share.
40005, Section IV. F., VFI-13	Valley Freeway Interchange Prioritization	Projects needed to facilitate delivery of a mainline freeway project shall receive priority over other interchanges and may be initiated by SANBAG but the local development share shall still apply	Interchanges reconstructed or upgraded as part of the managed lanes projects should not require a local development share because the interchange improvement is needed for the managed lane project.
40005, Section IV. L., VFI-35	Project Administrative Costs	Local jurisdictions pay 100% of the project administrative costs when the local jurisdiction requests SANBAG to be the project lead	The administrative costs should be split in accordance with the Valley Freeway Interchange public-private share splits identified in the Nexus Study regardless of whether SANBAG or the local agency is the lead.
40006, Section V. K., VMS-30	Project Administrative Costs	Local jurisdictions pay 100% of the project administrative costs when the local jurisdiction requests SANBAG to be the project lead	The administrative costs should be split in accordance with the Valley Major Streets public-private share splits identified in the Nexus Study regardless of whether SANBAG or the local agency is the lead.
40007	Valley Metrolink/Passenger Rail Program	Policy limits Gold Line expenditures to Montclair only	Should be changed to include the extension to the LA/Ontario Airport
Additional item related to but not specifically part of the 2015 Expenditure of Strategic Plan update	Valley Express Bus/BRT	-----	Discuss transit priorities especially Omnitrans' Route 61 (Holt Blvd) BRT.

Steven Smith

From: Saavedra, Melissa <msaavedra@cityofredlands.org>
Sent: Friday, April 04, 2014 3:31 PM
To: Steven Smith
Subject: Measure I Expenditure Plan 2015 - City of Redlands review

Hello Mr. Smith,

The City of Redlands Municipal Utilities and Engineering staff reviewed the 2015 Measure I Expenditure Plan. Staff concurs with the recommendation of the SANBAG Board of Directors that concurred with a recommendation of the City/County Manager Technical Advisory Committee (CCMTAC) that it is premature to entertain amendments to the Expenditure Plan at this time.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Melissa Saavedra

Sr. Administrative Technician
City of Redlands
909-798-7527 opt. 6
fax 909-798-7670

Steven Smith

From: Bill Hemsley <BHemsley@Yucaipa.org>
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 12:33 PM
To: Steven Smith
Cc: Ray Casey
Subject: Expenditure Plan Amendments

Hi Steve,

Here are the City of Yucaipa's initial comments on the Expenditure Plan:

1. There should not be an allowance of freeway funding for congestion relief projects on interchanges or arterials. This would impact geographic equity.
2. We should evaluate interchange phasing using economic incentive to the region for building interchanges that will spur growth and not just the amount of current congestion. We should also be taking steps now to avert future congestion in areas that will be developing.
3. There should be some more discussion on what kind of incentives would be provided to those agencies choosing to use phasing at their interchanges.

Steven Smith

From: Brent Merideth <meridethbl@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 8:43 AM
To: Steven Smith
Cc: Marven Norman
Subject: Measure I 2010-2040 Ordinance and Expenditure Plan comments

Mr. Smith,

Please dedicate a substantially greater percentage of Measure I funding towards bicycle facilities within the East and West valley areas of San Bernardino County. Bike facilities (often used by pedestrians as well) cost less and employ more people to build, require far less maintenance, improve health, reduce traffic, and reduce GHGs. Yet, even though cyclists have been contributing to Measure I sales tax revenue since its inception, barely any funding is dedicated to these highly beneficial projects. Please help cyclists separate their commute from dangerous vehicular traffic. It has been proven from coast to coast that regions that add more integrated cycling infrastructure have shown an increase in cycling as a mode share. We already have enough automotive-centric roads that we can get nearly anywhere with a car. We cannot say the same with cycling/walking.

Many argue that we shouldn't dedicate funding for facilities dedicated to a mode of transportation that currently records such a low mode share within the region. However, as a father and bicycle commuter who lives in Highland and works in the Tri-Cities area I cannot stress enough how important non-motorized facilities could be to the San Bernardino Valley. The Inland Empire is well within the top ten most dangerous metropolitan areas to walk or ride a bicycle, yet San Bernardino County's current cycling infrastructure is minimal, scattered, and disjointed. If the freeways were modeled even remotely like the current bicycle network they would probably be very lightly utilized. Furthermore, according to HealtySanBernardinoCounty.org the citizens of SBC are in critically poor shape, and in my experience even non-bicycle riders often use bike trails to improve their health. Despite these terrible conditions, I still see other cyclists on my commute every day, yet SANBAG distributes a negligible fraction of Measure I funding to bike facilities. In fact the pot of money from which bicycle funding is derived is mostly spent on signal synchronization, which inherently allows cars to drive faster through intersections thereby putting more cyclists and pedestrians at risk.

Meanwhile, the single act of commuting by bicycle reduces damage to infrastructure, reduces traffic, reduces Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and gives people options for travel. The county of San Bernardino and each of its cities have so much to gain from the development of bike infrastructure, and the benefits begin as soon as construction starts. Studies have confirmed that the installation of bicycle infrastructure employs more people per mile than the installation of automotive infrastructure. Bicycle infrastructure keeps money earned locally in local communities. It provides people who are unable or cannot afford to drive a safe option to do the things they need or want to do. Cities with well-designed bicycle infrastructure tend to be much healthier with lower automobile-related casualty rates than cities or regions with less cycling infrastructure. Children who bike to school perform better. And, developments near commuting trails have been shown nationally to increase home prices by as much as 10%, which is something San Bernardino needs to do to attract a more educated population.

As you know, most road projects within the county do not rely on gas taxes and vehicle registration fees alone. In fact, they barely cover half the cost. Simultaneously, most people who ride bicycles in SBC own and drive vehicles too. They pay Measure I sales taxes, income taxes, and property taxes, and are thus subsidizing each of the 28 current SANBAG and 20 San Bernardino County road projects, which include zero dedicated bicycle infrastructure projects. Bicycle riders deserve to have the ability to make themselves and their environment healthier. Nearly 0% of Measure I funding is mandated to be spent on bicycle facilities, yet cyclists and pedestrians account for a much greater percentage of commuters and fatalities. They deserve to be active without having to dodge cars and trucks on every journey.

I think there are some important multi-agency opportunities being missed within the Inland Empire that encompass multiple cities, important destinations, and large under served populations (i.e. minimal bike facilities, no train and limited bus routes), and deserve recognition in the near term as candidates for the aggressive pursuit of funding via multiple sources, especially from SANBAG Measure I funding. These should include (hopefully not exclusively) 1) Connecting the PE and San Timoteo trails to the SART, 2) Developing the San Bernardino Greenbelt/City Creek/Sand Creek and Midcity Connector trail, and 3) Cajon Lytle Creek trail at a minimum. Each of these contributes to the backbone network that will finally give San Bernardino County residents a viable option other than the car.

Thank you for your consideration. Thank you for reconsidering and re-analyzing how Measure I funding is disbursed. Thank you for allowing the public the opportunity to be heard in this process. Please significantly increase the share of Measure I funding towards dedicated bicycle facilities.

**Brent Merideth
Highland**



- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission
- San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
- San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency
- Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 9

Date: June 20, 2014

Subject: High Desert Corridor

Recommendation: Receive an update on the status of project development for the High Desert Corridor.

Background: Updates on the High Desert Corridor (HDC) were last provided to the Mountain/Desert Committee on March 15, June 21 and October 18, 2013. The purpose of the March update was to replace the earmark funds originally programmed on the High Desert Corridor, but were programmed and reallocated to Victorville's Green Tree Boulevard Extension Project, which is part of the Yucca Loma Corridor. The SANBAG Board subsequently re-allocated \$3,947,535 in Measure I Major Local Highways Program (MLHP) originally designated for Green Tree Boulevard to the HDC project development effort. The June and October reports provided a general update on the HDC project development effort.

This agenda item highlights recent HDC activities and progress for the period between October 2013 and May 2014. Project development is being managed by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), with work being performed under a contract with Caltrans. An update on the HDC was provided in May to the Metro Board by their staff.

The environmental clearance of the 63-mile HDC between State Route (SR) 14 in Los Angeles County and SR-18/Bear Valley Road in San Bernardino County is

*

Approved
 Mountain/Desert Policy Committee

Date: _____

Moved: *Second:*

In Favor: *Opposed:* *Abstained:*

Witnessed: _____

COG		CTC	X	CTA	X	SAFE		CMA	
-----	--	-----	---	-----	---	------	--	-----	--

Check all that apply.
 MDC1406a-tb

<http://portal.sanbag.ca.gov/mgmt/committee/desert/mdc2014/mdc1406/AgendaItems/MDC1406aI-tb.pdf>

included in Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). A conceptual diagram of the Corridor is provided in Attachment 1. The Project is also part of Metro's Measure R Accelerated Highway Program, from which funding is provided to the Project. The scope of the Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA & ED) work contained in the funding agreement between Metro and Caltrans includes a project report, alternative analyses, technical assessments, modeling, conceptual and preliminary engineering, and a Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR).

Thirteen partner agencies meet on a periodic basis for the development of the PA & ED. These partner agencies include Metro, Caltrans Districts 7 and 8, HDC Joint Powers Authority (JPA), SANBAG, SCAG, Cities of Lancaster, Palmdale, Adelanto, Victorville, Town of Apple Valley, and the Counties of Los Angeles and San Bernardino. Supervisor Robert Lovingood, Victorville Mayor Pro Tem Ryan McEachron, Adelanto Mayor Cari Thomas and Apple Valley Council Member Scott Nassif sit on the JPA Board for San Bernardino County.

Currently, the project has \$30 million in Measure R funds from Metro and \$15.5 million in grand-fathered Regional Improvement Program (RIP) funds from Caltrans District 7. The City of Victorville and the High Desert Corridor JPA were granted \$16.4 million in Federal Demonstration funds for the environmental clearance work. This includes the \$3.9 million in funds that has been provided from the San Bernardino County side from the Measure I Major Local Highway Program (MLHP) to offset the reallocation of a Federal earmark for the HDC to Victorville's Green Tree Boulevard Extension Project.

The following items identify the recent activities and progress on the PA & ED for the Project:

- The HDC Rail Alternative Analysis was completed in April 2014. An electronic copy of the final report is available on the Project's website: <http://www.metro.net/projects/high-desert-corridor/hdc-high-speed-rail-alternatives-analysis-report>
- Continued coordination with the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) for the design and environmental development of a wye connection in the City of Palmdale.
- Completion of the Draft Technical Studies and Chapters that will be included in the Draft Environmental Document.
- Circulation of Draft Technical Studies to the internal project team for review and comment.

- The team has provided HDC presentations and/or HDC informational booths at several regional conferences and public events, including the Los Angeles County Air Show, the High Desert Opportunity Conference and continue to present updates to the HDC JPA and the Project Partners.

Upcoming Outreach activities:

- Individual City/Town/County Technical Staff Briefings, April - May 2014. The purpose of these meetings is for the project team to discuss the HDC proposed alternatives in detail with staff from each jurisdiction within the HDC Study Area. The Project Team has encouraged the City and Town Managers and interested Executives to attend these meetings to review highlights from the technical studies and view maps of the proposed alignments.
- City and Town Council Presentations, May – June 2014. The purpose of these presentations is to provide the councils an opportunity to receive a project overview, receive a status update on the environmental process, learn about upcoming public meetings, including the formal hearings on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR).
- HDC Variation Workshops, July 2014. These workshops will provide an opportunity for the local community to review the four alignment Variations currently under study and provide input.
- Two Elected Officials Briefings, July – August 2014. One elected official briefing will be held in Los Angeles County and the other in San Bernardino County.
- Draft EIS/EIR Release and Public Hearing period, August – September 2014. Metro and Caltrans will release the Draft EIS/EIR in August 2014 and proceed with the Public Hearing period in September 2014. Caltrans has provided for a 60 day formal review and public comment period. Metro will also host four public hearings, two of which will include a webcast component (one in each county) in order to provide stakeholders the opportunity to participate either remotely or in-person.
- Updated HDC schedule below:
 - Rail Alternative Analysis – Completed April 2014
 - Review of Technical Studies – Ongoing, Spring 2014
 - Circulate Draft Environmental Document – Summer 2014
 - Public Hearings – Fall 2014

- Final Environmental Document – Spring 2015
- Record of Decision/Notice of Determination: Winter 2015

NEXT STEPS

Metro and Caltrans staff will continue working on the environmental clearance for the Project while providing supplemental outreach and community engagement opportunities that are above and beyond the legally required outreach under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)/National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). As work progresses on the Project, staff will provide updates to the Board periodically.

Financial Impact: This item has no impact to the SANBAG Fiscal Year 2013/2014 Budget.

Reviewed By: This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee.

Responsible Staff: Tim Byrne, Chief of Planning

High Desert Corridor





- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission
- San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
- San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency
- Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 10

Date: June 20, 2014

Subject: Review Financial Audits for Transit Operators

Recommendation:* That the Committee recommend the Board review and receive Operator financial reports for Fiscal Year 2012/2013 for the City of Barstow (Barstow Area Transit).

Background: Public Utility Code 99245.2, Single Audit Act, and the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) require an annual audit be conducted of SANBAG and its affiliated organizations: Barstow Area Transit (BAT), Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority (MARTA), Morongo Basin Transit Authority (MBTA), Needles Area Transit (NAT), Omnitrans, Valley Transportation Services (Vtrans), and Victor Valley Transit Authority (VVTA).

This item presents the results of audits performed on BAT. The audit of the financial statements for Fiscal Year 2012/2013 was completed by Vavrinek Trine and Day Co., LLC.

The financial statements for the transit operators include an Independent Auditors' Report included as attachment A for BAT. Each report includes an unmodified opinion, meaning no material misstatements or omissions.

The full financial package report for each operator is included as supplemental material with the board packet. It includes a combination of the following reports:

Approved
 Mountain/Desert Policy Committee

Date: _____

Moved: *Second:*

In Favor: *Opposed:* *Abstained:*

Witnessed: _____

COG	CTC	X	CTA	X	SAFE	CMA
-----	-----	---	-----	---	------	-----

Check all that apply.

1. Audit of Operators Basic Financial Statements and Annual Financial Report.
2. GAGAS (Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards) Report.

The table below represents the financial reports applicable to each transit operator.

Report/Letter	BAT (TDA Fund Only)
Basic Financial Report	X
GAGAS Report	X

The following is a summary of the audit reports along with any findings or recommendations for each transit agency.

BAT:

- **Basic Financial Report (TDA funds only): Unmodified Opinion**
- **SAS 114 Letter:** The City did not meet the required fare ratio.

Effective Audit Fiscal Year 2011/2012, SANBAG procured Vavrinek Trine and Day Co., LLC as the new auditor for the transit operators. The previous auditor Miers & Miers provided audit services since 1992 (excluding Omnitrans). This change created challenges for the operators during the first year of audits because of the new process. However, Fiscal Year 2012/2013 audits constituted the second year for Vavrinek Trine and Day Co., LLC.

A 90 day extension was required for BAT, NAT, and Omnitrans. Needles Area Transit is still in the process of completing their financial reports and should be completed by the end of June 2014. Once the reports are completed, SANBAG staff will present and report them to SANBAG Board.

Financial Impact: This item has no financial impact to the SANBAG Fiscal Year 2013/2014 budget.

Reviewed By: Each Operator has taken their financial reports to their respective board. This item is scheduled for review by the Commuter Rail and Transit Policy Committee on June 12, 2014. SANBAG's Finance department has reviewed and approved this item.

Responsible Staff: Monica Morales, Transit Analyst
Hilda Flores, Chief of Accounting and Procurement

CITY OF BARSTOW, CALIFORNIA
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS
Financial Statements
Year Ended June 30, 2013

Attachment A Barstow Area Transit
CITY OF BARSTOW, CALIFORNIA

TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS

Financial Statements

Year Ended June 30, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT	1	
FINANCIAL STATEMENTS		
Statement of Net Position	3	
Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position	4	
Statement of Cash Flows	5	
Notes to Financial Statements.....	6	
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION		
Schedule of Allocations Received and Expended, by Project Year.....	13	
INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS BASED ON AN AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH <i>GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS</i>.....		14
Schedule of Finding and Response	16	
Schedule of Prior Year Audit Findings.....	17	



INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT

To the Board of Directors
San Bernardino Associated Governments
San Bernardino, California

Report on the Financial Statements

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 Fund (TDA Fund) of the City of Barstow, California (City), as of and for the year ended June 30, 2013, and the related notes to the financial statements as listed in the table of contents.

Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America; this includes the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditors' Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditor's judgment, including the assessment of the risk of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the entity's preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity's internal control. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinion.

Opinion

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to previously present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the TDA Fund of the City as of June 30, 2013, and the respective changes in financial position and its cash flows thereof for the year then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

Attachment A Barstow Area Transit

Emphasis of Matter

As discussed in Note 1, the financial statements present only the TDA Fund of the City and do not purport to, and do not, present fairly the financial position of the City as of June 30, 2013, and the changes in financial position and cash flows thereof for the year then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. Our opinion is not modified with respect to this matter.

As described in Note 2 to the financial statements, the TDA Funds of the City adopted Statement No. 63, *Financial Reporting of Deferred Outflows of Resources, Deferred Inflows of Resources, and Net Position*, effective July 1, 2012. Our opinion is not modified with respect to this matter.

Other Matters

Required Supplementary Information

Management has omitted the *Management's Discussion and Analysis* for the TDA Fund that accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America requires to be presented to supplement the basic financial statements. Such missing information, although not a part of the basic financial statements, is required by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board, who considers it to be an essential part of financial reporting and for placing the basic financial statements in an appropriate operational, economic, or historical context. Our opinion on the basic financial statements is not affected by this missing information.

Other Information

Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming opinions on the financial statements that collectively comprise the City's TDA Fund. The schedule of allocations received and expended by project year are presented for purposes of additional analysis and are not a required part of the basic financial statements.

The schedule of allocations received and expended by project year is the responsibility of management and was derived from and relates directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements and certain additional procedures, including comparing and reconciling such information directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements or to the basic financial statements themselves, and other additional procedures in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United State of America. In our opinion the schedule of allocations received and expended by project year is fairly stated, in all material respects, in relation to the basic financial statements as a whole.

Other Reporting Required by Government Auditing Standards

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we have also issued a report dated March 4, 2014, on our consideration of the City's internal control over financial reporting for the TDA Fund, and our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, grant agreements, and other matters. The purpose of that report is to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* and should be considered in assessing the results of our audit.

Varrault, Tami, Day, Co., LLP

Rancho Cucamonga, California
March 4, 2014

This list provides information on acronyms commonly used by transportation planning professionals. This information is provided in an effort to assist SANBAG Board Members and partners as they participate in deliberations at SANBAG Board meetings. While a complete list of all acronyms which may arise at any given time is not possible, this list attempts to provide the most commonly-used terms. SANBAG staff makes every effort to minimize use of acronyms to ensure good communication and understanding of complex transportation processes.

AB	Assembly Bill
ACE	Alameda Corridor East
ACT	Association for Commuter Transportation
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
ADT	Average Daily Traffic
APTA	American Public Transportation Association
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
ARRA	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act
ATMIS	Advanced Transportation Management Information Systems
BAT	Barstow Area Transit
CALACT	California Association for Coordination Transportation
CALCOG	California Association of Councils of Governments
CALSAFE	California Committee for Service Authorities for Freeway Emergencies
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality
CMIA	Corridor Mobility Improvement Account
CMP	Congestion Management Program
CNG	Compressed Natural Gas
COG	Council of Governments
CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
CSAC	California State Association of Counties
CTA	California Transit Association
CTC	California Transportation Commission
CTC	County Transportation Commission
CTP	Comprehensive Transportation Plan
DBE	Disadvantaged Business Enterprise
DEMO	Federal Demonstration Funds
DOT	Department of Transportation
EA	Environmental Assessment
E&D	Elderly and Disabled
E&H	Elderly and Handicapped
EIR	Environmental Impact Report (California)
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement (Federal)
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FSP	Freeway Service Patrol
FRA	Federal Railroad Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
FTIP	Federal Transportation Improvement Program
GFOA	Government Finance Officers Association
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
HOV	High-Occupancy Vehicle
ICTC	Interstate Clean Transportation Corridor
IEEP	Inland Empire Economic Partnership
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991
IIP/ITIP	Interregional Transportation Improvement Program
ITS	Intelligent Transportation Systems
IVDA	Inland Valley Development Agency
JARC	Job Access Reverse Commute
LACMTA	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
LNG	Liquefied Natural Gas
LTF	Local Transportation Funds

MAGLEV	Magnetic Levitation
MARTA	Mountain Area Regional Transportation Authority
MBTA	Morongo Basin Transit Authority
MDAB	Mojave Desert Air Basin
MDAQMD	Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MSRC	Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee
NAT	Needles Area Transit
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
OA	Obligation Authority
OCTA	Orange County Transportation Authority
PA&ED	Project Approval and Environmental Document
PASTACC	Public and Specialized Transportation Advisory and Coordinating Council
PDT	Project Development Team
PNRS	Projects of National and Regional Significance
PPM	Planning, Programming and Monitoring Funds
PSE	Plans, Specifications and Estimates
PSR	Project Study Report
PTA	Public Transportation Account
PTC	Positive Train Control
PTMISEA	Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement and Service Enhancement Account
RCTC	Riverside County Transportation Commission
RDA	Redevelopment Agency
RFP	Request for Proposal
RIP	Regional Improvement Program
RSTIS	Regionally Significant Transportation Investment Study
RTIP	Regional Transportation Improvement Program
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RTPA	Regional Transportation Planning Agencies
SB	Senate Bill
SAFE	Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies
SAFETEA-LU	Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users
SCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCRRA	Southern California Regional Rail Authority
SHA	State Highway Account
SHOPP	State Highway Operations and Protection Program
SOV	Single-Occupant Vehicle
S RTP	Short Range Transit Plan
STAF	State Transit Assistance Funds
STIP	State Transportation Improvement Program
STP	Surface Transportation Program
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
TCIF	Trade Corridor Improvement Fund
TCM	Transportation Control Measure
TCRP	Traffic Congestion Relief Program
TDA	Transportation Development Act
TEA	Transportation Enhancement Activities
TEA-21	Transportation Equity Act for the 21 st Century
TMC	Transportation Management Center
T MEE	Traffic Management and Environmental Enhancement
TSM	Transportation Systems Management
TSSDRA	Transit System Safety, Security and Disaster Response Account
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
VCTC	Ventura County Transportation Commission
VVTA	Victor Valley Transit Authority
WRCOG	Western Riverside Council of Governments

San Bernardino Associated Governments



MISSION STATEMENT

To enhance the quality of life for all residents, San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) will:

- Improve cooperative regional planning
- Develop an accessible, efficient, multi-modal transportation system
- Strengthen economic development efforts
- Exert leadership in creative problem solving

To successfully accomplish this mission, SANBAG will foster enhanced relationships among all of its stakeholders while adding to the value of local governments.

Approved June 2, 1993
Reaffirmed March 6, 1996