



**San Bernardino Associated Governments**

1170 W. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, San Bernardino, CA 92410  
Phone: (909) 884-8276 Fax: (909) 885-4407  
Web: [www.sanbag.ca.gov](http://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**  
**Transit Committee Meeting**

**June 9, 2016**

**9:00 AM**

**Location**

**SANBAG**

*First Floor Lobby*

1170 W. 3rd Street, San Bernardino, CA 92410

***Transit Committee Membership***

**Chair**

Supervisor James RAMOS (SCRRRA Alternate)  
County of San Bernardino

Mayor L. Dennis Michael  
City of Rancho Cucamonga

**Vice Chair**

Mayor Pro Tem Bill Jahn (Mtn/Desert Board Member)  
City of Big Bear Lake

Mayor Pro Tem Jon Harrison  
City of Redlands

Supervisor Robert Lovingood (Mtn/Desert Board Member)  
County of San Bernardino

Mayor Deborah Robertson  
City of Rialto

Mayor Larry McCallon (SCRRRA Primary)  
City of Highland

Mayor Ray Musser  
City of Upland

Mayor Paul Eaton (SCRRRA Primary)  
City of Montclair

Council Member Richard Riddell  
City of Yucaipa

Council Member Alan Wapner (SCRRRA Alternate)  
City of Ontario

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

**AGENDA**

**Transit Committee Meeting**

**June 9, 2016  
9:00 AM**

**Location**

**SANBAG Office**

**First Floor Lobby**

**1170 W. 3rd Street, San Bernardino, CA 92410**

To obtain additional information on any items, please contact the staff person listed under each item. You are encouraged to obtain any clarifying information prior to the meeting to allow the Board to move expeditiously in its deliberations. Additional *“Meeting Procedures”* and agenda explanations are attached to the end of this agenda.

**CALL TO ORDER**

(Meeting Chaired by James Ramos)

- i. Pledge of Allegiance
- ii. Attendance
- iii. Announcements
- iv. Agenda Notices/Modifications – Marleana Roman

**Possible Conflict of Interest Issues**

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.

**1. Information Relative to Possible Conflict of Interest**

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

**This item is prepared monthly for review by SANBAG Board and Committee members.**

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

Items listed on the Consent Calendar are expected to be routine and non-controversial. The Consent Calendar will be acted upon as a single motion. Items on the Consent Calendar may be removed for discussion by Board Members.

## **Consent - Transit**

### **2. Construction Contract Change Orders to on-going SANBAG Construction Contract with Shimmick Construction Company, Inc.**

Receive and File Change Orders.

**Presenter: Carrie Schindler**

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

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **Discussion - Transit**

#### **3. Election of Committee Chair and Vice Chair**

Conduct elections for members to serve as Chair and Vice Chair of the SANBAG Commuter Rail and Transit Committee for terms to end June 30, 2017.

**Presenter: Carrie Schindler**

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

#### **4. Revised Southern California Regional Rail Authority Budget Allocations for Fiscal Years 2015/2016 & 2016/2017**

That the Transit Committee recommend the Board, acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission:

A. Approve an increase in the Southern California Regional Rail Authority Fiscal Year 2016/2017 operating assistance allocation of \$55,000, for a new total of \$14,840,000, to be funded with Valley Local Transportation Fund;

B. Approve an increase in the Southern California Regional Rail Authority Fiscal Year 2016/2017 capital assistance allocation of \$200, from \$187,000 to \$187,200, to be funded with State Transit Assistance Fund – Operator Allocation.

C. Approve rescission of \$309,120 of Proposition 1B California Transit Security Grant Program funds allocated to Southern California Regional Rail Authority as part of the Fiscal Year 2015/2016 SANBAG subsidy.

D. Authorize a budget amendment to the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 adopted budget in the amount of \$55,000 to Task 0314 Transit Operations, Subtask 0377 Metrolink Operating & Maintenance Subsidy, funded with Local Transportation Funds for a new task total of \$16,627,275.

E. Authorize a budget amendment to the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 adopted budget in the amount of \$200 to Task 0315 Transit Capital, Subtask 0379 Metrolink Capital Subsidy, funded with State Transit Assistance Funds for a new task total of \$82,104,651.

**Presenter: Monica Morales**

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

**5. Award Lilac to Rancho Double Track Preliminary Design and Environmental Clearance Contract**

That the Transit Committee recommend the Board, acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission:

A. Allocate \$719,381 of Valley State Transit Assistance Funds – Operator Share for the Lilac to Rancho Double Track Project, reducing the previously allocated Proposition 1B Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Funds from \$2,000,000 to \$1,548,487, and funding a cost increase of \$267,868.

B. Approve Contract No. 16-1001411 with Moffatt & Nichol for an eighteen month term in an amount not-to-exceed \$1,695,000 for the Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Clearance of the Lilac to Rancho Double Track Project.

C. Approve contingency of an amount not-to-exceed \$200,000 for Contract No. 16-1001411 and authorize the Executive Director or his designee to release contingency as necessary for the project.

D. Authorize a budget amendment to the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 adopted budget in the amount of \$481,714 to Task 0315 Transit Capital, Subtask 0328 Lilac to Rancho Double Track, funded with State Transit Assistance (STA) Funds – Operator Share for a new task total of \$82,586,365.

E. Authorize a budget amendment reducing the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 adopted budget in the amount \$79,568 to Task 0315 Transit Capital, Subtask 0328 Lilac to Rancho Double Track, funded with Proposition 1B Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement for a new task total of \$82,506,797.

**Presenter: Justin Fornelli**

**This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee. This item was reviewed and approved by SANBAG General Counsel and Procurement Manager.**

**6. Redlands Passenger Rail Project - Procurement of Diesel Multiple Unit Rail Vehicles**

That the Transit Committee recommend the Board, acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission, approve the release of Request for Proposals No. 16-1001531 for the procurement of Redlands Passenger Rail Project Diesel Multiple Unit rail vehicles.

**Presenter: Justin Fornelli**

**This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee. SANBAG General Counsel and Procurement Manager will review and approve the RFP prior to release.**

**7. Redlands Passenger Rail Project - Design of Downtown Redlands Station Betterments**

That Transit Committee recommend the Board, acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission:

A. Authorize the Executive Director or his designee to negotiate the final form of and execute Amendment 1 to Memorandum of Understanding, Contract No. 15-1001047 with the City of Redlands, for the design of betterments to the Redlands Passenger Rail Project Downtown Redlands Station, for a not-to-exceed amount still being negotiated, but currently estimated at \$150,000, subject to approval as to form by SANBAG legal counsel.

B. Authorize the Executive Director or his designee to negotiate the final form of and execute Amendment 2 to Contract No. 15-1001093 with HDR Engineering, Inc., contingent upon and commensurate with the final amendment amount of Recommendation A above, for additional design services for betterments to the Redlands Passenger Rail Project Downtown Redlands Station.

C. Approve a budget amendment to the SANBAG Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Budget to increase Task No. 0314, Sub Task 0324 Redlands Passenger Rail Project in the estimated amount of \$150,000 in accordance with the final negotiated value of Amendment 1 to Contract No. 15-1001047 in reimbursable Redlands Passenger Rail Project funds from the City of Redlands for a new Task Total of \$82,656,797.

**Presenter: Justin Fornelli**

**This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee. SANBAG General Counsel and Procurement Manager have reviewed this item.**

**8. San Bernardino Transit Center Emergency Generator and Landscape Modifications Project**

That the Transit Committee recommend the Board acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission:

A. Approve the Plans, Specifications, and Estimate package for construction of the San Bernardino Transit Center Emergency Generator and Landscape Modifications Project.

B. Authorize advertising the Invitation for Bid No. 16-1001520, subject to approval by SANBAG General Counsel as to form, for the construction bids for the San Bernardino Transit Center Emergency Generator and Landscape Modification Project.

C. Authorize staff to proceed directly to Board without prior Transit Committee review for award of Construction Contract No. 16-1001520 for the San Bernardino Transit Center Emergency Generator and Landscape Modification Project.

**Presenter: Carrie Schindler**

**This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee. SANBAG General Counsel and Procurement Manager have reviewed this item.**

**9. Agreement with City of Rancho Cucamonga and Creative Housing Associates for Exclusive Negotiations Pertaining to a Transit-Oriented Development at the Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station**

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

A. Approve draft Contract No. 16-1001524, an exclusive negotiating agreement, with the City of Rancho Cucamonga and Creative Housing Associates, to establish the terms and conditions of a financeable development ground lease at the Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station.

B. Authorize the Executive Director or his designee to make changes to the terms of the agreement prior to execution by the Board President as approved by General Counsel.

**Presenter: Carrie Schindler**

**This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee. SANBAG General Counsel has reviewed this item and the draft contract.**

**Discussion - Transportation Programming and Fund Administration**

**10. Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account Program Fund Allocation for the City of Needles**

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

A. Approve a swap of \$169,014 Valley State Transit Assistance funds for \$169,014 Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) funds with the City of Needles for the purchase of replacement vehicles.

B. Approve an amendment to the PTMISEA Expenditure Plan for San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) as shown in Attachment A, increasing the overall allocation to SANBAG by \$169,014 for the Redlands Passenger Rail Project.

C. Approve an amendment to the PTMISEA Expenditure Plan for the City of Needles as shown in Attachment B, decreasing the overall allocation to the City of Needles by \$169,014.

**Presenter: Vanessa Jezik**

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

**11. Allocation of Transportation Development Act Funds for Fiscal Year 2016/2017**

That the Transit Committee recommend the Board, acting as the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission, adopt Resolution No. 17-001 authorizing the allocation of Local Transportation Funds and State Transit Assistance Funds for Fiscal Year 2016/2017.

**Presenter: Nancy Strickert**

**This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee. SANBAG General Counsel has reviewed this item and the Resolution.**

## **12. Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Transit Operator Allocations**

That the Transit Committee recommend the Board, acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission and San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, approve Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Transit Operator Funding Allocations, as indicated in Attachment 1, to the City of Needles, Morongo Basin Transit Authority, Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority, Omnitrans, and Victor Valley Transit Authority.

**Presenter: Nancy Strickert**

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

## **Discussion - Administrative Matters**

### **13. Policy Amendment for Senior and Disabled Allocations**

That the Transit Committee recommend the Board, acting as the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, amend Policies 40009, 40014, and 40018 concerning the Measure I Senior and Disabled Transit Programs to change the disbursement schedule from monthly to quarterly and include a section on Accounting Requirements.

**Presenter: Hilda Flores**

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

## **Comments from Board Members**

Brief comments from Board Members

## **Public Comment**

Brief comments from the General Public

## **ADJOURNMENT**

## **Additional Information**

Attendance  
SANBAG Entities  
Acronym List  
Mission Statement

**The next Transit Committee Meeting will be August 11, 2016.**

## 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. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, San Bernardino, CA.

**Agendas** – All agendas are posted at 1170 W. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, 1st 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. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, San Bernardino and our website: [www.sanbag.ca.gov](http://www.sanbag.ca.gov).

**Agenda Actions** – Items listed on both the “Consent Calendar” and “Discussion” contain recommended 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 or unanimous vote of members present as provided in the Ralph M. Brown Act Government Code Sec. 54954.2(b).

**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. Members of the public requesting information be distributed to the Board of Directors must provide 40 copies of such information in advance of the meeting, except for noticed public hearings. Information provided as public testimony is not read into the record by the Clerk.

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 applies.

**Disruptive or Prohibited 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 or prohibited conduct includes without limitation 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, bringing into the meeting any type of object that could be used as a weapon, including without limitation sticks affixed to signs, or otherwise preventing the Board from conducting its meeting in an orderly manner. 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 or she would like to amend his or her 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 voted upon first, and if it fails, then the original motion is considered.
- 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 SANBAG Board of Directors January 2008  
Revised March 2014  
Revised May 4, 2016*

- 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 9, 2016

**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 SANBAG 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, except for the initial award of a competitively bid public works contract. This agenda contains recommendations for action relative to the following contractors:

Item No.	Contract No.	Principals & Agents	Subcontractors
2	C14001	Shimmick Construction Company Inc. <i>Paul Camaur</i>	Allied Steel Co., Inc. Marina Landscape, Inc. Innovative Concrete & Engineering Giroux Glass Winegardner Masonry Excelsior Elevator Fencecorp Inc. Ellis Excavating Gerdau Eberhard EMC Rutherford Co., Inc. M.B. Herzog Electric Hardy & Harper, Inc.
5	16-1001411	Moffatt & Nichol <i>Pierce Homer</i>	CH2MHILL STV Xorail JMDiaz, Inc. The Greenway Group Hout Construction Wagner Engineering & Survey, Inc. Psomas
7	15-1001093	HDR Engineering, Inc. <i>Robert Klovsky</i>	Acumen Building Enterprise, Inc. Atwell Consulting Group

Entity: CMA, COG, CTA, CTC, SAFE

## Transit Committee Agenda Item

June 9, 2016

Page 2

			ICF International Lance Schulte L.D. King, Inc. PAC Engineering LLC Pacific Railway Enterprises, Inc. Project Design Consultants Stack Traffic Consulting, Inc. Orange Coast Analytical, Inc. 2R Drilling, Inc. Cascade Drilling, L.P. Anderson Environmental
9	16-1001524	Creative Housing Associates Lambert Development Gluckstein Family Investments/Apex Realty Inc.	None

**Financial Impact:**

This item has no direct impact on the SANBAG budget.

**Reviewed By:**

This item is prepared monthly for review by SANBAG Board and Committee members.

**Responsible Staff:**

Carrie Schindler, Director of Transit and Rail

Approved  
Transit Committee  
Date: June 9, 2016

Witnessed By:

- 
- 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: 2

**Date:** June 9, 2016

**Subject:**

Construction Contract Change Orders to on-going SANBAG Construction Contract with Shimmick Construction Company, Inc.

**Recommendation:**

Receive and File Change Orders.

**Background:**

Contract Number C14001 with Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. for construction of the Downtown San Bernardino Passenger Rail Project had one Construction Change Order approved since the last report to the Transit Committee. CCO No. 13 (\$58,000.00 increase for modifications to the San Bernardino Transit Center Platform C south wall).

**Financial Impact:**

This item is consistent with the SANBAG Fiscal Year 2015/2016 Budget.

**Reviewed By:**

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

**Responsible Staff:**

Carrie Schindler, Director of Transit and Rail

---

Approved  
Transit Committee  
Date: June 9, 2016

Witnessed By:

Entity: CTC

## Rail and Transit Construction Contracts

<b>Downtown San Bernardino Passenger Rail Project (C14001)</b>		
<b>Executed Change Orders</b>		
Number	Description	Amount
1	Replace Signals Mast at Depot for Tracks P5 and P6, (CN 5-\$60,761), Remove and Dispose of Debris (CN 6-\$27,000).	\$87,761.00
2	Build Temporary Mini-High (CN 4.1-\$81,320), Removal of Property Owner Debris (CN 6.1-\$52,000). Install Temp Fence adjacent to San Bernardino Transit Center (CN 12-\$5,000).	\$138,320.00
3	Reconstruct CMU block wall trash enclosure at the San Manuel stadium (CN 010-\$34,950), Additional tree removal along railroad right-of-way (CN 16-\$18,000); Relocate equipment and materials at the San Bernardino Transit Center parking lot (CN 17-\$40,000); Construction of temporary platform at Santa Fe Depot (CN 18-\$40,000).	\$132,950.00
4	Additional electrical work for power pedestal, rail lubricator and signal house (CN 2-\$45,179.50). Additional miscellaneous electrical work (CN 14-\$26,476.62).	\$71,656.12
5	Adjustments to the various allowance bid items (CN 26-\$208,142.57).	\$208,142.57
6	Modify various storm drain structures (CN 8-\$89,381). Installation additional parking lot light poles at the Southern California Gas Company parking lot (CN 14.01-\$3,229.87). Increase gauge rubber on crossing panels (CN 21-\$4,102.13)	\$96,713.00
7	Installation of infrastructure for electric vehicle charging stations (CN 7.2-\$24,000). Installation of water line bypass at G St (CN 28-\$84,000).	\$108,000.00
8	Adjustments to the various allowance bid items (CN 26-\$208,142.57).	\$207,000.00
9	Adjustments to allowance bid item 006-Railroad Flagging (CN 35-\$121,000.00).	\$121,000.00
10	Adjustments to allowance bid item 002-Unforeseen Utilities (CN 36-\$200,000.00).	\$200,000.00
11	Extension to the contract period of performance and adjustment to bid item 003 for the construction daily overhead cost (CN 030- \$486,000)	\$486,000.00
12	Modifications to signing and striping plans (CN 23.1-\$5,880). Property and conform adjustment (CN 39-\$70,000).	\$75,880.00
13	<b>Modifications to SBTC Platform C south wall (CN 41-\$58,000)</b>	<b>\$58,000.00</b>
<b>CCO TOTAL</b>		<b>\$1,991,422.69</b>
<b>APPROVED CONTINGENCY</b>		<b>\$2,981,464.00</b>
<b>REMAINING CONTINGENCY</b>		<b>\$990,041.31</b>

**Bold-Construction Change Orders** approved since the last reporting to the Commuter Rail Transit Committee  
Amounts shown in parentheses represent a credit to the Agency

## *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 3

**Date:** June 9, 2016

**Subject:**

Election of Committee Chair and Vice Chair

**Recommendation:**

Conduct elections for members to serve as Chair and Vice Chair of the SANBAG Commuter Rail and Transit Committee for terms to end June 30, 2017.

**Background:**

Terms for the Chair and Vice Chair of each of the SANBAG policy committees and Metro Valley Study Session expire on June 30, 2016. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for each of the policy committees and Metro Valley Study Session is scheduled to immediately follow the annual election of SANBAG Officers, which occurred at the June Board of Directors meeting.

This item provides for an election to be conducted, which will identify the Chair and Vice Chair of the Transit Committee to serve until June 30, 2017. A complete listing of SANBAG policy committees, memberships, and chairs is attached to this item for reference.

**Financial Impact:**

Staff support for this activity is consistent with the adopted budget. There is no additional financial impact on the adopted SANBAG Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Budget.

**Reviewed By:**

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

**Responsible Staff:**

Carrie Schindler, Director of Transit and Rail

Approved  
 Transit Committee  
 Date: June 9, 2016

Witnessed By:

Entity: COG, CTA, CTC

**SANBAG Policy Committee Membership**

COMMITTEE	PURPOSE	MEMBERSHIP	TERMS
<p><b>General Policy Committee</b>                      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.                      (Brown Act)</p>	<p>Robert Lovingood, Supervisor, Vice President (Chair)                      Ryan McEachron, Victorville, President (Vice Chair)                      L. Dennis Michael, Rancho Cucamonga, Past President    <u>West Valley</u>                      L. Dennis Michael, Rancho Cucamonga                      Alan Wapner, Ontario (Chair – MVSS)                      Dennis Yates, Chino                      Janice Rutherford, Supervisor    <u>East Valley</u>                      James Ramos, Supervisor (Chair – CRTD)                      Larry McCallon, Highland                      Rhodes “Dusty” Rigsby, Loma Linda                      Dick Riddell, Yucaipa    <u>Mountain/Desert</u>                      Robert Lovingood, Supervisor, Vice President (Chair – MDC)                      Ryan McEachron, Victorville, President                      Joel Klink, Twentynine Palms                      Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake</p>	<p>6/30/2016                      6/30/2016                      6/30/2016                        6/30/2016                      6/30/2016                      6/30/2016                      6/30/2016                        6/30/2016                      6/30/2016                      6/30/2016                      6/30/2016                        6/30/2016                      6/30/2016                      6/30/2016</p>
<p><b>Transit Committee</b>                      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.                        * SCRRA Primary Member                      ** SCRRA Alternate Member                      (Brown Act)</p>	<p>James Ramos, Supervisor** (Chair)                      Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake (Vice Chair)                      Paul Eaton, Montclair*                      Jon Harrison, Redlands                      Robert Lovingood, Supervisor                      Larry McCallon, Highland*                      L. Dennis Michael, Rancho Cucamonga                      Ray Musser, Upland                      Dick Riddell, Yucaipa                      Deborah Robertson, Rialto                      Alan Wapner, Ontario**</p>	<p>Indeterminate (6/30/2016                      Indeterminate (6/30/2016                      Indeterminate                      12/31/2016                      12/31/2017                      Indeterminate                      12/31/2017                      12/31/2017                      12/31/2016                      12/31/2016                      Indeterminate</p>

Attachment: SANBAG Policy Committee Membership (2578 : Election of Committee Chair and Vice Chair)

### SANBAG Policy Committee Membership

COMMITTEE	PURPOSE	MEMBERSHIP	TERMS
<p><b>Mountain/Desert Committee</b> Membership consists of 12 SANBAG Board Members from each Mountain/Desert jurisdiction and County Supervisors representing the First, Second, and Third Districts.</p>	<p>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.  (Brown Act)</p>	<p>Robert Lovingood, Supervisor (Chair) Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake (Vice Chair) Curt Emick, Apple Valley George Huntington, Yucca Valley Rich Kerr, Adelanto Joel Klink, Twentynine Palms Ryan McEachron, Victorville Julie McIntyre, Barstow Edward Paget, Needles James Ramos, Supervisor Janice Rutherford, Supervisor Eric Schmidt, Hesperia</p>	<p>Indeterminate (6/30/2016) Indeterminate (6/30/2016) Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate</p>

**Policy Committee Meeting Times**

General Policy Committee	Second Wednesday, 9:00 a.m., SANBAG Office
Transit Committee	Second Thursday, 9:00 a.m., 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).

### Board of Directors Study Sessions for Metro Valley Issues

STUDY SESSION	PURPOSE	MEMBERSHIP	TERMS
<p>Board of Directors Study Sessions for Metro Valley Issues Refer to SANBAG Policy 10007.</p>	<p>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.  (Brown Act)</p>	<p>Board of Directors Alan Wapner, Ontario (Chair) Janice Rutherford, Supervisor (Vice Chair)</p>	<p>6/30/2016 6/30/2016</p>

**Meeting Time:** Second Thursday, 9:30 a.m., SANBAG Office

### I-10 and I-15 Corridor Joint Sub-Committee

Joint Sub-Committee	PURPOSE	MEMBERSHIP
<p><b>I-10 and I-15 Corridor Joint Sub-Committee</b> In January 2015, the Board approved the change status of Express Lanes Ad Hoc Committee to the creation of the I-10 and I-15 Corridor Joint Sub-Committee of the Board of Directors Metro Valley Study Session and the Mountain/Desert Policy Committee (I-10 and I-15 Joint Sub-Committee). Members of the committee will be members of the SANBAG Board of Directors and will be appointed by the SANBAG Board President. The President will appoint the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Sub-Committee. The Sub-Committee will include a minimum of nine and a maximum of fourteen SANBAG Board members. Membership will be composed of a minimum of three representatives from the East Valley; and a minimum of two representatives from the Victor Valley. The Sub-Committee will meet as necessary immediately following the Metro Valley Study Session.</p>	<p>The purpose is to consider and make recommendations to the Board of Directors on the development of express lanes in San Bernardino County, in particular on the I-10 and I-15 Corridors.  (Brown Act)</p>	<p>Alan Wapner, Ontario – Chair Ryan McEachron, Victorville – Vice Chair Josie Gonzales, Supervisor Robert Lovingood, Supervisor Larry McCallon, Highland L. Dennis Michael, Rancho Cucamonga Frank Navarro, Colton Dusty Rigsby, Loma Linda Deborah Robertson, Rialto Janice Rutherford, Supervisor Michael Tahan, Fontana</p>

**Public and Specialized Transportation Advisory and Coordinating Council (PASTACC)**

COMMITTEE	PURPOSE	MEMBERSHIP	TERMS
<p>Public and Specialized Transportation Advisory and Coordinating Council (PASTACC)</p> <p>Membership consists of 13 members appointed by the SANBAG Executive Director.</p> <p>6 representing Public Transit Providers</p> <p>1 representing County Dept. of Public Works</p> <p>1 representing the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency</p> <p>5 representing Social Service Providers</p>	<p>Subject to the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Section 99238 – establishes PASTACC’s statutory responsibilities;</p> <p>(1)Review and make recommendations on annual Unmet Transit Needs hearing findings</p> <p>(2)Score and make recommendations for Federal Transit Administration Section 5310 Capital Grant Program applications</p> <p>(3) Assist SANBAG in developing public outreach approach on updating the Coordinated Public Transit/Human Services Transportation Plan</p> <p>(4) Review call for projects for Federal Transit Administration Section 5316, and 5317 grant applications</p> <p>(5) Monitor and make recommendations on Federal regulatory processes as they relate to transit and specialized transit</p> <p>(6) Monitor and disseminate information in reference to State level law and recommendations as they relate to transit and specialized transit</p> <p>(7) Receive annual reports on funded specialized programs funded through FTA Section 5316, 5317 and Measure I</p> <p>(8) Identify regional or county level areas of unmet needs</p> <p>(9) Address special grant or funding opportunities</p> <p>(10)Address any special issues of PASTACC voting and non-voting members</p> <p>(Brown Act)</p>	<p>Standing Membership –</p> <p>Barstow Area Transit, Manager *</p> <p>Morongo Basin Transit Authority, Manager *</p> <p>Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority, Manager *</p> <p>Needles Area Transit, Manager *</p> <p>Omnitrans, Manager *</p> <p>Victor Valley Transit Authority, Manager *</p> <p>County of San Bernardino Dept. of Public Work, Manager *</p> <p>Valley Transportation Services (VTS), Manager *</p> <p>At Large Membership –</p> <p>San Bernardino Dept. of Aging and Adult Services, Director *</p> <p>Inland Regional Center, Director *</p> <p>Inland Empire United Way 2-1-1, Director *</p> <p>Victor Valley Community Service Counsel, Director *</p> <p>Community Senior Services, Director *</p>	<p>On-going</p> <p>On-going</p> <p>On-going</p> <p>On-going</p> <p>On-going</p> <p>On-going</p> <p>On-going</p> <p>On-going</p> <p>1/31/2017</p> <p>9/30/2017</p> <p>9/30/2017</p> <p>1/31/2017</p> <p>2/28/2018</p>

**Meeting Dates and Time:** Bi monthly, beginning in February, 2<sup>nd</sup> Tuesday of the month, 10:00 a.m., SANBAG Office

\* Manager or Director may designate alternate/s

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

COMMITTEE	PURPOSE	MEMBERSHIP	TERMS
<p>Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) Review of Measure I Expenditure Plan</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>(Brown Act)</p>	<p>Richard Haller</p> <p>Rod Johnson</p> <p>Mike Layne</p> <p>Norman Orfall</p> <p>Craig Scott</p> <p>Ray Wolfe, Ex-Officio</p> <p>In addition to the appointed members, the SANBAG Executive Director will serve as an ex officio member.</p>	<p>12/31/16</p> <p>12/31/16</p> <p>12/31/18</p> <p>12/31/18</p> <p>12/31/18</p>

### SANBAG Ad Hoc Committees

COMMITTEE	PURPOSE	MEMBERSHIP
<p><b>Budget Process</b>                      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><b>Legislative</b>                      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 – Ryan McEachron, Victorville                      Vice President – Robert Lovingood, Supervisor                      Immediate Past President – Dennis Michael, Rancho Cucamonga</p>
<p><b>Transit Review Ad Hoc Committee</b>                      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>
<p><b>Statutory Entity Ad Hoc Committee</b>                      In June 2015, the SANBAG Board President appointed this ad hoc committee.</p>	<p>Study and make recommendations to full Board regarding sponsoring legislation to consolidate certain SANBAG entities and functions into a new statutory entity.</p>	<p>Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake - Chair                      Jon Harrison, Redlands                      George Huntington, Yucca Valley                      Robert Lovingood, Supervisor                      Ryan McEachron, Victorville                      Janice Rutherford, Supervisor                      Alan Wapner, Ontario</p>

### SANBAG Technical Advisory Committees

COMMITTEE	PURPOSE	MEETING SCHEDULE
<p><b>Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC)</b>                      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.                       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>

Attachment: SANBAG Policy Committee Membership (2578 : Election of Committee Chair and Vice Chair)

<p><b>City/County Manager’s Technical Advisory Committee (CCM TAC)</b>  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.  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><b>Planning and Development Technical Forum (PDTF)</b>  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.  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>
<p><b>Project Development Teams</b></p>	<p>Project Development Teams (PDTs) are assembled for all major project development activities by SANBAG staff.  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.  PDTs make recommendations related to approaches to project development, evaluation of alternatives, and technical solutions.  PDTs meet on a regular basis throughout the project phase to review progress and to provide technical input required for project development.  The PDTs are not Brown Act Committees.</p>	<p>Varies with the PDT, at SANBAG.</p>

## *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 4

**Date:** June 9, 2016

**Subject:**

Revised Southern California Regional Rail Authority Budget Allocations for Fiscal Years 2015/2016 & 2016/2017

**Recommendation:**

That the Transit Committee recommend the Board, acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission:

- A. Approve an increase in the Southern California Regional Rail Authority Fiscal Year 2016/2017 operating assistance allocation of \$55,000, for a new total of \$14,840,000, to be funded with Valley Local Transportation Fund;
- B. Approve an increase in the Southern California Regional Rail Authority Fiscal Year 2016/2017 capital assistance allocation of \$200, from \$187,000 to \$187,200, to be funded with State Transit Assistance Fund – Operator Allocation.
- C. Approve rescission of \$309,120 of Proposition 1B California Transit Security Grant Program funds allocated to Southern California Regional Rail Authority as part of the Fiscal Year 2015/2016 SANBAG subsidy.
- D. Authorize a budget amendment to the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 adopted budget in the amount of \$55,000 to Task 0314 Transit Operations, Subtask 0377 Metrolink Operating & Maintenance Subsidy, funded with Local Transportation Funds for a new task total of \$16,627,275.
- E. Authorize a budget amendment to the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 adopted budget in the amount of \$200 to Task 0315 Transit Capital, Subtask 0379 Metrolink Capital Subsidy, funded with State Transit Assistance Funds for a new task total of \$82,104,651.

**Background:**

On April 22, 2016, the Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) Board of Directors authorized the transmittal of the Preliminary FY2016/17 (FY17) SCRRA Budget to their Member Agencies. Accordingly, the corresponding preliminary SCRRA Fiscal Year 2016/2017 SANBAG operating allocation of \$14,785,000 was approved by the SANBAG Board at the June 1, 2016 Board meeting. However, subsequent to the preliminary SCRRA budget being presented to the May 2016 Transit Committee, SCRRA transmitted a revised Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Budget, included as Attachment A, related to implementation of reduced fares for short distance trips.

In 2015, SCRRA developed options for fare reductions and identified the possibility of reducing the cost of short distance trips. In January, SCRRA launched a six-month “station fare” pilot with reduced fares for short distance trips. This pilot will end on June 30<sup>th</sup> at which time fares would have reverted to their original levels unless the SCRRA Board took action. In April 2016,

*Entity: CTC*

SCRRA initiated a public outreach process in preparation for the potential adoption of a modified distance fare effective July 1, 2016. SCRRA staff prepared various fare options for the Board's consideration. However, based on feedback from riders, stakeholders, and SCRRA's fare analysis the SCRRA Board adopted a modified fare structure that reduces short distance fares based on miles traveled while not increasing long distance fares when the current station fare pilot expires on June 30, 2016. SCRRA's total operational budget increased from \$141,569,000 to \$141,989,000; a change of \$421,000. SANBAG's subsidy impact is an increase of \$55,000. The table below illustrates the overall distribution of these changes for all the member agencies.

(In 000's)	<b>TOTAL FY16-17</b>	<b>Metro Share</b>	<b>OCTA Share</b>	<b>RCTC Share</b>	<b>SANBAG Share</b>	<b>VCTC Share</b>
<b>Revenues</b>	85,002	41,559	22,031	7,789	11,074	2,549
Original Revenue	84,582	41,353	21,922	7,750	11,019	2,537
Revised Revenue						
<b>Change</b>	<b>(421)</b>	<b>(206)</b>	<b>(109)</b>	<b>(39)</b>	<b>(55)</b>	<b>(13)</b>
<b>Subsidy</b>	<b>141,569</b>	<b>71,794</b>	<b>28,185</b>	<b>17,305</b>	<b>14,785</b>	<b>9,500</b>
Original Subsidy	<b>141,989</b>	<b>71,998</b>	<b>28,294</b>	<b>17,345</b>	<b>14,841</b>	<b>9,511</b>
Revised Subsidy						
<b>Change</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>13</b>

*Numbers may not foot due to rounding.*

This change did not affect SANBAG's other Fiscal Year 2016/2017 SCRRA allocations for the Rehabilitation Program, Capital Program, or Rotem car reimbursement. However, since approval of the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Capital Program allocation, it was determined that the SANBAG allocation of \$187,000 was short by \$200 due to a rounding error. Recommendation B is a request to increase the Capital Program allocation from \$187,000 to \$187,200 to correct that error.

In addition, SANBAG staff and SCRRA staff have reviewed prior year allocations to ensure that funding will be expended by the funding deadlines associated with the individual fund source. As part of SANBAG's Fiscal Year 2015/2016 SCRRA member subsidy, SANBAG allocated \$309,120 of Proposition 1B California Transit Security Grant Program funds (CTSGP) for passenger car refurbishment. However, the passenger car refurbishment efforts have since been deferred and SCRRA does not need the CTSGP funds at this time. CTSGP funds must be allocated by the State to a specific project by the December 31, 2016. Further, the CTSGP funds must be expended by March 31, 2020. As identified in Recommendation C, staff is recommending the \$309,120 of CTSGP fund be rescinded from SCRRA and replaced with another fund source in the future when the passenger car refurbishment effort moves forward.

Recommendations D and E are needed to adjust the SANBAG Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Budget to reflect the changes to SANBAG's Fiscal Year 2016/2017 SCRRA operating and capital allocations identified in Recommendations A and B.

Transit Committee Agenda Item  
June 9, 2016  
Page 3

***Financial Impact:***

This item is not consistent with the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 budget. A budget amendment is requested in Recommendation D & E.

***Reviewed By:***

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

***Responsible Staff:***

Monica Morales, Transit Analyst

---

Approved  
Transit Committee  
Date: June 9, 2016

Witnessed By:



Southern California Regional Rail Authority

May 23, 2016

**TO:** Darrell Johnson, *Chief Executive Officer, OCTA*  
 Darren Kettle, *Executive Director, VCTC*  
 Anne Mayer, *Executive Director, RCTC*  
 Phil Washington, *Chief Executive Officer, Metro*  
 Dr. Raymond Wolfe, *Executive Director, SANBAG*

**FROM:** Arthur T. Leahy,  
*Chief Executive Officer, SCRRRA*

**SUBJECT:** Revisions to SCRRRA Preliminary FY2017 Budget

On April 22, 2016, the SCRRRA Board of Directors authorized the transmittal of the Preliminary FY2016-17 (FY17) SCRRRA Budget to our Member Agencies.

Subsequent to that date, on May 13, 2016, the SCRRRA Board of Directors adopted a modified fare structure effective July 1, 2016, that reduces short distance fares based on miles traveled, while not increasing long distance fares when the current station fare pilot expires on June 30, 2016. This action is estimated to reduce the FY17 Budgeted Farebox Revenue in the amount of \$420,800 (0.3%), which will require an increase in member agency subsidies of \$420,800 in the FY2016-17 Budget. The distribution of these changes are as shown below:

(In 000's)	TOTAL FY16-17	Metro Share	OCTA Share	RCTC Share	SANBAG Share	VCTC Share
<b>Revenues</b>						
Original Revenue	85,002	41,559	22,031	7,789	11,074	2,549
Revised Revenue	84,582	41,353	21,922	7,750	11,019	2,537
<b>Change</b>	<b>(421)</b>	<b>(206)</b>	<b>(109)</b>	<b>(39)</b>	<b>(55)</b>	<b>(13)</b>
<b>Subsidy</b>						
Original Subsidy	141,569	71,794	28,185	17,305	14,785	9,500
Revised Subsidy	141,989	71,998	28,294	17,345	14,841	9,511
<b>Change</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>13</b>

Numbers may not foot due to rounding.

The original memo of April 29, 2016, which transmitted the FY17 Budget, has been revised and is attached, with the revisions shown in track changes to reflect the reduction to Farebox Revenue resulting from the Board action described above.

All original attachments are also revised, and all revisions highlighted in yellow.

The changes have affected only Revenue and Subsidy in the operational Budget for FY17.

Forecasts for FY18 and FY 19 remain unchanged.

The May 13 Board action did not create any changes to the Capital portion of the FY17 Budget.

**Next Steps**

May – June: Member Agencies Consider and Approve FY17 Budget

June 7 Required Public Posting of FY17 Budget

June 24 Request Board Approval of FY17 Budget

Thank you for your ongoing support and active participation in the development of the Preliminary FY17 Budget. As in the past, our respective staffs will continue to work together throughout the adoption process to ensure all concerns you may have are addressed in anticipation of adoption of the budget by the SCRRA Board of Directors in June 2016. My staff and I will also be available at your request to attend or present at your Board Meetings considering the budget adoption.

If you have any questions, comments or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact Elissa Konove at (213) 452-0269, or have any member of your staff contact Christine Wilson, Manager, Budget and Financial Analysis at (213) 452-0297.

Attachment: REVISED - FY2016-17 Preliminary Budget for Transmittal - 05-23-16 (2879 : Southern California Regional Rail Authority Budget

April 29, 2016 – [With May 23, 2016 Revisions](#)

**TO:** Darrell Johnson, *Chief Executive Officer, OCTA*  
 Darren Kettle, *Executive Director, VCTC*  
 Anne Mayer, *Executive Director, RCTC*  
 Phil Washington, *Chief Executive Officer, Metro*  
 Dr. Raymond Wolfe, *Executive Director, SANBAG*

**FROM:** Arthur T. Leahy,  
*Chief Executive Officer, SCRRA*

**SUBJECT:** SCRRA Preliminary FY2017 Budget

---

The SCRRA Board of Directors acted on April 22, 2016, to authorize the transmittal to our Member Agencies the Preliminary FY 2016-17 (FY17) SCRRA Budget. After Member Agency Boards have acted on the Preliminary Budget, staff will return to the SCRRA Board in June for adoption of the final FY17 Budget.

The Preliminary FY17 Budget was presented at a Board budget workshop on February 26, 2016. Following the workshop, meetings were held with individual Member Agencies in March and April. Member Agencies indicated funding constraints for Operating and Capital Rehabilitation expenses. As a result, the Preliminary FY17 Budget amounts for Operating and Capital Rehabilitation have been reduced from the amounts initially presented on February 26. The revised Preliminary FY17 Budget was presented to the Board on April 22, 2016.

### **Budget Priorities for FY17**

The Preliminary FY17 Budget reflects priorities consistent with the “back to basics” approach outlined in the Strategic Plan, adopted in March 2016. The budget provides funding in alignment with the Authority’s strategic goals and includes the following priorities for the upcoming fiscal year:

- Continued emphasis on safe operations, with the full implementation of Positive Train Control (PTC) as the centerpiece of our efforts.
- Improved reliability and on-time performance, by putting Tier 4 locomotives into service and providing funding necessary for required equipment maintenance, consistent with the Fleet Management Plan.
- Enhanced customer experience, by implementing upgrades to the mobile ticketing application and a modernized ticket vending system.
- Increased ridership and regional mobility, with expanded service from Riverside to Perris Valley.

- Investment in existing assets to maintain a state of good repair, by funding critical rehabilitation projects and improving processes to accelerate project delivery.
- Ongoing workforce development, by training and engaging employees.

### Overall Summary

The Preliminary FY17 Budget includes new budgetary authority of \$274.9 million. The proposed budget consists of Operating Budget authority of \$243.8 million, an increase of 1.4% over the FY16 Budget. Capital Program authority totals \$31.1 million, \$29.8 million for Rehabilitation Projects and \$1.3 million for New Capital Projects. Carryover of New Capital Projects approved in prior years is \$255.1 million, and carryover of Rehabilitation Projects approved in prior years is \$37.9 million.

### Operating Budget

#### Budget Assumptions

For the Preliminary FY17 Budget, the assumptions included no increase of current service ridership-based fare revenues and no fare increase. The only changes to Revenue were an additional 4½ months of the Perris Valley Line, and a slight decrease for Station to Station discounts. The “Big Five” major vendors (for train operations, track maintenance, signal maintenance, equipment maintenance, and security), which represent approximately 39% of the operating expense budget, were limited to the contracted escalators for current service. Diesel fuel is approximately 10% of the operating budget. The budget reflects an anticipated average price per gallon of \$2.75, with a 5% contingency to allow for any unexpected cost increase. The budget for parts for the repair of the aging fleet is \$14.0 million, which is consistent with actual costs in prior years. The budget includes a net reduction of two positions. Budgeted increases include a 1.5% Cost of Living Increase, and a Merit Pool equal to 0.5% of Payroll. The Preliminary FY17 Budget includes the three leased locomotives for PTC testing. The portion of the deductible for the 2015 Oxnard incident to be recognized this year is lower by \$1.0M to \$2.0M. BNSF Locomotives and related expenses are included through October 2016.

#### Operating Revenues

Operating revenues include farebox, dispatching, maintenance-of-way revenues, interest, other minor miscellaneous revenues, and are currently estimated to equal ~~\$102.2~~ \$101.8 million, an increase of ~~\$0.8~~ \$0.4 million, or ~~0.8%~~ 0.4% compared to the FY16 budget.

Fare Revenues, the largest operating revenue of the budget, have increased ~~\$0.6~~ \$0.1 million or ~~0.7%~~ 0.2% compared to the FY16 budget to a total of ~~\$85.0~~ \$84.6 million. The FY17 budget reflects no fare increase. This increase is consistent with the current forecast for FY16 actual expense.

Maintenance-of-way revenues from the freight railroads and Amtrak are estimated from existing agreements based on projections of current usage. The Preliminary FY17 Budget estimates an increase of 2.0% from the FY16 budget to a total of \$14.6 million. Dispatching Revenues were only minimally different from FY16.

Train Operations, Maintenance-of-Way (MOW), Administration, and Insurance

The Train Operations component of the budget consists of those costs necessary to provide Metrolink commuter rail services across the six-county service area, including the direct costs of railroad operations, equipment maintenance, required support costs, and other administrative and operating costs. Ordinary MOW expenditures are those costs necessary to perform the inspections and repairs needed to assure the reliable, safe operation of trains and safety of the public. The FY17 budgeted amount for Train Operations is \$144.6 million, MOW is \$39.6 million, Administration & Services is \$36.7 million, Insurance/Claims \$16.8 million, and BNSF Lease expenses \$6.1 million. Attachment B provides the detail of the Operating Budget components compared to prior years. Attachment C shows the detail of the allocation of the Operating Budget components among the five Member Agencies.

The Preliminary FY17 Budget assumes the operation of a total of 2.8 million revenue service miles through the operation of 172 weekday trains and 90 weekend trains. No incremental services were requested for FY17.

Overall, the total budgeted expenses have increased by 1.4%. This change is the result of:

- a) an increase of \$9.0M in total Train Operations and Services, driven primarily by increases in parts purchased for rolling stock (\$4.3M), an additional 4½ months of Perris Valley Service (\$1.6M), and increases to Bombardier (\$1.1M), and Other mechanical (\$1.8M).
- b) a decrease in Maintenance of Way of \$2.8 million. MOW amounts are limited to estimated prior year expenditures, with an increase of \$1.1 million primarily due by contract escalations for Veolia and MASS Electric staff additions.
- c) an increase in Administration and Services (\$3.9M), driven by an increase in the Operations and Admin Salaries and Wages caused by the removal of the vacancy factor included in last year’s budget (\$0.9M) in combination with a lower percent charge of salaries to projects charged to Capital Projects (\$1.2M), FY16 hiring over the mid-point budgeted for salaries and increases (\$0.9M), an increase in fringe benefits (\$0.5M), a COLA of 1.5% and merit pool of 0.5% for FY17 (\$0.4M), increased operational PTC charges no longer covered by Grants (\$1.0M) and a reduction of professional service expense (-\$1.0M).
- d) total Insurance expense lower by \$1.3M, as a result of the \$3.0M budgeted to cover Oxnard related costs in FY16 reduced to \$2.0M for FY17 (-\$1.0M), and an insurance premium reduction (-\$0.3M).

In total, the FY17 budget increase is \$3.3M, or 1.4%, over the FY16 budget. Attachment D presents the elements driving the increases in FY17.

Member Agency Subsidy

Member Agency subsidies are required to fund the difference between the total costs of operations and all available revenues. The Preliminary FY17 Budget estimates total Member Agency contributions to equal ~~\$141.6~~ \$142.0 million, an increase of ~~\$2.5~~ \$2.9 million or ~~1.8%~~ 2.1% over the FY16 budget. The subsidy increase is the net result of slightly increased farebox revenue, higher routine operating expenses as a result of a full year of the Perris Valley Line, the Shortway and Redlands route additions, lower insurance cost, and the expiration of the BNSF Lease. Attachment E reflects subsidies FY14-FY16 and provides a specific analysis of the FY16 vs. FY17 change in the Member Agency subsidy.

### **Capital Budget**

Capital Projects are frequently multi-year endeavors. The project balances are referred to as “Carryovers” because their uncompleted balance moves to the following year. Projects authorized in prior years but “carried over” total \$37.9 million for Rehabilitation and \$255.1 million for New Capital. They are shown in detail on Attachments J and N respectively.

The Capital Rehabilitation authorization request for FY17 was identified as necessary for safe and efficient rail operations. These projects total \$29.8 million and are represented in summary in Attachment H, and in detail in Attachment I.

The information presented in detail at the Board Workshop to Member Agencies included a total Rehabilitation request of \$101.1 million. Due to Member Agency funding constraints, this amount was reduced to \$29.8 million. Those projects removed from the budget request are displayed on Attachment H-1 by project type as ‘lined out’, on Attachment H-2 by project type as removed, and on Attachment H-3 by subdivision.

The total Rehabilitation Program includes:

- Track and Structures upgrades totaling \$18.9 million;
- Locomotive and Rolling Stock upgrades of \$1.0 million;
- Signal system improvements of \$2.8 million;
- Fleet and Facility projects of \$3.6 million;
- Communications and Signage improvements of \$3.5 million.

As the Rehabilitation Program needs identified exceed the amount of funding currently included in the Preliminary FY17 Budget, SCRRA may return to the Member Agencies and the Board during FY17 to request additional Rehabilitation funding. SCRRA will continue to work with the Member Agencies to track the status of Rehabilitation projects and any potential request for additional funding will be coordinated with the Member Agencies.

Capital Rehabilitation projects shown for FY18 and FY19 cover many other projects critical to the safe operation of the railroad. Over a number of years, a significant backlog of deferred maintenance has accrued, creating the large numbers shown in the FY18 and FY19 listings. The needed projects are shown on Attachments K through L.

The New Capital authorization request for FY17 was identified as necessary for safe and efficient rail operations. The only new project proposed for FY17 totals \$1.3 million and is an amount to be used for project study reports and preliminary design on high priority projects. The project is shown on Attachment M. This information was also presented to the TAC members, and at the Board Workshop.

New Capital projects that have been identified as candidates for consideration in future years are listed in their totality on Attachment O. A description of possible funding which may apply to these projects is included.

Cash flow projections for FY17, FY18, and FY19 are presented in Attachment P.

**Operating and Capital Budget Projections for FY18 and FY19**

Upon approval by the Board, the FY17 Budget will be transmitted to Member Agencies for consideration. FY18 and FY19 projected budgets are included in this report for informational purposes only. Operating Budget projections are outlined in Attachments F and G, and Capital Budget Projections are shown in Attachments L through O.

FY18 and FY19 Projected Operating Budgets are based upon possible requested new services in combination with an inflation factor (3%) applied to all other costs.

**Next Steps**

- May – June: Member Agencies Consider and Approve FY17 Budget
- June 7 Required Public Posting of FY17 Budget
- June 24 Request Board Approval of FY17 Budget

Thank you for your ongoing support and active participation in the development of the Preliminary FY17 Budget. As in the past, our respective staffs will continue to work together throughout the adoption process to ensure all concerns you may have are addressed in anticipation of adoption of the budget by the SCRRA Board of Directors in June 2016. My staff and I will also be available at your request to attend or present at your Board Meetings considering the budget adoption.

If you have any questions, comments or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me directly at (213) 452-0269, or have any member of your staff contact Christine Wilson, Manager, Budget and Financial Analysis at (213) 452-0297.

**OPERATING FUNDING ALLOCATION BY MEMBER AGENCY**

(In 000's)	TOTAL FY16-17	Metro Share	OCTA Share	RCTC Share	SANBAG Share	VCTC Share
<b>Revenues</b>						
Gross Farebox	\$84,582	\$41,353	\$21,922	\$7,750	\$11,019	\$2,537
Dispatching	2,590	1,315	887	6	69	313
Other Operating	12	6	3	1	2	
Maintenance-of-Way	14,641	9,147	2,716	677	1,575	527
<b>Total Revenues FY17 Budget</b>	<b>\$101,825</b>	<b>\$51,822</b>	<b>\$25,528</b>	<b>\$8,434</b>	<b>\$12,665</b>	<b>\$3,377</b>
<b>Expenses</b>						
Train Operations & Services	\$144,655	\$73,087	\$33,889	\$15,779	\$15,723	\$6,177
Maintenance-of-Way	39,592	20,864	8,125	2,887	5,439	2,277
Administration & Services	36,726	17,592	6,479	5,309	3,710	3,636
Insurance	16,787	8,989	4,062	1,227	1,954	554
BNSF	6,055	3,287	1,267	577	680	244
<b>Total Expense FY17 Budget</b>	<b>\$243,814</b>	<b>\$123,820</b>	<b>\$53,822</b>	<b>\$25,779</b>	<b>\$27,506</b>	<b>\$12,888</b>
<b>Total FY17 Subsidy by Member</b>	<b>\$141,989</b>	<b>\$71,998</b>	<b>\$28,294</b>	<b>\$17,345</b>	<b>\$14,841</b>	<b>\$9,511</b>
<b>FY 2015-16 Budget</b>	<b>\$139,055</b>	<b>\$71,796</b>	<b>\$28,527</b>	<b>\$15,015</b>	<b>\$14,153</b>	<b>\$9,564</b>
Over/(Under) Last Year Budget	\$2,934	\$202	(\$232)	\$2,330	\$688	(\$53)
Percent of Change	2.1%	0.3%	( 0.8%)	15.5%	4.9%	( 0.6%)

Attachment: REVISED - FY2016-17 Preliminary Budget for Transmittal - 05-23-16 (2879 : Southern California Regional Rail Authority Budget Amendment for FY 2016/2017)

**Comparative Annual Operating Budget Distribution**  
**by Cost Component by Year**

(\$000's)	FY 14-15 Actual	FY 15-16 Budget	FY 16-17 Budget	FY16-17 Budget vs. FY15-16 Budget	
				Change	%
<b>Operating Revenue</b>					
Farebox Revenue	83,134	84,446	83,556	(890)	(1.1%)
Metro Fare Reduction Subsidy			1,025	1,025	n/a
<b>Subtotal-Pro Forma FareBox</b>	<b>83,134</b>	<b>84,446</b>	<b>84,582</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>0.2%</b>
Dispatching	2,493	2,663	2,590	(73)	(2.7%)
Other Revenues	372	-	12	12	n/a
MOW Revenues	13,207	14,348	14,641	293	2.0%
<b>Subtotal Operating Revenue</b>	<b>99,207</b>	<b>101,458</b>	<b>101,825</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>0.4%</b>
<b>Operating Expenses</b>					
<b>Operations &amp; Services</b>					
Train Operations	40,569	43,979	43,942	(38)	(0.1%)
Equipment Maintenance	32,649	29,352	37,581	8,230	28.0%
Fuel	24,454	22,952	22,772	(179)	(0.8%)
Non-Scheduled Rolling Stock Repairs	2	232	100	(132)	(56.9%)
Operating Facilities Maintenance	1,120	1,182	1,418	236	20.0%
Other Operating Train Services	293	567	496	(71)	(12.5%)
Rolling Stock Lease	105	640	370	(270)	(42.2%)
Security - Sheriff	5,136	5,482	5,511	29	0.5%
Security - Guards	1,591	2,010	2,000	(10)	(0.5%)
Supplemental Additional Security	81	690	690	-	0.0%
Public Safety Program	177	260	320	60	23.2%
Passenger Relations	1,639	1,885	2,069	184	9.8%
TVM Maintenance/Revenue Collection	5,984	6,703	7,495	792	11.8%
Marketing	949	1,020	1,220	200	19.7%
Media & External Communications	234	426	396	(30)	(7.1%)
Utilities/Leases	2,622	2,677	2,778	100	3.8%
Transfers to Other Operators	7,081	7,411	6,577	(834)	(11.3%)
Amtrak Transfers	800	1,400	1,400	-	0.0%
Station Maintenance	1,121	1,464	1,640	175	12.0%
Rail Agreements	4,997	4,831	5,379	548	11.3%
<b>Subtotal Operations &amp; Services</b>	<b>131,602</b>	<b>135,163</b>	<b>144,153</b>	<b>8,991</b>	<b>6.7%</b>
<b>Maintenance-of-Way</b>					
MoW - Line Segments	33,043	41,160	38,102	(3,058)	(7.4%)
MoW - Extraordinary Maintenance	1,235	1,228	1,490	261	21.3%
<b>Subtotal Maintenance-of-Way</b>	<b>34,278</b>	<b>42,388</b>	<b>39,592</b>	<b>(2,796)</b>	<b>(6.6%)</b>
<b>Administration &amp; Services</b>					
Ops Salaries & Fringe Benefits	11,535	11,586	14,019	2,434	21.0%
Ops Non-Labor Expenses	3,651	4,760	5,384	624	13.1%
Indirect Administrative Expenses	11,791	13,621	15,507	1,886	13.8%
Ops Professional Services	969	2,870	1,816	(1,054)	(36.7%)
<b>Subtotal Admin &amp; Services</b>	<b>27,946</b>	<b>32,837</b>	<b>36,726</b>	<b>3,888</b>	<b>11.8%</b>
<b>Contingency (Non-Train Ops)</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>501</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.2%</b>
<b>Total Operating Expenses</b>	<b>193,839</b>	<b>210,889</b>	<b>220,973</b>	<b>10,084</b>	<b>4.8%</b>
<b>Insurance Expense/(Revenue)</b>					
Liability/Property/Auto	12,597	12,880	12,588	(292)	(2.3%)
Claims / SI	1,884	4,000	3,000	(1,000)	(25.0%)
Claims Administration	1,145	1,198	1,198	-	0.0%
PLPD Revenue	(1)	-	-	-	n/a
<b>Net Insurance Expense</b>	<b>15,625</b>	<b>18,079</b>	<b>16,787</b>	<b>(1,292)</b>	<b>(7.1%)</b>
<b>Total Expense Before BNSF</b>	<b>209,464</b>	<b>228,968</b>	<b>237,760</b>	<b>8,792</b>	<b>3.8%</b>
<b>Loss Before BNSF</b>	<b>(110,257)</b>	<b>(127,510)</b>	<b>(135,934)</b>	<b>(8,424)</b>	<b>(6.6%)</b>
<b>Member Subsidies</b>					
Operations	92,252	109,431	119,148	9,716	8.9%
Insurance	17,678	18,079	16,787	(1,292)	(7.1%)
<b>Member Subsidies - Normal Ops</b>	<b>109,930</b>	<b>127,510</b>	<b>135,934</b>	<b>8,424</b>	<b>6.6%</b>

<b>Surplus / (Deficit) Before BNSF</b>	<b>(328)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	
<b>BNSF LEASED LOCOMOTIVE COSTS</b>					
Lease cost Inc. ship	-	4,275	2,525	(1,750)	(40.9%)
Major Component Parts	-	800	-	(800)	(100.0%)
Labor for Maintenance	-	2,500	900	(1,600)	(64.0%)
Additional Fuel	-	5,003	1,230	(3,773)	(75.4%)
Diesel Fuel Offset	-	(7,011)	-	7,011	(100.0%)
Wheel truing, Software Mods, Brakes	-	960	-	(960)	(100.0%)
Temp Facility Mods	-	450	-	(450)	(100.0%)
PTC Costs	-	4,010	1,399	(2,611)	(65.1%)
Contingency	-	557	-	(557)	(100.0%)
<b>Total BNSF Lease Loco Expenses</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11,545</b>	<b>6,055</b>	<b>(5,490)</b>	<b>(47.6%)</b>
<b>Member Subsidies - BNSF Lease</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11,545</b>	<b>6,055</b>	<b>(5,490)</b>	<b>(47.6%)</b>
<b>Surplus / (Deficit) - BNSF Lease</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	
<b>Net Loss</b>	<b>(110,257)</b>	<b>(139,055)</b>	<b>(141,989)</b>	<b>(2,934)</b>	<b>2.1%</b>
<b>All Member Subsidies</b>	<b>109,930</b>	<b>139,055</b>	<b>141,989</b>	<b>2,934</b>	<b>2.1%</b>
<b>Surplus / (Deficit)</b>	<b>(328)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	

**FY17 Annual Operating Budget Distribution**  
**by Cost Component By Member Agency**

(\$000s)	Total	Metro	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC
<b>Operating Revenue</b>						
Farebox Revenue	83,556	40,328	21,922	7,750	11,019	2,537
Metro Fare Reduction Subsidy	1,025	1,025	-	-	-	-
<b>Subtotal-Pro Forma FareBox</b>	<b>84,582</b>	<b>41,353</b>	<b>21,922</b>	<b>7,750</b>	<b>11,019</b>	<b>2,537</b>
Dispatching	2,590	1,315	887	6	69	313
Other Revenues	12	6	3	1	2	
MOW Revenues	14,641	9,147	2,716	677	1,575	527
<b>Subtotal Operating Revenue</b>	<b>101,825</b>	<b>51,822</b>	<b>25,528</b>	<b>8,434</b>	<b>12,665</b>	<b>3,377</b>
<b>Operating Expenses</b>						
<b><u>Operations &amp; Services</u></b>						
Train Operations	43,942	23,408	9,813	4,471	4,635	1,615
Equipment Maintenance	37,581	18,968	8,802	3,830	4,319	1,663
Fuel	22,772	11,719	5,681	2,271	2,362	739
Non-Scheduled Rolling Stock Repairs	100	54	24	7	12	3
Operating Facilities Maintenance	1,418	759	343	104	165	47
Other Operating Train Services	496	234	86	74	50	52
Rolling Stock Lease	370	176	73	41	53	27
Security - Sheriff	5,511	2,940	1,138	730	581	122
Security - Guards	2,000	945	345	300	200	211
Supplemental Additional Security	690	337	179	63	90	21
Public Safety Program	320	151	55	48	32	34
Passenger Relations	2,069	1,039	524	169	266	70
TVM Maintenance/Revenue Collection	7,495	3,031	1,708	1,213	1,102	441
Marketing	1,220	633	295	93	160	39
Media & External Communications	396	187	68	59	39	42
Utilities/Leases	2,778	1,312	480	416	277	292
Transfers to Other Operators	6,577	3,620	1,526	459	753	219
Amtrak Transfers	1,400	446	885	-	-	69
Station Maintenance	1,640	1,009	235	106	215	76
Rail Agreements	5,379	1,881	1,542	1,249	362	343
<b>Subtotal Operations &amp; Services</b>	<b>144,153</b>	<b>72,850</b>	<b>33,802</b>	<b>15,703</b>	<b>15,673</b>	<b>6,124</b>
<b><u>Maintenance-of-Way</u></b>						
MoW - Line Segments	38,102	20,007	7,763	2,871	5,279	2,182
MoW - Extraordinary Maintenance	1,490	857	362	16	159	96
<b>Subtotal Maintenance-of-Way</b>	<b>39,592</b>	<b>20,864</b>	<b>8,125</b>	<b>2,887</b>	<b>5,439</b>	<b>2,277</b>
<b><u>Administration &amp; Services</u></b>						
Ops Salaries & Fringe Benefits	14,019	6,621	2,431	2,096	1,400	1,471
Ops Non-Labor Expenses	5,384	2,789	1,057	617	581	340
Indirect Administrative Expenses	15,507	7,324	2,678	2,324	1,548	1,633
Ops Professional Services	1,816	858	314	272	181	191
<b>Subtotal Admin &amp; Services</b>	<b>36,726</b>	<b>17,592</b>	<b>6,479</b>	<b>5,309</b>	<b>3,710</b>	<b>3,636</b>
<b><u>Contingency (Non-Train Ops)</u></b>	<b>502</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Total Operating Expenses</b>	<b>220,973</b>	<b>111,543</b>	<b>48,493</b>	<b>23,975</b>	<b>24,872</b>	<b>12,090</b>
<b>Insurance Expense/(Revenue)</b>						
Liability/Property/Auto	12,588	6,741	3,046	920	1,465	415
Claims / SI	3,000	1,607	726	219	349	99
Claims Administration	1,198	642	290	88	139	40
PLPD Revenue	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Net Insurance Expense</b>	<b>16,787</b>	<b>8,989</b>	<b>4,062</b>	<b>1,227</b>	<b>1,954</b>	<b>554</b>
<b>Total Expense Before BNSF</b>	<b>237,760</b>	<b>120,533</b>	<b>52,556</b>	<b>25,202</b>	<b>26,826</b>	<b>12,644</b>
<b>Loss Before BNSF</b>	<b>(135,934)</b>	<b>(68,711)</b>	<b>(27,028)</b>	<b>(16,768)</b>	<b>(14,161)</b>	<b>(9,267)</b>
<b>Member Subsidies</b>						
Operations	119,148	59,722	22,965	15,540	12,207	8,713
Insurance	16,787	8,989	4,062	1,227	1,954	554
<b>Total Member Subsidies</b>	<b>135,934</b>	<b>68,711</b>	<b>27,028</b>	<b>16,768</b>	<b>14,161</b>	<b>9,267</b>
<b>Surplus / (Deficit) Before BNSF</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

Attachment: REVISED - FY2016-17 Preliminary Budget for Transmittal - 05-23-16 (2879 : Southern California Regional Rail Authority Budget Amendment for FY 2016/2017)

**BNSF LEASED LOCOMOTIVE COSTS**

Lease cost Inc. ship	2,525	1,371	528	241	284	102
Major Component Parts	-	-	-	-	-	-
Labor for Maintenance	900	489	188	86	101	36
Additional Fuel	1,230	668	257	117	138	50
Wheel truing, Software Mods, Brakes	-	-	-	-	-	-
Temp Facility Mods	-	-	-	-	-	-
PTC Costs	1,399	760	293	133	157	56
Contingency	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total BNSF Lease Loco Expenses</b>	<b>6,055</b>	<b>3,287</b>	<b>1,267</b>	<b>577</b>	<b>680</b>	<b>244</b>
<b>Member BNSF Lease Subsidies</b>	<b>6,055</b>	<b>3,287</b>	<b>1,267</b>	<b>577</b>	<b>680</b>	<b>244</b>
<b>Surplus / (Deficit) - BNSF Lease</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Net Loss</b>	<b>(141,989)</b>	<b>(71,998)</b>	<b>(28,294)</b>	<b>(17,345)</b>	<b>(14,841)</b>	<b>(9,511)</b>
<b>All Member Subsidies</b>	<b>141,989</b>	<b>71,998</b>	<b>28,294</b>	<b>17,345</b>	<b>14,841</b>	<b>9,511</b>
<b>Surplus / (Deficit)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY  
FISCAL YEAR 2017 PROPOSED BUDGET**

Attachment D

**Operational Expense Budget**

(in 000's)

<b>FY 2016 Amended Adopted Budget</b>	<b>\$ 240,513</b>	
<b>FY 2017 Preliminary Budget</b>	<b><u>243,814</u></b>	
<b>Total Operational Expense Budget Increase</b>	<b><u>\$ 3,302</u></b>	<b>1.4%</b>

**INCREASE DRIVERS:**

**New Initiatives:**

Remove Effect of BNSF reduction	(5,490)	(lower than FY16)
Without Change to BNSF, increase = \$12,661,721 (this is amount analyzed below)		
Perris Valley- increase to full year	2,568	
Redlands-1st - 4 mo, Redlands & Shortway full year	598	
Mobile Ticketing	672	

**Big Five**

Train Operations	1,262
MOW (including 5 new MASS Positions)	1,140
MOW cut	(3,870)

**Other**

Material Issues	4,337
Effect of Payroll Vacancy Factor used in FY16	1,430
Variance in Pay mid-pt vs hire	1,207
Change in Salaries charged to Capital Projects	1,294
Reduction in Consultants	(1,086)
Reduction in Insurance/Claims (Oxnard)	(1,292)
 FY 2017 COLA (1.5%) & Merit Pool (0.5%)	 532

<b>Total Operational Expense Budget Increase</b>	<b><u>\$ 3,302</u></b>	<b>0.0%</b>
--	------------------------	-------------

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY  
FISCAL YEAR 2017 PROPOSED BUDGET

Attachment E

**Net Local Subsidy by Member Agency**

(In 000's)

	Total Net Local Subsidy	Metro Share	OCTA share	RCTC Share	SANBAG Share	VCTC Share
FY14 ACTUAL*	\$100,003	\$54,448	\$19,060	\$7,585	\$11,618	\$7,292
FY 15 ACTUAL	\$110,257	\$59,030	\$22,252	\$9,388	\$11,605	\$7,983
FY16 BUDGET	\$139,055	\$71,796	\$28,527	\$15,015	\$14,153	\$9,564
FY17 BUDGET	\$141,989	\$71,998	\$28,294	\$17,345	\$14,841	\$9,511

\*Excludes inventory write up

**YEAR OVER YEAR CHANGE**

	Total Net Local Subsidy	Metro Share	OCTA share	RCTC Share	SANBAG Share	VCTC Share
<b>FY14 vs FY15</b>						
\$ Increase	\$10,254	\$4,582	\$3,192	\$1,803	(\$13)	\$691
% Increase	10.3%	8.4%	16.7%	23.8%	-0.1%	9.5%
<b>FY15 vs FY16</b>						
\$ Increase	\$28,798	\$12,766	\$6,275	\$5,627	\$2,548	\$1,581
% Increase	26.1%	21.6%	28.2%	59.9%	22.0%	19.8%
<b>FY16 vs FY17</b>						
\$ Increase	\$2,934	\$202	(\$233)	\$2,330	\$688	(\$53)
% Increase	2.1%	0.3%	-0.8%	15.5%	4.9%	-0.6%

Analysis of 16 vs 17 variance:

**Of the 2.1%**

**Of the \$2,934**

0.3% Farebox Revenue Adjustment	\$	420	=	14.3%	of the variance
-0.6% Increase in Revenue (Primarily PVL)	\$	(788)	=	-26.9%	of the variance
3.1% Material Issues		4,337	=	147.8%	of the variance
1.8% Perris Valley increase to full year		2,568	=	87.5%	of the variance
0.9% Big Five Train Operations		1,262	=	43.0%	of the variance
0.8% Big Five MOW		1,140	=	38.9%	of the variance
-2.8% MOW Cut		(3,870)	=	-131.9%	of the variance
1.0% Payroll Vacancy Factor used in FY16		1,430	=	48.7%	of the variance
0.9% Change in Salaries to Capital Projects		1,294	=	44.1%	of the variance
0.9% Payroll Variation Hire to Mid point		1,207	=	41.1%	of the variance
0.5% Mobile ticketing		672	=	22.9%	of the variance
0.4% Redlands(both) & Shortway		598	=	20.4%	of the variance
-0.8% Ops Prof Services Reduced		(1,085)	=	-37.0%	of the variance
-0.9% Reduce insurance (Oxnard incident)		(1,292)	=	-44.0%	of the variance
-3.9% BNSF decrease to partial year		(5,490)	=	-187.1%	of the variance
0.4% FY17 COLA (1.5%) & Merit Pool (0.5%)		531	=	18.1%	of the variance
<b>2.1%</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>2,934</b>		<b>100.0%</b>	

Attachment: REVISED - FY2016-17 Preliminary Budget for Transmittal - 05-23-16 (2879 : Southern California Regional Rail Authority Budget Amendment for FY 2016/2017)

**FY18 Forecasted Operating Budget**  
**by Cost Component By Member Agency**

(\$000s)	Total FY17-18	Metro	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC
<b>Operating Revenue</b>						
Farebox Revenue	86,804	41,203	22,955	8,482	11,602	2,563
Metro Fare Reduction Subsidy	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Subtotal-Pro Forma FareBox</b>	<b>86,804</b>	<b>41,203</b>	<b>22,955</b>	<b>8,482</b>	<b>11,602</b>	<b>2,563</b>
Dispatching	2,668	1,355	913	6	71	322
Other Revenues	12	6	3	1	2	0
MOW Revenues	15,081	9,421	2,798	697	1,622	542
<b>Subtotal Operating Revenue</b>	<b>104,565</b>	<b>51,985</b>	<b>26,669</b>	<b>9,187</b>	<b>13,297</b>	<b>3,428</b>
<b>Operating Expenses</b>						
<b><u>Operations &amp; Services</u></b>						
Train Operations	46,189	24,101	10,472	4,788	5,173	1,655
Equipment Maintenance	39,723	19,558	9,639	4,276	4,516	1,735
Fuel	24,298	12,076	6,135	2,633	2,693	761
Non-Scheduled Rolling Stock Repairs	103	54	25	9	12	3
Operating Facilities Maintenance	1,460	768	351	127	166	48
Other Operating Train Services	511	241	88	76	53	54
Rolling Stock Lease	381	181	75	42	55	27
Security - Sheriff	5,677	3,220	1,269	412	637	139
Security - Guards	2,060	969	355	308	212	216
Supplemental Additional Security	711	337	188	69	95	21
Public Safety Program	330	155	57	49	34	35
Passenger Relations	2,131	1,063	527	186	280	75
TVM Maintenance/Revenue Collection	7,720	3,122	1,759	1,249	1,136	454
Marketing	1,257	647	296	104	168	42
Media & External Communications	408	192	70	61	42	43
Utilities/Leases	2,861	1,346	492	427	295	300
Transfers to Other Operators	6,774	3,662	1,553	540	796	224
Amtrak Transfers	1,442	459	911	-	-	72
Station Maintenance	1,689	1,028	250	109	225	78
Rail Agreements	6,029	1,913	1,789	1,527	450	350
<b>Subtotal Operations &amp; Services</b>	<b>151,752</b>	<b>75,094</b>	<b>36,300</b>	<b>16,993</b>	<b>17,036</b>	<b>6,330</b>
<b><u>Maintenance-of-Way</u></b>						
MoW - Line Segments	39,335	20,584	7,798	3,058	5,648	2,247
MoW - Extraordinary Maintenance	1,534	883	372	16	164	98
<b>Subtotal Maintenance-of-Way</b>	<b>40,870</b>	<b>21,467</b>	<b>8,170</b>	<b>3,074</b>	<b>5,812</b>	<b>2,346</b>
<b><u>Administration &amp; Services</u></b>						
Ops Salaries & Fringe Benefits	14,440	6,795	2,495	2,151	1,490	1,508
Ops Non-Labor Expenses	5,546	2,822	1,070	682	625	346
Indirect Administrative Expenses	15,972	7,516	2,749	2,386	1,647	1,674
Ops Professional Services	1,870	880	322	279	193	196
<b>Subtotal Admin &amp; Services</b>	<b>37,827</b>	<b>18,014</b>	<b>6,635</b>	<b>5,499</b>	<b>3,955</b>	<b>3,724</b>
<b><u>Contingency (Non-Train Ops)</u></b>	<b>517</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Total Operating Expenses</b>	<b>230,967</b>	<b>114,818</b>	<b>51,194</b>	<b>25,644</b>	<b>26,856</b>	<b>12,454</b>
<b>Insurance Expense/(Revenue)</b>						
Liability/Property/Auto	12,966	6,821	3,115	1,131	1,473	426
Claims / SI	3,090	1,626	742	270	351	101
Claims Administration	1,234	649	297	108	140	41
PLPD Revenue	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Net Insurance Expense</b>	<b>17,290</b>	<b>9,096</b>	<b>4,154</b>	<b>1,508</b>	<b>1,964</b>	<b>568</b>
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>248,257</b>	<b>123,914</b>	<b>55,348</b>	<b>27,152</b>	<b>28,820</b>	<b>13,022</b>
<b>Total Loss</b>	<b>(143,692)</b>	<b>(71,928)</b>	<b>(28,680)</b>	<b>(17,965)</b>	<b>(15,524)</b>	<b>(9,594)</b>
<b>Member Subsidies</b>						
Operations	126,401	62,833	24,525	16,457	13,560	9,026
Insurance	17,290	9,096	4,154	1,508	1,964	568
<b>Member Subsidies</b>	<b>143,692</b>	<b>71,928</b>	<b>28,680</b>	<b>17,965</b>	<b>15,524</b>	<b>9,594</b>
<b>Surplus / (Deficit)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

Attachment: REVISED - FY2016-17 Preliminary Budget for Transmittal - 05-23-16 (2879 : Southern California Regional Rail Authority Budget Amendment for FY 2016/2017)

**FY19 Forecasted Operating Budget**  
**by Cost Component By Member Agency**

(\$000s)	Total FY18-19	Metro	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC
<b>Operating Revenue</b>						
Farebox Revenue	89,540	42,570	24,024	8,743	11,817	2,386
Metro Fare Reduction Subsidy	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Subtotal-Pro Forma FareBox</b>	<b>89,540</b>	<b>42,570</b>	<b>24,024</b>	<b>8,743</b>	<b>11,817</b>	<b>2,386</b>
Dispatching	2,748	1,395	941	6	73	332
Other Revenues	13	7	3	1	2	0
MOW Revenues	15,533	9,704	2,881	718	1,671	559
<b>Subtotal Operating Revenue</b>	<b>107,833</b>	<b>53,675</b>	<b>27,849</b>	<b>9,469</b>	<b>13,563</b>	<b>3,277</b>
<b>Operating Expenses</b>						
<b><u>Operations &amp; Services</u></b>						
Train Operations	49,364	25,882	11,423	4,990	5,370	1,699
Equipment Maintenance	42,325	20,824	10,291	4,775	4,657	1,778
Fuel	26,223	13,018	6,847	2,761	2,812	785
Non-Scheduled Rolling Stock Repairs	106	55	25	10	12	3
Operating Facilities Maintenance	1,504	782	357	147	169	49
Other Operating Train Services	527	248	91	79	54	55
Rolling Stock Lease	393	186	78	44	57	28
Security - Sheriff	5,847	3,289	1,295	471	650	142
Security - Guards	2,122	999	365	317	219	222
Supplemental Additional Security	732	348	196	71	97	20
Public Safety Program	339	160	58	51	35	36
Passenger Relations	2,195	1,091	556	202	270	76
TVM Maintenance/Revenue Collection	7,951	3,215	1,812	1,286	1,170	468
Marketing	1,294	664	314	115	159	42
Media & External Communications	420	198	72	63	43	44
Utilities/Leases	2,947	1,387	507	440	304	309
Transfers to Other Operators	6,978	3,754	1,620	560	811	233
Amtrak Transfers	1,485	467	945	-	-	74
Station Maintenance	1,739	1,064	264	109	224	78
Rail Agreements	6,633	2,187	1,926	1,647	516	357
<b>Subtotal Operations &amp; Services</b>	<b>161,123</b>	<b>79,817</b>	<b>39,042</b>	<b>18,140</b>	<b>17,627</b>	<b>6,497</b>
<b><u>Maintenance-of-Way</u></b>						
MoW - Line Segments	40,516	21,180	8,085	3,125	5,811	2,315
MoW - Extraordinary Maintenance	1,580	909	384	17	169	101
<b>Subtotal Maintenance-of-Way</b>	<b>42,096</b>	<b>22,089</b>	<b>8,469</b>	<b>3,142</b>	<b>5,980</b>	<b>2,416</b>
<b><u>Administration &amp; Services</u></b>						
Ops Salaries & Fringe Benefits	14,873	6,999	2,570	2,216	1,535	1,553
Ops Non-Labor Expenses	5,712	2,901	1,110	702	643	356
Indirect Administrative Expenses	16,451	7,742	2,831	2,458	1,696	1,724
Ops Professional Services	1,926	906	331	288	199	202
<b>Subtotal Admin &amp; Services</b>	<b>38,962</b>	<b>18,549</b>	<b>6,843</b>	<b>5,663</b>	<b>4,072</b>	<b>3,835</b>
<b><u>Contingency (Non-Train Ops)</u></b>	<b>533</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Total Operating Expenses</b>	<b>242,714</b>	<b>120,706</b>	<b>54,445</b>	<b>27,024</b>	<b>27,734</b>	<b>12,804</b>

**Insurance Expense/(Revenue)**

Liability/Property/Auto	13,355	6,942	3,170	1,309	1,500	434
Claims / SI	3,183	1,654	756	312	357	103
Claims Administration	1,271	661	302	125	143	41
PLPD Revenue	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Net Insurance Expense</b>	<b>17,809</b>	<b>9,257</b>	<b>4,228</b>	<b>1,745</b>	<b>2,000</b>	<b>579</b>
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>260,523</b>	<b>129,963</b>	<b>58,673</b>	<b>28,770</b>	<b>29,734</b>	<b>13,383</b>
<b>Total Loss</b>	<b>(152,689)</b>	<b>(76,288)</b>	<b>(30,824)</b>	<b>(19,301)</b>	<b>(16,171)</b>	<b>(10,105)</b>

**Member Subsidies**

Operations	134,880	67,031	26,596	17,556	14,171	9,527
Insurance	17,809	9,257	4,228	1,745	2,000	579
<b>Member Subsidies</b>	<b>152,689</b>	<b>76,288</b>	<b>30,824</b>	<b>19,301</b>	<b>16,171</b>	<b>10,105</b>

<b>Surplus / (Deficit)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
----------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

FY 2017 REDUCED REHABILITATION PROJECT PROPOSALS AS PRESENTED AT THE BOARD WORKSHOP 4/28/16 - WITH CHANGES MARKED

Metrolink

Attachement H-1  
"before" with markup

Line	Asset Type	Subdiv	Project Type	TOTAL	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	Other
1	Structures	Valley	Bridge rehab 35.75, and design 10 bridges	\$4,020,800	\$4,020,800					
2	Structures	Valley	Culvert rehab (design for rplce up to 21 culverts)	\$867,860	\$867,860					
3	Structures	Valley	ROW Grading	\$100,000	\$100,000					
4	Structures	Ventura-VC	Bridge rehab 438.89, design 434.12 & 436.96	\$2,049,600					\$909,600	\$1,140,000
5	Structures	Ventura-VC	Culvert rehab MP 436.56	\$490,000					\$490,000	
6	Structures	Ventura-LA	Bridge design 2 bridges 458.71 & 452.1	\$616,000	\$616,000					
7	Structures	Ventura-LA	ROW Grading	\$100,000	\$100,000					
8	Structures	Orange	Bridge rehab	\$0		\$0				
9	Structures	Orange	Culvert rehab MP 201.4	\$385,000		\$385,000				
10	Structures	Orange	ROW Grading	\$100,000		\$100,000				
11	Structures	San Gabriel	Culvert rehab (Re-entered in Line 74)	\$0	\$0			\$0		
12	Structures	San Gabriel	ROW Grading	\$100,000	\$60,000			\$40,000		
13	Structures	River	ROW Grading	\$50,000	\$23,750	\$9,900	\$5,550	\$7,200	\$3,600	
14	Structures	Montalvo-W	Culvert rehab MP 404.65	\$210,000					\$210,000	
15	<b>Sub-Total Structures</b>			<b>\$9,089,259</b>	<b>\$5,788,410</b>	<b>\$494,900</b>	<b>\$5,550</b>	<b>\$47,200</b>	<b>\$1,613,200</b>	<b>\$1,140,000</b>
16	Track	Ventura-VC	Replace rail curve 437.76 (1636') plus 500' tangent	\$333,217					\$333,217	
17	Track	Ventura-LA	Transpose Curve 442.58 (1520'), Curve 442.96 (1368')	\$684,372	\$684,372					
18	Track	Ventura-LA	Replace Ties rated 3 (Poor Cond) and 4 (Failed)	\$1,007,500	\$1,007,500					
19	Track	Valley	Replace rail M1 4.62 (1026'), S 16.85 (263'), 61.20	\$1,817,400	\$1,817,400					
20	Track	Valley	Replace Ties rated 3 (Poor Cond) and 4 (Failed)	\$3,120,000	\$3,120,000					
			<b>REVISE TO</b>	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000					
21	Track	River*	WB-MT4 Transpose Curve 143.03 (2021'), Lead 3 MP	\$5,507,256	\$1,071,864	\$446,798	\$250,478	\$324,944	\$162,472	\$3,250,701
22	Track	River*	Replace 5,000 Ties for River EB, 3600 Spread across r	\$3,899,216	\$943,442	\$393,266	\$220,468	\$286,012	\$143,006	\$1,913,022
23	Track	San Gabriel	Upgrade aged worn 115/119 lb rail to 136 lb rail MP 4	\$1,500,000	\$900,000			\$600,000		
24	Track	San Gabriel	Upgrade aged and worn 119 lb rail to 136 lb rail MP 3	\$2,250,000	\$1,350,000			\$900,000		
25	Track	Orange	Upgrade worn 115 lb rail with 136 lb rail from MP	\$6,912,120		\$6,912,120				
26	<b>Sub-Total Rail &amp; Ties</b>			<b>\$27,031,081</b>	<b>\$10,894,578</b>	<b>\$7,752,184</b>	<b>\$470,945</b>	<b>\$2,110,956</b>	<b>\$638,695</b>	<b>\$5,163,723</b>
			* Reference Engr dept estimates for UPRR share.							
27	Track	Ventura-LA	Turnouts & special trackwork	\$900,000	\$900,000					
28	Track	Valley	Turnouts & special trackwork	\$400,000	\$400,000					
29	Track	San Gabriel	Turnouts & special trackwork	\$1,000,000	\$600,000			\$400,000		
30	Track	River	Turnouts & special trackwork	\$1,000,000	\$475,000	\$198,000	\$111,000	\$144,000	\$72,000	
31	<b>Sub-Total Turnouts &amp; Trackwork</b>			<b>\$3,300,000</b>	<b>\$2,375,000</b>	<b>\$198,000</b>	<b>\$111,000</b>	<b>\$544,000</b>	<b>\$72,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>
32	Signals	Olive	Train control & grade xing signal rehab	\$450,000		\$450,000				
33	Signals	Orange	Train control & grade xing signal rehab	\$450,000		\$450,000				
34	Signals	Ventura-VC	Train control rehab	\$200,000					\$200,000	
35	Signals	Ventura-LA	Train control rehab	\$200,000	\$200,000					
36	Signals	Valley	Train control & grade xing signal rehab	\$700,000	\$700,000					
			<b>REVISE TO</b>	\$350,000	\$350,000					

Attachment: REVISED - FY2016-17 Preliminary Budget for Transmittal - 05-23-16 (2879 : Southern California Regional Rail Authority

FY 2017 REDUCED REHABILITATION PROJECT PROPOSALS AS PRESENTED AT THE BOARD WORKSHOP 4/28/16 - WITH CHANGES MARKED

Metrolink

Attachement H-1  
"before" with markup

Line	Asset Type	Subdiv	Project Type	TOTAL	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	Other
37	Signals	Pasadena	<del>Train control rehab</del>	\$200,000	\$200,000					
38	Signals	San Gabriel	Train control rehab	\$400,000	\$240,000			\$160,000		
39	Signals	PVL	<del>Grade xing signal rehab</del>	\$250,000			\$250,000			
40	Signals	East Bank	Train control rehab	\$500,000	\$74,100	\$30,888	\$17,316	\$22,464	\$11,232	\$344,000
41	Signals	River	Grade xing signal rehab	\$250,000	\$118,750	\$49,500	\$27,750	\$36,000	\$18,000	
42	Signals	Systemwide	Train control rehab	\$75,000	\$35,625	\$14,850	\$8,325	\$10,800	\$5,400	
43			<b>Sub-Total Signals</b>	<b>\$3,675,000</b>	<b>\$1,568,475</b>	<b>\$995,238</b>	<b>\$303,391</b>	<b>\$229,264</b>	<b>\$234,632</b>	<b>\$344,000</b>
44	Comm & PTC	Olive	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$150,000		\$150,000				
45	Comm & PTC	Orange	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$150,000		\$150,000				
46	Comm & PTC	Ventura-VC	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$237,500					\$237,500	
47	Comm & PTC	Ventura-LA	<del>Wayside comm &amp; CIS rehab</del>	\$87,500	\$87,500					
48	Comm & PTC	Valley	<del>Wayside comm &amp; CIS rehab</del>	\$325,000	\$325,000					
49	Comm & PTC	San Gabriel	<del>Wayside comm &amp; CIS rehab</del>	\$175,000	\$105,000			\$70,000		
50	Comm & PTC	PVL	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$125,000			\$125,000			
51	Comm & PTC	East Bank	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$123,130	\$18,248	\$7,606	\$4,264	\$5,532	\$2,766	\$84,713
52	Comm & PTC	Systemwide	<del>On-Board PTC systems</del>	\$1,100,000	\$522,500	\$217,800	\$122,100	\$158,400	\$79,200	
53	Comm & PTC	Systemwide	Back office PTC systems	\$2,598,000	\$1,234,050	\$514,404	\$288,378	\$374,112	\$187,056	
54			<b>Sub-Total Comm &amp; PTC</b>	<b>\$5,071,130</b>	<b>\$2,292,298</b>	<b>\$1,039,810</b>	<b>\$539,742</b>	<b>\$608,044</b>	<b>\$506,522</b>	<b>\$84,713</b>
55			<b>TOTAL Infrastructure</b>	<b>\$48,166,470</b>	<b>\$22,918,760</b>	<b>\$10,480,133</b>	<b>\$1,430,628</b>	<b>\$3,539,464</b>	<b>\$3,065,049</b>	<b>\$6,732,436</b>
56	Rolling Stock	Systemwide	<del>Sentinel Rail Car Comprehensive Overhaul</del>	\$40,500,000	\$7,371,525	\$3,072,762	\$1,722,609	\$2,234,736	\$1,117,368	\$24,981,000
57	Rolling Stock	Systemwide	Sentinel HVAC Overhaul	\$975,000	\$463,125	\$193,050	\$108,225	\$140,400	\$70,200	
58	Rolling Stock	Systemwide	<del>Sentinel LED Lighting Replacement</del>	\$1,170,000	\$555,750	\$231,660	\$129,870	\$168,480	\$84,240	
59	Rolling Stock	Systemwide	<del>Rotem Coupler Overhaul (44 cars)</del>	\$3,500,000	\$1,662,500	\$693,000	\$388,500	\$504,000	\$252,000	
60			<b>Sub-Total Rolling Stock</b>	<b>\$46,145,000</b>	<b>\$10,052,900</b>	<b>\$4,190,472</b>	<b>\$2,349,204</b>	<b>\$3,047,616</b>	<b>\$1,523,808</b>	<b>\$24,981,000</b>
61	Facilities	Systemwide	<del>Material Handling Equipment</del>	\$405,038	\$192,393	\$80,197	\$44,959	\$58,325	\$29,163	
62	Facilities	Systemwide	CMF Elevator Modernization	\$140,185	\$66,588	\$27,757	\$15,561	\$20,187	\$10,093	
63	Facilities	Systemwide	CMF Drainage Re-direction	\$1,593,900	\$757,103	\$315,592	\$176,923	\$229,522	\$114,761	
64	Facilities	Systemwide	EMF Parking & Track Lighting	\$586,600	\$300,253	\$125,158	\$70,164	\$91,024	\$0	
65	Vehicles	Systemwide	<del>3 Hy-Rails, 2 MOW, 1 gang truck</del>	\$670,475	\$318,476	\$132,754	\$74,423	\$96,548	\$48,274	
66			<b>Sub-Total Facilities &amp; Vehicles</b>	<b>\$3,396,198</b>	<b>\$1,634,812</b>	<b>\$681,458</b>	<b>\$382,030</b>	<b>\$495,606</b>	<b>\$202,291</b>	<b>\$0</b>
67	IT	Systemwide	<del>Replace switch equipment</del>	\$249,700	\$118,608	\$49,441	\$27,717	\$35,957	\$17,978	
68	IT	Systemwide	<del>Enhance VM Infrastructure</del>	\$539,000	\$256,025	\$106,722	\$59,829	\$77,616	\$38,808	
69	IT	Systemwide	<del>Desktop management systems</del>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
70			<b>Sub-Total IT</b>	<b>\$788,700</b>	<b>\$374,633</b>	<b>\$156,163</b>	<b>\$87,546</b>	<b>\$113,573</b>	<b>\$56,786</b>	<b>\$0</b>
70.5	Facilities	Systemwide	LAUPT Platform & Canopy Upgrades	\$2,700,000	\$987,525	\$411,642	\$230,769	\$299,376	\$149,688	\$621,000

Attachment: REVISED - FY2016-17 Preliminary Budget for Transmittal - 05-23-16 (2879 : Southern California Regional Rail Authority

FY 2017 REDUCED REHABILITATION PROJECT PROPOSALS AS PRESENTED AT THE BOARD WORKSHOP 4/28/16 - WITH CHANGES MARKED

Metrolink

Attachement H-1  
"before" with markup

Line	Asset Type	Subdiv	Project Type	TOTAL	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	Other
			REVISE TO ONLY 2 PLATFORMS (2 & 3)	\$1,266,000	\$475,000	\$198,000	\$111,000	\$144,000	\$72,000	\$266,000
71			<b>TOTAL Other Assets</b>	<b>\$53,029,898</b>	<b>\$13,049,870</b>	<b>\$5,439,735</b>	<b>\$3,049,548</b>	<b>\$3,956,171</b>	<b>\$1,932,573</b>	<b>\$25,602,000</b>
<b>LA Co; LA County Portion of FY 2016 San Gabriel Sub projects (Required to match SANBAG funding already approved in FY 2016):</b>										
72	Comm	San Gabriel	Comm system rehab	\$105,000	\$105,000			\$0		
73	Signal	San Gabriel	Signal system rehab	\$594,000	\$594,000			\$0		
74	Structures	San Gabriel	Rehab culvert 28.23	\$120,000	\$120,000			\$0		
75	Structures	San Gabriel	ROW grading/ditching	\$48,000	\$48,000			\$0		
76	Track	San Gabriel	Rail grinding	\$119,700	\$119,700			\$0		
77	Track	San Gabriel	Tie rehab, turnout replace, track panels @ Grand, pe	\$1,185,600	\$1,185,600			\$0		
78			<b>Sub-Total LA Portion of FY 2016</b>	<b>\$2,172,300</b>	<b>\$2,172,300</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
79	<b>REHAB PROJECT PROPOSALS</b>	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>\$103,368,668</b>	<b>\$38,140,930</b>	<b>\$15,919,868</b>	<b>\$4,480,177</b>	<b>\$7,495,635</b>	<b>\$4,997,622</b>	<b>\$32,334,436</b>
			<b>New Totals</b>	\$29,779,628	\$9,991,444	\$10,215,192	\$1,284,374	\$1,664,052	\$2,876,831	\$3,747,735

**FUNDING:**

Notes:

- 1) "Other" funds in FY 2017 are anticipated from CalTrans UPRR, and Amtrak
- 2) \$43,268 of projected UPRR budget was removed from FY 2016
- 3) Platform Repair not in original presentation are included here.

Attachment: REVISED - FY2016-17 Preliminary Budget for Transmittal - 05-23-16 (2879 : Southern California Regional Rail Authority

FY 2017 REDUCED REHABILITATION PROJECT PROPOSALS AS PRESENTED AT THE BOARD WORKSHOP 4/28/16 - WITH CHANGES

Metrolink

Attachment H-2  
After reductions

Line	Asset Type	Subdiv	Project Type	TOTAL	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	Other
2	Structures	Valley	Culvert rehab (design to replce up to 21 culverts)	\$867,860	\$867,860					
4	Structures	Ventura-VC	Bridge rehab 438.89, design 434.12 & 436.96	\$2,049,600					\$909,600	\$1,140,000
5	Structures	Ventura-VC	Culvert rehab MP 436.56	\$490,000					\$490,000	
9	Structures	Orange	Culvert rehab MP 201.4	\$385,000		\$385,000				
10	Structures	Orange	ROW Grading	\$100,000		\$100,000				
15	<b>Sub-Total Structures</b>			<b>\$3,892,460</b>	<b>\$867,860</b>	<b>\$485,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,399,600</b>	<b>\$1,140,000</b>
16	Track	Ventura-VC	Replace rail curve 437.76 (1636') plus 500' tangent	\$333,217					\$333,217	
20	Track	Valley	Replace Ties rated 3 (Poor Cond) and 4 (Failed)	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000					
22	Track	River*	Replace 5,000 Ties for River EB, 3600 Spread across rest o	\$3,899,216	\$943,442	\$393,266	\$220,468	\$286,012	\$143,006	\$1,913,022
25	Track	Orange	Upgrade worn 115 lb rail with 136 lb rail from MP 201.1-	\$6,912,120		\$6,912,120				
26	<b>Sub-Total Rail &amp; Ties</b>			<b>\$12,544,553</b>	<b>\$2,343,442</b>	<b>\$7,305,386</b>	<b>\$220,468</b>	<b>\$286,012</b>	<b>\$476,223</b>	<b>\$1,913,022</b>
* Reference Engr dept estimates for UPRR share.										
30	Track	River	Turnouts & special trackwork	\$1,000,000	\$475,000	\$198,000	\$111,000	\$144,000	\$72,000	
31	<b>Sub-Total Turnouts &amp; Trackwork</b>			<b>\$1,000,000</b>	<b>\$475,000</b>	<b>\$198,000</b>	<b>\$111,000</b>	<b>\$144,000</b>	<b>\$72,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>
32	Signals	Olive	Train control & grade xing signal rehab	\$450,000		\$450,000				
34	Signals	Ventura-VC	Train control rehab	\$200,000					\$200,000	
36	Signals	Valley	Train control & grade xing signal rehab	\$350,000	\$350,000					
38	Signals	San Gabriel	Train control rehab	\$400,000	\$240,000			\$160,000		
40	Signals	East Bank	Train control rehab	\$500,000	\$74,100	\$30,888	\$17,316	\$22,464	\$11,232	\$344,000
41	Signals	River	Grade xing signal rehab	\$250,000	\$118,750	\$49,500	\$27,750	\$36,000	\$18,000	
42	Signals	Systemwide	Train control rehab	\$75,000	\$35,625	\$14,850	\$8,325	\$10,800	\$5,400	
43	<b>Sub-Total Signals</b>			<b>\$2,225,000</b>	<b>\$818,475</b>	<b>\$545,238</b>	<b>\$53,391</b>	<b>\$229,264</b>	<b>\$234,632</b>	<b>\$344,000</b>
44	Comm & PTC	Olive	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$150,000		\$150,000				
45	Comm & PTC	Orange	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$150,000		\$150,000				
46	Comm & PTC	Ventura-VC	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$237,500					\$237,500	
50	Comm & PTC	PVL	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$125,000			\$125,000			
51	Comm & PTC	East Bank	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$123,130	\$18,248	\$7,606	\$4,264	\$5,532	\$2,766	\$84,713
53	Comm & PTC	Systemwide	Back office PTC systems	\$2,598,000	\$1,234,050	\$514,404	\$288,378	\$374,112	\$187,056	
54	<b>Sub-Total Comm &amp; PTC</b>			<b>\$3,383,630</b>	<b>\$1,252,298</b>	<b>\$822,010</b>	<b>\$417,642</b>	<b>\$379,644</b>	<b>\$427,322</b>	<b>\$84,713</b>
55	<b>TOTAL Infrastructure</b>			<b>\$23,045,643</b>	<b>\$5,757,075</b>	<b>\$9,355,635</b>	<b>\$802,501</b>	<b>\$1,038,920</b>	<b>\$2,609,777</b>	<b>\$3,481,735</b>
57	Rolling Stock	Systemwide	Sentinel HVAC Overhaul	\$975,000	\$463,125	\$193,050	\$108,225	\$140,400	\$70,200	
60	<b>Sub-Total Rolling Stock</b>			<b>\$975,000</b>	<b>\$463,125</b>	<b>\$193,050</b>	<b>\$108,225</b>	<b>\$140,400</b>	<b>\$70,200</b>	<b>\$0</b>
62	Facilities	Systemwide	CMF Elevator Modernization	\$140,185	\$66,588	\$27,757	\$15,561	\$20,187	\$10,093	
63	Facilities	Systemwide	CMF Drainage Re-direction	\$1,593,900	\$757,103	\$315,592	\$176,923	\$229,522	\$114,761	

Attachment: REVISED - FY2016-17 Preliminary Budget for Transmittal - 05-23-16 (2879 : Southern California Regional Rail Authority Budget

FY 2017 REDUCED REHABILITATION PROJECT PROPOSALS AS PRESENTED AT THE BOARD WORKSHOP 4/28/16 - WITH CHANGES

Metrolink

Attachment H-2

After reductions

Line	Asset Type	Subdiv	Project Type	TOTAL	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	Other
64	Facilities	Systemwide	EMF Parking & Track Lighting	\$586,600	\$300,253	\$125,158	\$70,164	\$91,024	\$0	
66			<b>Sub-Total Facilities &amp; Vehicles</b>	<b>\$2,320,685</b>	<b>\$1,123,944</b>	<b>\$468,507</b>	<b>\$262,648</b>	<b>\$340,732</b>	<b>\$124,854</b>	<b>\$0</b>
70.5	Facilities	Systemwide	LAUPT Platform & Canopy Upgrades <b>REVISE TO ONLY 2 PLATFORMS (2 &amp; 3)</b>	\$1,266,000	\$475,000	\$198,000	\$111,000	\$144,000	\$72,000	\$266,000
71			<b>TOTAL Other Assets</b>	<b>\$4,561,685</b>	<b>\$2,062,069</b>	<b>\$859,557</b>	<b>\$481,873</b>	<b>\$625,132</b>	<b>\$267,054</b>	<b>\$266,000</b>
<b>LA County LA County Portion of FY 2016 San Gabriel Sub projects (Required to match SANBAG funding already approved in FY 2016):</b>										
72	Comm	San Gabriel	Comm system rehab	\$105,000	\$105,000			\$0		
73	Signal	San Gabriel	Signal system rehab	\$594,000	\$594,000			\$0		
74	Structures	San Gabriel	Rehab culvert 28.23	\$120,000	\$120,000			\$0		
75	Structures	San Gabriel	ROW grading/ditching	\$48,000	\$48,000			\$0		
76	Track	San Gabriel	Rail grinding	\$119,700	\$119,700			\$0		
77	Track	San Gabriel	Tie rehab, turnout replace, track panels @ Grand, ped xin	\$1,185,600	\$1,185,600			\$0		
78			<b>Sub-Total LA Portion of FY 2016</b>	<b>\$2,172,300</b>	<b>\$2,172,300</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
79	<b>REHAB PROJECT PROPOSALS</b>	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>\$29,779,628</b>	<b>\$9,991,444</b>	<b>\$10,215,192</b>	<b>\$1,284,374</b>	<b>\$1,664,052</b>	<b>\$2,876,831</b>	<b>\$3,747,735</b>

**FUNDING:**

Notes:

1) "Other" funds in FY 2017 are anticipated from CalTrans UPRR, and Amtrak

Attachment: REVISED - FY2016-17 Preliminary Budget for Transmittal - 05-23-16 (2879 : Southern California Regional Rail Authority Budget

ATTACHMENT "H-3"								
<b>FY2016-17 Rehabilitation New Authority Projects - Summary - by Subdivision</b>								
<i>(\$ Thousands)</i>								
Subdivision	Project Type	TOTAL	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	Other
Olive	Communication & PTC	150	-	150	-	-	-	-
Olive	Signals	450	-	450	-	-	-	-
Orange	Communication & PTC	150	-	150	-	-	-	-
Orange	Structures	485	-	485	-	-	-	-
Orange	Track	6,912	-	6,912	-	-	-	-
Perris Valley	Communication & PTC	125	-	-	125	-	-	-
San Gabriel	Communication & PTC	105	105	-	-	-	-	-
San Gabriel	Signals	994	834	-	-	160	-	-
San Gabriel	Structures	168	168	-	-	-	-	-
San Gabriel	Track	1,306	1,306	-	-	-	-	-
Valley	Signals	350	350	-	-	-	-	-
Valley	Structures	868	868	-	-	-	-	-
Valley	Track	1,400	1,400	-	-	-	-	-
Ventura-VC	Communication & PTC	238	-	-	-	-	238	-
Ventura-VC	Signals	200	-	-	-	-	200	-
Ventura-VC	Structures	2,540	-	-	-	-	1,400	1,140
Ventura-VC	Track	333	-	-	-	-	333	-
East Bank	Communication & PTC	123	18	8	4	5	3	85
East Bank	Signals	500	74	31	17	22	11	344
River	Signals	250	119	50	28	36	18	-
River	Track	4,899	1,418	591	332	430	215	1,913
Systemwide	Communication & PTC	2,598	1,234	515	288	374	187	-
Systemwide	Facilities	3,586	1,599	666	373	485	197	266
Systemwide	Rolling Stock	975	463	193	108	141	70	-
Systemwide	Signals	75	36	15	8	11	5	-
<b>CURRENT PROPOSED FY2016-17 REHAB BUDGET</b>		<b>29,779</b>	<b>9,991</b>	<b>10,215</b>	<b>1,284</b>	<b>1,664</b>	<b>2,877</b>	<b>3,748</b>
<b>ROTEM SETTLEMENT AMOUNTS (YEAR 5)</b>		-	1,936	(3,773)	500	1,000	337	-
<b>TOTAL PROPOSED FY 2016-17 REHAB BUDGET</b>		<b>29,779</b>	<b>11,927</b>	<b>6,442</b>	<b>1,784</b>	<b>2,664</b>	<b>3,214</b>	<b>3,748</b>
<b>PRIOR YEAR CARRYOVERS</b>		<b>37,863</b>	<b>8,148</b>	<b>16,199</b>	<b>2,070</b>	<b>5,069</b>	<b>3,550</b>	<b>2,827</b>
<b>TOTAL FY 16-17 AUTHORITY INCLUDING CARRYOVERS</b>		<b>67,643</b>	<b>20,075</b>	<b>22,641</b>	<b>3,854</b>	<b>7,733</b>	<b>6,764</b>	<b>6,575</b>

Attachment: REVISED - FY2016-17 Preliminary Budget for Transmittal - 05-23-16 (2879 : Southern California Regional Rail Authority Budget Amendment for FY 2016/2017)

ATTACHMENT "I"

FY2016-17 Rehabilitation New Authority Projects - Detail

(\$ Thousands)

Project Title	Subdivision	Project Type	TOTAL	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	Other
Wayside comm & CIS rehab	Olive	Communication & PTC	150	-	150	-	-	-	-
Train control & grade xing signal rehab	Olive	Signals	450	-	450	-	-	-	-
Wayside comm & CIS rehab	Orange	Communication & PTC	150	-	150	-	-	-	-
Culvert rehab MP 201.4	Orange	Structures	385	-	385	-	-	-	-
ROW Grading	Orange	Structures	100	-	100	-	-	-	-
Orange Subdivision Rail Rehab Program	Orange	Track	6,912	-	6,912	-	-	-	-
Wayside comm & CIS rehab	PVL	Communication & PTC	125	-	-	125	-	-	-
Comm system rehab	San Gabriel	Communication	105	105	-	-	-	-	-
Signal system rehab	San Gabriel	Signal	594	594	-	-	-	-	-
Train control rehab	San Gabriel	Signals	400	240	-	-	160	-	-
Rehab culvert 28.23	San Gabriel	Structures	120	120	-	-	-	-	-
ROW grading/ditching	San Gabriel	Structures	48	48	-	-	-	-	-
Rail grinding	San Gabriel	Track	120	120	-	-	-	-	-
Tie rehab, turnout replace, track panels @ Grand, ped xing par	San Gabriel	Track	1,186	1,186	-	-	-	-	-
Train control & grade xing signal rehab	Valley	Signals	350	350	-	-	-	-	-
Culvert rehab (up to 21 pipe culverts)	Valley	Structures	868	868	-	-	-	-	-
Replace Ties rated 3 (Poor Cond) and 4 (Failed)	Valley	Track	1,400	1,400	-	-	-	-	-
Wayside comm & CIS rehab	Ventura-VC	Communication & PTC	238	-	-	-	-	238	-
Train control rehab	Ventura-VC	Signals	200	-	-	-	-	200	-
Bridge rehab 438.89, design 434.12 & 436.96	Ventura-VC	Structures	2,050	-	-	-	-	910	1,140
Culvert rehab MP 436.56	Ventura-VC	Structures	490	-	-	-	-	490	-
Replace rail curve 437.76 (1636') plus 500' tangent	Ventura-VC	Track	333	-	-	-	-	333	-
Wayside comm & CIS rehab	East Bank	Communication & PTC	123	18	8	4	5	3	85
Train control rehab	East Bank	Signals	500	74	31	17	22	11	344
Grade xing signal rehab	River	Signals	250	119	50	28	36	18	-
River Tie Rehabilitation	River	Track	3,899	943	393	220	286	143	1,913
Turnouts & special trackwork	River	Track	1,000	475	198	111	144	72	-
Back office PTC systems	Systemwide	Communication & PTC	2,598	1,234	514	288	374	187	-
CMF Drainage Re-direction	Systemwide	Facilities	1,594	757	315	177	230	115	-
CMF Elevator Modernization	Systemwide	Facilities	140	67	28	16	20	10	-
EMF Parking & Track Lighting	Systemwide	Facilities	587	300	125	70	91	-	-
Stabilizing Canopies and Platforms at LAUS	Systemwide	Facilities	1,266	475	198	111	144	72	266
Sentinel HVAC Overhaul	Systemwide	Rolling Stock	975	463	193	108	140	70	-
Train control rehab	Systemwide	Signals	75	36	15	8	11	5	-
<b>CURRENT PROPOSED FY2016-17 REHAB BUDGET (INCLUDING AMOUNTS UNALLOCATED IN FY2016)</b>			<b>\$29,779</b>	<b>\$9,991</b>	<b>\$10,215</b>	<b>\$1,284</b>	<b>\$1,664</b>	<b>\$2,877</b>	<b>\$3,748</b>
<b>ROTEM SETTLEMENT AMOUNTS (YEAR 5)</b>			-	\$1,936	-\$3,773	\$500	\$1,000	\$337	\$0
<b>TOTAL PROPOSED FY 2016-17 REHAB BUDGET</b>			29,779	11,927	6,442	1,784	2,664	3,214	3,748
<b>PRIOR YEAR CARRYOVERS</b>			37,863	8,148	16,199	2,070	5,069	3,550	2,827
<b>TOTAL FY 16-17 AUTHORITY INCLUDING CARRYOVERS</b>			67,643	20,075	22,641	3,854	7,733	6,764	6,575

Attachment: REVISED - FY2016-17 Preliminary Budget for Transmittal - 05-23-16 (2879 : Southern California Regional Rail Authority Budget Amendment for FY

ATTACHMENT "J"  
**FY2016-17 Rehabilitation Carryover Projects**  
*By subdivision and by category*  
 (\$ Thousands)

Subdivision	Category	Carryover June-16 - End	Metro	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	UPRR\PTMISEA	VCTC
	Communication	75	-	-	75	-	-	-
	Signal	175	-	-	175	-	-	-
	Track	322	-	-	322	-	-	-
<b>Olive Total</b>		<b>572</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	Communication	225	-	-	225	-	-	-
	Signal	1,710	-	-	1,710	-	-	-
	Signal & Communication	38	-	-	38	-	-	-
	Structures	7,328	-	-	7,328	-	-	-
	Track	3,967	-	-	3,967	-	-	-
<b>Orange Total</b>		<b>13,268</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>13,268</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	Signal & Communication	117	-	-	117	-	-	-
	Structures	490	-	-	490	-	-	-
<b>Orange &amp; Olive Total</b>		<b>607</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>607</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	Signal & Communication	62	62	-	-	-	-	-
	Track	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pasadena Total</b>		<b>63</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	Communication	125	-	-	125	-	-	-
	Signal	790	-	-	790	-	-	-
<b>PVL</b>		<b>915</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>915</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	Track	300	-	-	-	300	-	-
<b>Redlands Total</b>		<b>300</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	Facilities	172	-	-	172	-	-	-
<b>Riverside Total</b>		<b>172</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	Communication	70	-	-	-	70	-	-
	Signal	396	-	-	-	396	-	-
	Signal & Communication	2,344	1,406	-	-	938	-	-
	Structures	112	-	-	-	112	-	-
	Track	2,226	351	-	-	1,874	-	-
<b>San Gabriel Total</b>		<b>5,148</b>	<b>1,758</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,390</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	Signal & Communication	538	538	-	-	-	-	-
	Structures	109	109	-	-	-	-	-
	Track	317	317	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Valley Total</b>		<b>964</b>	<b>964</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	Signal & Communication	892	892	-	-	-	-	-
	Structures	83	83	-	-	-	-	-
	Track	17	17	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Ventura (LA Co) Total</b>		<b>991</b>	<b>991</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	Signal	245	-	-	-	-	-	245
	Signal & Communication	469	-	-	-	-	-	469
	Structures	1,681	-	-	-	-	-	1,681
	Track	523	-	-	-	-	-	523
<b>Ventura (Ven Co) Total</b>		<b>2,918</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,918</b>
	Signal & Communication	756	359	150	84	109	-	54
	Structures	125	59	25	14	18	-	9
	Track	1,928	285	119	67	87	1,327	43
<b>River Total</b>		<b>2,809</b>	<b>704</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>1,327</b>	<b>107</b>
	Equipment	351	173	67	38	49	-	24

Attachment: REVISED - FY2016-17 Preliminary Budget for Transmittal - 05-23-16 (2879 : Southern California Regional Rail Authority Budget Amendment for FY 2016/2017)

Facilities	1,484	707	295	165	214	-	102
IT	1,369	650	271	152	197	-	99
Mechanical	2,338	1,111	463	260	337	-	168
Other	5	4	1	0	0	-	0
Rolling Stock	1,500	-	-	-	-	1,500	-
Security	500	238	99	56	72	-	36
Signal & Communication	1,354	676	216	121	262	-	79
Track	236	112	47	26	34	-	17
<b>Systemwide Total</b>	<b>9,137</b>	<b>3,670</b>	<b>1,459</b>	<b>818</b>	<b>1,166</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>525</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>37,863</b>	<b>8,148</b>	<b>16,199</b>	<b>2,070</b>	<b>5,069</b>	<b>2,827</b>	<b>3,550</b>

## ATTACHMENT "K"

## FY 2017-18 NEW AUTHORITY REHABILITATION PROJECTS

## PROJECTS BY SUBDIVISION (\$Thousands)

Subdivision	Project Type	Proposed Rehabilitation Projects
All	Facilities	Station Signage Rehab
All	Facilities	Customer Information System Replacement at Stations
All	Communication & PTC	SCRRRA Positive Train Control Lab Systems Support and Testing
All	Communication & PTC	Backoffice Hardware & Software Replacement (DOC & MOC)
All	Communication & PTC	SCRRRA Production Backoffice Systems Upgrades and Testing Support
All	Signals	Rehab AC Units
All	Signals	Rehab Signal Maint Vehicles
All	Business Systems	Vehicle Track Interaction
All	Track	San Gabriel Grade Cross Rehab
All	Business Systems	Systemwide
All	Communication & PTC	PTC Update & Repairs
All	Business Systems	Systemwide Rail Grinding
All	Vehicles	MOW VEHICLE REPLACEMENT
PVL	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
Olive	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables
Olive	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
Olive	Track	Olive Sub Cross Rehab
Olive	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace Olive
Olive	Track	OLIVE CROSSTIE REHAB
Orange	Signals	C&S Corrosion Mitigation
Orange	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables
Orange	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
Orange	Track	Orange Sub Turnout Replace
Orange	Track	Orange Sub Crossing Replacement
Orange	Structures	Orange Sub Culvert Replace
Orange	Structures	Orange Sub ROW Maint
Orange	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace Orange
Orange	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Mitigation Orange
Orange	Business Systems	Wysde Com Replace OrangeOlive
Orange	Track	Orange Track Rehab
Pasadena	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
Pasadena	Signals	Pole Line Rehab
Pasadena	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
River	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
River	Signals	Signal System Rehab
River	Signals	Signal System Rehab
River	Signals	CP Dayton Signal Sys Rehab
River	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables
River	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace River
River	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Mitigation River
River	Track	RIVER TRACK REHAB
River	Track	RIVER CROSSTIE REHAB
River Sub - East Bank	Track	River East Turnout Replacement
River Sub - East Bank	Facilities	REPLACE PUBLIC ADDRESS SYSTEM

San Gabriel - LA County	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
San Gabriel - LA County	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables
San Gabriel - LA County	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables
San Gabriel - LA County	Structures	San Gabriel LA Sub ROW Maint
San Gabriel - LA County	Track	San Gab Track Rehab LA
San Gabriel - LA County	Track	SAN GAB CROSSTIE REHAB
San Gabriel - SB County	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables
San Gabriel - SB County	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
San Gabriel - SB County	Structures	San Gabriel Bridge Replace
San Gabriel - SB County	Structures	San Gabriel SB Sub ROW Maint
San Gabriel - SB County	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace San Gab
San Gabriel - SB County	Track	San Gab Track Rehab SB
San Jacinto (PVL)	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace PVL
San Jacinto (PVL)	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Mitigation PVL
San Jacinto (PVL)	Track	PERRIS VALLEY TRACK REHAB
Valley	Track	Valley Tie Rehabilitation
Valley	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
Valley	Signals	Signal System Rehab
Valley	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables
Valley	Track	Valley Sub Turnout Replacement
Valley	Track	Valley Sub Cross Replacement
Valley	Structures	Valley Bdrge Desgn Constrct
Valley	Structures	Valley Culvert Replace/Abandon
Valley	Structures	Valley Sub Culvert Replace
Valley	Structures	Valley Sub Row Maint
Valley	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace Valley
Valley	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Mitigation Valley
Valley	Business Systems	Rehab Update CIS Valley
Valley	Track	Valley Track Rehab
Valley	Track	VALLEY CROSSTIE REHAB
Valley	Track	TUNNEL REHAB
Ventura - LA County	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
Ventura - LA County	Signals	Signal System Rehab
Ventura - LA County	Track	Ventura Sub Grade Cross Rehab
Ventura - LA County	Structures	Ventura (LA) Sub ROW Maint
Ventura - LA County	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace Ventura - LA
Ventura - LA County	Business Systems	Wayside Mtigation Ventura LA
Ventura - LA County	Track	VENTURA TRACK REHAB LA
Ventura - LA County	Track	VENTURA CROSSTIE REHAB LA
Ventura - VC County	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
Ventura - VC County	Signals	Signal System Rehab
Ventura - VC County	Structures	Ventura Sub Bridge Replace
Ventura - VC County	Business Systems	Rehab CIS Ventura

Ventura - VC County	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace Ventura
Ventura - VC County	Business Systems	Wayside Mtgation Ventura Ven
Ventura - VC County	Track	VENTURA TRACK REHAB VC
		PROPOSED FY 2017-18 REHAB BUDGET
		Deferred Rehab from FY17
		<b>TOTAL PROPOSED FY 2017-18 REHAB BUDGET</b>

TOTAL COST	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	OTHER
\$242	\$115	\$48	\$27	\$35	\$17	\$
\$1,276	\$606	\$253	\$142	\$184	\$92	\$
\$948	\$450	\$188	\$105	\$136	\$68	\$
\$1,130	\$537	\$224	\$125	\$163	\$81	\$
\$598	\$284	\$118	\$66	\$86	\$43	\$
\$237	\$113	\$47	\$26	\$34	\$17	\$
\$198	\$94	\$39	\$22	\$28	\$14	\$
\$68	\$32	\$13	\$7	\$10	\$5	\$
\$1,852	\$880	\$367	\$206	\$267	\$133	\$
\$449	\$213	\$89	\$50	\$65	\$32	\$
\$1,100	\$522	\$218	\$122	\$158	\$79	\$
\$1,091	\$518	\$216	\$121	\$157	\$79	\$
\$1,013	\$481	\$201	\$112	\$146	\$73	\$
\$250	\$	\$	\$250	\$	\$	\$
\$237	\$	\$237	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$500	\$	\$500	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$4,275	\$	\$4,275	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$75	\$	\$75	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$475	\$	\$475	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$162	\$	\$162	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$237	\$	\$237	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,030	\$	\$1,030	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,852	\$	\$1,852	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,781	\$	\$1,781	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,715	\$	\$1,715	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$210	\$	\$210	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$75	\$	\$75	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$125	\$	\$125	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$75	\$	\$75	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,624	\$	\$1,624	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,028	\$1,028	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$504	\$504	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,028	\$1,028	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$248	\$118	\$49	\$28	\$36	\$18	\$
\$1,006	\$478	\$199	\$112	\$145	\$72	\$
\$500	\$238	\$99	\$56	\$72	\$36	\$
\$1,498	\$712	\$297	\$166	\$216	\$108	\$
\$237	\$113	\$47	\$26	\$34	\$17	\$
\$100	\$48	\$20	\$11	\$14	\$7	\$
\$75	\$36	\$15	\$8	\$11	\$5	\$
\$1,160	\$551	\$230	\$129	\$167	\$84	\$
\$998	\$474	\$198	\$111	\$144	\$72	\$
\$4,703	\$2,234	\$931	\$522	\$677	\$339	\$
\$120	\$57	\$24	\$13	\$17	\$9	\$

Attachment: REVISED - FY2016-17 Preliminary Budget for Transmittal - 05-23-16 (2879 : Southern California Regional Rail Authority Budget

\$1,006	\$604	\$	\$	\$403	\$	\$
\$237	\$142	\$	\$	\$95	\$	\$
\$237	\$142	\$	\$	\$95	\$	\$
\$67	\$40	\$	\$	\$27	\$	\$
\$3,050	\$1,830	\$	\$	\$1,220	\$	\$
\$1,747	\$1,048	\$	\$	\$699	\$	\$
\$237	\$142	\$	\$	\$95	\$	\$
\$1,036	\$622	\$	\$	\$415	\$	\$
\$1,400	\$840	\$	\$	\$560	\$	\$
\$44	\$27	\$	\$	\$18	\$	\$
\$100	\$60	\$	\$	\$40	\$	\$
\$4,880	\$2,928	\$	\$	\$1,952	\$	\$
\$50	\$	\$	\$50	\$	\$	\$
\$75	\$	\$	\$75	\$	\$	\$
\$4,400	\$	\$	\$4,400	\$	\$	\$
\$7,458	\$7,458	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,028	\$1,028	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,000	\$1,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$237	\$237	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,589	\$1,589	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$2,223	\$2,223	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$6,370	\$6,370	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$420	\$420	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,820	\$1,820	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$224	\$224	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$100	\$100	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$75	\$75	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$150	\$150	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,855	\$1,855	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$3,320	\$3,320	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$10,000	\$10,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$998	\$998	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,006	\$1,006	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$855	\$855	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$224	\$224	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$50	\$50	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$38	\$38	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$750	\$750	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,603	\$1,603	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,018	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$1,018	\$
\$1,006	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$1,006	\$
\$3,850	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$3,850	\$
\$150	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$150	\$

Attachment: REVISED - FY2016-17 Preliminary Budget for Transmittal - 05-23-16 (2879 : Southern California Regional Rail Authority Budget

\$50	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$50	\$
\$38	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$38	\$
\$500	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$500	\$
\$106,672	\$64,276	\$18,576	\$7,089	\$8,618	\$8,112	\$
\$231,838	\$77,784	\$79,517	\$9,999	\$12,955	\$22,408	\$29,175
<b>\$338,509</b>	<b>\$142,060</b>	<b>\$98,092</b>	<b>\$17,088</b>	<b>\$21,573</b>	<b>\$30,521</b>	<b>\$29,175</b>

## ATTACHMENT "L"

## FY 2018-19 NEW AUTHORITY REHABILITATION PROJECTS

## PROJECTS BY SUBDIVISION (\$Thousands)

Subdivision	Project Type	Proposed Rehabilitation Projects	TOTAL COST	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	OTHER
All	Stations	Station Signage Rehab	\$242	\$115	\$48	\$27	\$35	\$17	\$
All	Stations	Customer Information System Replacement at Stations	\$1,276	\$606	\$253	\$142	\$184	\$92	\$
All	Backoffice	Backoffice Hardware & Software Replacement (DOC & MOC)	\$1,020	\$485	\$202	\$113	\$147	\$73	\$
All	Backoffice	SCRRA Production Backoffice Systems Upgrades and Testing Support	\$547	\$260	\$108	\$61	\$79	\$39	\$
All	Labratory Testing	SCRRA Positive Train Control Lab Systems Support and Testing	\$848	\$403	\$168	\$94	\$122	\$61	\$
All	Signals	Rehab AC Units	\$237	\$113	\$47	\$26	\$34	\$17	\$
All	Signals	Rehab Signal Maint Vehicles	\$198	\$94	\$39	\$22	\$28	\$14	\$
All	Track	Vehicle Track Interaction	\$68	\$32	\$13	\$7	\$10	\$5	\$
All	Business Systems	Systemwide	\$470	\$223	\$93	\$52	\$68	\$34	\$
All	Business Systems	Wayside Com Mitigation Valley	\$75	\$36	\$15	\$8	\$11	\$5	\$
All	Business Systems	PTC UPDATE & REPAIRS	\$1,100	\$522	\$218	\$122	\$158	\$79	\$
Olive	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables	\$237	\$	\$237	\$	\$	\$	\$
Olive	Grade Crossing	Grade Crossing Rehab	\$500	\$	\$500	\$	\$	\$	\$
Olive	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace Olive	\$75	\$	\$75	\$	\$	\$	\$
Orange	Signals	C&S Corrosion Mitigation	\$162	\$	\$162	\$	\$	\$	\$
Orange	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables	\$237	\$	\$237	\$	\$	\$	\$
Orange	Grade Crossing	Grade Crossing Rehab	\$1,030	\$	\$1,030	\$	\$	\$	\$
Orange	Business Systems	Orange Sub Bridge Replace	\$9,800	\$	\$9,800	\$	\$	\$	\$
Orange	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace Orange	\$75	\$	\$75	\$	\$	\$	\$
Orange	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Mitigation Orange	\$125	\$	\$125	\$	\$	\$	\$
Orange and Olive	Business Systems	Wayside Replace OrangeOlive	\$75	\$	\$75	\$	\$	\$	\$
Pasadena	Signals	Pole Line Rehab	\$504	\$504	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Pasadena	Grade Crossing	Grade Crossing Rehab	\$1,028	\$1,028	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Pasadena	Business Systems	Pasadena Sub Bridge Replace	\$1,120	\$1,120	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Redlands	Business Systems	Redlands Sub Bridge Replace	\$1,750	\$	\$	\$	\$1,750	\$	\$
River	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables	\$237	\$113	\$47	\$26	\$34	\$17	\$
River	Signals	Signal System Rehab	\$1,006	\$478	\$199	\$112	\$145	\$72	\$
River	Signals	Signal System Rehab	\$500	\$238	\$99	\$56	\$72	\$36	\$
River	Signals	CP Dayton Signal Sys Rehab	\$1,498	\$712	\$297	\$166	\$216	\$108	\$
River	Business Systems	River Sub Bridge Replace	\$28,000	\$13,300	\$5,544	\$3,108	\$4,032	\$2,016	\$
River	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace River	\$100	\$48	\$20	\$11	\$14	\$7	\$
River	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Mitigation River	\$75	\$36	\$15	\$8	\$11	\$5	\$
River Sub - East Bank	Business Systems	River East Turnout Replacement	\$2,137	\$1,015	\$423	\$237	\$308	\$154	\$
San Gabriel - LA County	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables	\$237	\$142	\$	\$	\$95	\$	\$
San Gabriel - LA County	Grade Crossing	Grade Crossing Rehab	\$1,006	\$604	\$	\$	\$403	\$	\$
San Gabriel - LA County	Business Systems	San Gabriel Grade Cross Reha	\$2,993	\$1,796	\$	\$	\$1,197	\$	\$
San Gabriel - LA County	Business Systems	San Gabriel LA Bridge Replace	\$770	\$462	\$	\$	\$308	\$	\$
San Gabriel - SB County	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables	\$237	\$142	\$	\$	\$95	\$	\$
San Gabriel - SB County	Grade Crossing	Grade Crossing Rehab	\$1,036	\$622	\$	\$	\$415	\$	\$
San Gabriel - SB County	Business Systems	San Gabriel Turnout Replace	\$2,422	\$1,453	\$	\$	\$969	\$	\$
San Gabriel - SB County	Business Systems	Wayside Com Mitigation San Gab	\$75	\$45	\$	\$	\$30	\$	\$
San Jacinto (PVL)	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace PVL	\$50	\$	\$	\$50	\$	\$	\$
San Jacinto (PVL)	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Mitigation PVL	\$75	\$	\$	\$75	\$	\$	\$
SB Shortway	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace San Gab	\$100	\$	\$	\$	\$100	\$	\$

Valley	Ties	Valley Tie Rehabilitation	\$7,458	\$7,458	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Valley	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables	\$237	\$237	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Valley	Grade Crossing	Grade Crossing Rehab	\$1,028	\$1,028	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Valley	Signals	Signal System Rehab	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Valley	Business Systems	Valley Sub Turnout Replacement	\$4,909	\$4,909	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Valley	Business Systems	Valley Sub Crossing Rehab	\$4,447	\$4,447	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Valley	Business Systems	Valley Sub Bridge Replace	\$15,260	\$15,260	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Valley	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace Valley	\$100	\$100	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Valley	Business Systems	Rehab CIS Valley	\$150	\$150	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
ventura - LA County	Grade Crossing	Grade Crossing Rehab	\$998	\$998	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
ventura - LA County	Signals	Signal System Rehab	\$1,006	\$1,006	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
ventura - LA County	Business Systems	Ventura Sub Grade Cross Rehab	\$2,850	\$2,850	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
ventura - LA County	Business Systems	Ventura LA Sub Bridge Replace	\$16,520	\$16,520	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
ventura - LA County	Business Systems	WAYSIDE COM REPLACE VENTURA	\$50	\$50	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
ventura - LA County	Business Systems	WAYSIDE COM MITIGATION VENTURA	\$38	\$38	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
ventura - VC County	Grade Crossing	Grade Crossing Rehab	\$1,018	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$1,018	\$
ventura - VC County	Signals	Signal System Rehab	\$1,006	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$1,006	\$
ventura - VC County	Business Systems	Ventura Sub Turnout Replace	\$4,909	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$4,909	\$
ventura - VC County	Business Systems	Rehab CIS Ventura Ven	\$150	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$150	\$
ventura - VC County	Business Systems	WAYSIDE COM REPLACE VENTURA	\$50	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$50	\$
ventura - VC County	Business Systems	WAYSIDE COM MITIGATION VENTURA	\$38	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$38	\$
PROPOSED FY 2018-19 REHAB BUDGET			\$128,574	\$82,794	\$20,164	\$4,524	\$11,068	\$10,024	\$
DEFERRED REHAB FROM FY17			\$231,838	\$77,784	\$79,517	\$9,999	\$12,955	\$22,408	\$29,175
<b>TOTAL PROPOSED FY 2018-19 REHAB BUDGET</b>			<b>\$360,412</b>	<b>\$160,578</b>	<b>\$99,681</b>	<b>\$14,523</b>	<b>\$24,022</b>	<b>\$32,433</b>	<b>\$29,175</b>

ATTACHMENT "M"

**FY2016-17 New Capital New Authority Projects**

*(\$ Thousands)*

Project Description	TOTAL BUDGET	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	OTHER
Project Studies	\$ 1,300	\$ 618	\$ 257	\$ 144	\$ 187	\$ 94	\$ -
<b>TOTAL FY 2016-17 AUTHORITY FOR NEW FUNDING</b>	<b>\$ 1,300</b>	<b>\$ 618</b>	<b>\$ 257</b>	<b>\$ 144</b>	<b>\$ 187</b>	<b>\$ 94</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>PRIOR YEAR CARRYOVERS</b>	<b>\$ 255,128</b>	<b>\$ 33,784</b>	<b>\$ 8,389</b>	<b>\$ 5,940</b>	<b>\$ 6,574</b>	<b>\$ 3,500</b>	<b>\$ 196,943</b>
<b>TOTAL FY 2016-17 AUTHORITY INCLUDING CARRYOVERS</b>	<b>\$ 256,428</b>	<b>\$ 34,402</b>	<b>\$ 8,646</b>	<b>\$ 6,084</b>	<b>\$ 6,761</b>	<b>\$ 3,593</b>	<b>\$ 196,943</b>

## ATTACHMENT "N"

**FY2016-17 New Capital Carryover Projects**

(\$Thousands)

Subdivision	Category	Project	Total Carryover	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	Lease\Other	State
San Gabriel & Valley	Track	860892	15,708	7,000	-	-	-	-	-	8,708
San Gabriel	Track	860885	345	-	-	-	245	-	100	-
San Gabriel	Track	860893	275	275	-	-	-	-	-	-
Valley	Structures	414002	9,330	4,656	-	-	-	-	-	4,674
Valley	Track and Structure	409006	5,009	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,009
Systemwide	IT	TBD	30,488	12,985	6,857	4,822	4,024	1,800	-	-
Systemwide	Rolling Stock	Various	7,208	4,096	-	-	785	-	-	2,326
Systemwide	Rolling Stock	613001	4,785	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,785
Systemwide	Rolling Stock	613003	10,050	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,050
Systemwide	Rolling Stock	613005	76,956	3,047	812	826	1,140	1,438	244	69,450
Systemwide	Rolling Stock	613006	267	-	-	-	-	-	-	267
Systemwide	Rolling Stock	616001	88,162	1,250	521	292	379	190	-	85,530
Systemwide	Other	TBD	745	475	198	-	-	72	-	-
Systemwide	Security	TBD	5,800	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,800
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>255,128</b>	<b>33,784</b>	<b>8,389</b>	<b>5,940</b>	<b>6,574</b>	<b>3,500</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>196,599</b>

## ATTACHMENT "O"

**New Capital Projects Proposed for Future Consideration**

For Future Consideration - Not Seeking Approval in the FY17 Budget - Funding Not Yet Identified				
Project Type	Subdivision	Project Name	Total Estimated Cost	Candidate Funding Sources - see key below
Communications	All	On-board Wireless Communications Network Phase I	\$10,164	4
Track	Valley	Palmdale Passing Siding	\$11,580	1,2,3,4
Stations	Ventura - LA County	Chatsworth Station Pedestrian Grade Separation	\$10,950	4,10, 5
Business Systems	All	Central Maintenance Facility West Entrance	\$11,699	1,2,4
Track	Valley	Second Main Track Between CP Humphreys and CP Lang	\$17,400	1,2,3,4
Structures	Ventura - VC County	Arroyo Simi 1st Crossing Scour Protection with Concrete Pile Collar and Debris Removal	\$1,120	4,7,8
Facilities	SB Shortway	Eastern Area Maintenance Facility Locomotive and Car Shop, Wheel Truer Machine, storage and S&I Tracks	\$60,181	1,2,4
Track	Valley	Brighton Siding Replacement	\$9,488	1,2,3,4
Structures	Valley	Verdugo Wash (8.12) Bridge Deck Replacement	\$1,485	4,7,8
Business Systems	All	Arroyo Seco (480.82) Bridge Replacement	\$10,462	4,7,8
PTC Systems	All	Interoperable Positive Train Control Rung II Non-Vital to Vital System Upgrade	\$10,500	4,9
Structures	Valley	CP Canyon Safe Access	\$215	4,7,8
Facilities	All	Purchase Hy-Rail Bucket Truck	\$198	4
Track	San Gabriel - LA County	CP Barranca to Lone Hill-Second Main Track-PSR and Environmental Clearance	\$1,101	1,2,4
Track	San Gabriel - SB County	CP Rochester to CP Nolan-Second Main Track-PSR and Environmental Clearance	\$1,101	1,2,4
Track	San Gabriel - LA County	CP Beech to CP Locust-Second Main Track-PSR and Environmental Clearance	\$1,690	1,2,4
Track	San Gabriel - LA County	CP Amar to CP Irvin-Second Main Track-PSR and Environmental Clearance	\$1,690	1,2,4
Facilities	Orange	Irvine Maintenance Facility Phase I	\$50,100	1,2,3,4
Business Systems	All	Automated Wheel and Brake Inspection	\$3,082	4
Business Systems	All	Automatic Passenger Counters	\$5,000	4,5,10
Communications	All	On-board Wireless Communications Network Phase II	\$9,144	
Facilities	SB Shortway	EMF ADDITIONAL UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	\$2,627	
Rolling Stock	All	Refurbish 9 passenger cars for expanded service**	\$6,075	
Communications	All	On-board Wireless Communications Network Phase III	\$9,144	
Rolling Stock	All	Refurbish 10 passenger cars for expanded service**	\$6,750	
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$252,944</b>	

Notes:

\*\* Total cost to refurbish a passenger car is \$1.35M/unit; the amount shown is 50% of the total cost as TIRCP grant is anticipated to cover the other 50%. Final allocation formula TBD

Funding Keys:

- 1 Federal Core Capacity
- 2 State Cap and Trade Transit & Intercity Rail Program
- 3 High Speed Rail Funding
- 4 Member Agency
- 5 State Interregional Rail Transportation Program

- 7 Federal FASTLANE
- 8 State Bonds
- 9 Federal PTC Commuter Rail
- 10 State Active Transportation Program

Exhibit 6.7  
CAPITAL SUMMARY AND CASH FLOW

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY  
ALL AGENCIES

(\$ Thousands)

FISCAL YEAR	REHABILITATION PROJECTS	NEW CAPITAL PROJECTS	TOTAL
2016/17 <sup>1</sup>	\$29,780	\$1,300	\$31,080
2017/18	\$338,509	\$	\$338,509
2018/19	\$360,412	\$	\$360,412
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$728,701</b>	<b>\$1,300</b>	<b>\$730,001</b>

1. Excludes prior year budget carryover amounts
2. Assumption for budget will be that the remainder of FY17 originally submitted rehab amount will be divided equally between FY18 and FY19.

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY CONSOLIDATED CASH FLOW BY FISCAL YEAR							
(\$ Thousands)							
BUDGET FISCAL YEAR	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	TOTAL
<b>2016/2017</b>							
REHABILITATION	\$9,968	\$18,010	\$1,786	\$16	\$	\$	\$29,780
NEW CAPITAL	\$324	\$649	\$327				\$1,300
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$10,292</b>	<b>\$18,659</b>	<b>\$2,113</b>	<b>\$16</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$31,080</b>
<b>2017/2018</b>							
REHABILITATION		\$125,720	\$198,763	\$13,903	\$123	\$	\$338,509
NEW CAPITAL		\$	\$				\$
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$125,720</b>	<b>\$198,763</b>	<b>\$13,903</b>	<b>\$123</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$338,509</b>
<b>2018/2019</b>							
REHABILITATION			\$120,169	\$193,278	\$46,843	\$123	\$360,412
NEW CAPITAL			\$				\$
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>			<b>\$120,169</b>	<b>\$193,278</b>	<b>\$46,843</b>	<b>\$123</b>	<b>\$360,412</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>							
REHABILITATION	\$9,968	\$143,731	\$320,718	\$207,196	\$46,965	\$123	\$728,701
NEW CAPITAL	\$324	\$649	\$327	\$	\$	\$	\$1,300
<b>TOTAL PROJECTED CASH FLOW BY FISCAL YEAR</b>	<b>\$10,292</b>	<b>\$144,380</b>	<b>\$321,045</b>	<b>\$207,196</b>	<b>\$46,965</b>	<b>\$123</b>	<b>\$730,001</b>
<b>PROJECT BUDGETS BY FISCAL YEAR</b>	<b>\$31,080</b>	<b>\$338,509</b>	<b>\$360,412</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Exhibit 6.7  
LACMTA- CAPITAL SUMMARY AND CASH FLOW

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY LACMTA			
(\$ Thousands)			
FISCAL YEAR	REHABILITATION PROJECTS	NEW CAPITAL PROJECTS	TOTAL
2016/17	\$9,991	\$618	
ROTEM SETTLEMENT	\$1,936		
<b>TOTAL 2016/17</b>	<b>\$11,927</b>	<b>\$618</b>	<b>\$12,545</b>
<b>2017/18</b>	<b>\$142,060</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$142,060</b>
<b>2018/19</b>	<b>\$160,578</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$160,578</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$314,566</b>	<b>\$618</b>	<b>\$315,183</b>

1. 17/18 AND 18/19 REHAB BUDGETS EXCLUDE ROTEM SETTLEMENT

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY LACMTA CASH FLOW BY FISCAL YEAR							
(\$ Thousands)							
BUDGET FISCAL YEAR	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	TOTAL
<b>2016/2017</b>							
REHABILITATION	\$2,704	\$6,691	\$581	\$16			\$9,991
ROTEM SETTLEMENT	\$648	\$1,171	\$116	\$1			\$1,936
NEW CAPITAL	\$154	\$308	\$155	\$			\$618
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,506</b>	<b>\$8,170</b>	<b>\$852</b>	<b>\$17</b>			<b>\$12,545</b>
<b>2017/2018</b>							
REHABILITATION		\$56,260	\$81,095	\$4,665	\$41		\$142,060
NEW CAPITAL		\$	\$	\$	\$		\$
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$56,260</b>	<b>\$81,095</b>	<b>\$4,665</b>	<b>\$41</b>		<b>\$142,060</b>
<b>2018/2019</b>							
REHABILITATION			\$55,130	\$79,658	\$25,748	\$41	\$160,578
NEW CAPITAL			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>			<b>\$55,130</b>	<b>\$79,658</b>	<b>\$25,748</b>	<b>\$41</b>	<b>\$160,578</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>							
REHABILITATION AND ROTEM	\$3,352	\$64,121	\$136,922	\$84,340	\$25,790	\$41	\$314,566
NEW CAPITAL	\$154	\$308	\$155	\$	\$	\$	\$618
<b>TOTAL PROJECTED CASH FLOW BY</b>	<b>\$3,506</b>	<b>\$64,430</b>	<b>\$137,077</b>	<b>\$84,340</b>	<b>\$25,790</b>	<b>\$41</b>	<b>\$315,183</b>
<b>PROJECT BUDGETS BY FISCAL YEAR</b>	<b>\$12,545</b>	<b>\$142,060</b>	<b>\$160,578</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Note: EXCLUDES ROTEM SETTLEMENT AMOUNTS FOR FY 17/18 AND 18/19

Exhibit 6.7

OCTA- CAPITAL SUMMARY AND CASH FLOW

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY OCTA			
(\$ Thousands)			
FISCAL YEAR	REHABILITATION PROJECTS	NEW CAPITAL PROJECTS	TOTAL
2016/17	\$10,214	\$257	
ROTEM SETTLEMENT LACMTA	-\$1,936		
ROTEM SETTLEMENT RCTC	-\$500		
ROTEM SETTLEMENT SANBAG	-\$1,000		
ROTEM SETTLEMENT VCTC	-\$337		
<b>TOTAL 16/17</b>	<b>\$6,441</b>	<b>\$257</b>	<b>\$6,698</b>
<b>2017/18</b>	<b>\$98,092</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$98,092</b>
<b>2018/19</b>	<b>\$99,681</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$99,681</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$204,214</b>	<b>\$257</b>	<b>\$204,471</b>

1. EXCLUDES ROTEM SETTLEMENT FOR FY 17/18 AND 18/19

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY OCTA CASH FLOW BY FISCAL YEAR							
(\$ Thousands)							
BUDGET FISCAL YEAR	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	TOTAL
<b>2016/17</b>							
REHABILITATION	\$4,161	\$5,806	\$247	\$	\$		\$10,214
ROTEM SETTLEMENT LACMTA	-\$648	-\$1,171	-\$116	-\$1	\$		-\$1,936
ROTEM SETTLEMENT RCTC	-\$167	-\$302	-\$30	\$	\$		-\$500
ROTEM SETTLEMENT SANBAG	-\$335	-\$605	-\$60	-\$1	\$		-\$1,000
ROTEM SETTLEMENT VCTC	-\$113	-\$204	-\$20	\$	\$		-\$337
NEW CAPITAL	\$64	\$129	\$65	\$	\$		\$257
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,962</b>	<b>\$3,653</b>	<b>\$85</b>	<b>-\$2</b>	<b>\$</b>		<b>\$6,698</b>
<b>2017/2018</b>							
REHABILITATION		\$34,547	\$58,734	\$4,769	\$42		\$98,092
NEW CAPITAL		\$	\$	\$	\$		\$
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$34,547</b>	<b>\$58,734</b>	<b>\$4,769</b>	<b>\$42</b>		<b>\$98,092</b>
<b>2018/2019</b>							
REHABILITATION			\$32,729	\$56,745	\$10,164	\$42	\$99,681
NEW CAPITAL			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>			<b>\$32,729</b>	<b>\$56,745</b>	<b>\$10,164</b>	<b>\$42</b>	<b>\$99,681</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>							
REHABILITATION NET OF ROTEM	\$2,898	\$38,072	\$91,484	\$61,512	\$10,206	\$42	\$204,214
NEW CAPITAL	\$64	\$129	\$65	\$	\$	\$	\$257
<b>TOTAL PROJECTED CASH FLOW BY</b>	<b>\$2,962</b>	<b>\$38,200</b>	<b>\$91,549</b>	<b>\$61,512</b>	<b>\$10,206</b>	<b>\$42</b>	<b>\$204,471</b>
<b>PROJECT BUDGETS BY FISCAL YEAR</b>	<b>\$6,698</b>	<b>\$98,092</b>	<b>\$99,681</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Note: EXCLUDES ROTEM SETTLEMENT FOR FY 17/18 AND 18/19

**Exhibit 6.7  
RCTC- CAPITAL SUMMARY AND CASH FLOW**

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY RCTC			
(\$ Thousands)			
FISCAL YEAR	REHABILITATION PROJECTS	NEW CAPITAL PROJECTS	TOTAL
2016/17	\$1,284	\$144	
ROTEM SETTLEMENT	\$500		
<b>TOTAL 16/17</b>	<b>\$1,784</b>	<b>\$144</b>	<b>\$1,929</b>
<b>2017/18</b>	<b>\$17,088</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$17,088</b>
<b>2018/19</b>	<b>\$14,523</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$14,523</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$33,395</b>	<b>\$144</b>	<b>\$33,540</b>

1. EXCLUDES ROTEM SETTLEMENT FOR FY 17/18 AND 18/19

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY RCTC CASH FLOW BY FISCAL YEAR							
(\$ Thousands)							
BUDGET FISCAL YEAR	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	TOTAL
<b>2016/2017</b>							
REHABILITATION	\$468	\$767	\$49				\$1,284
ROTEM SETTLEMENT	\$167	\$302	\$30	\$			\$500
NEW CAPITAL	\$36	\$72	\$36				\$144
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$672</b>	<b>\$1,141</b>	<b>\$115</b>				<b>\$1,929</b>
<b>2017/2018</b>							
REHABILITATION		\$6,542	\$9,941	\$600	\$5		\$17,088
NEW CAPITAL							
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$6,542</b>	<b>\$9,941</b>	<b>\$600</b>	<b>\$5</b>		<b>\$17,088</b>
<b>2018/2019</b>							
REHABILITATION			\$4,782	\$7,960	\$1,776	\$5	\$14,523
NEW CAPITAL							
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>			<b>\$4,782</b>	<b>\$7,960</b>	<b>\$1,776</b>	<b>\$5</b>	<b>\$14,523</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>							
REHABILITATION AND ROTEM	\$636	\$7,611	\$14,802	\$8,559	\$1,781	\$5	\$33,395
NEW CAPITAL	\$36	\$72	\$36	\$	\$	\$	\$144
<b>TOTAL PROJECTED CASH FLOW BY</b>	<b>\$672</b>	<b>\$7,683</b>	<b>\$14,839</b>	<b>\$8,559</b>	<b>\$1,781</b>	<b>\$5</b>	<b>\$33,540</b>
<b>PROJECT BUDGETS BY FISCAL</b>	<b>\$1,929</b>	<b>\$17,088</b>	<b>\$14,523</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Note: EXCLUDES ROTEM SETTLEMENT FOR FY 17/18 AND 18/19

## Exhibit 6.7

## SANBAG- CAPITAL SUMMARY AND CASH FLOW

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY SANBAG			
(\$ Thousands)			
FISCAL YEAR	REHABILITATION PROJECTS	NEW CAPITAL PROJECTS	TOTAL
2016/17	\$1,664	\$187	
ROTEM SETTLEMENT	\$1,000		
<b>TOTAL 16/17</b>	<b>\$2,664</b>	<b>\$187</b>	<b>\$2,851</b>
<b>2017/18</b>	<b>\$21,573</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$21,573</b>
<b>2018/19</b>	<b>\$24,022</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$24,022</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$48,260</b>	<b>\$187</b>	<b>\$48,447</b>

1. EXCLUDES ROTEM SETTLEMENT FOR FY 17/18 AND 18/19

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY SANBAG CASH FLOW BY FISCAL YEAR							
(\$ Thousands)							
BUDGET FISCAL YEAR	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	TOTAL
<b>2016/2017</b>							
REHABILITATION	\$526	\$1,074	\$63				\$1,664
ROTEM SETTLEMENT	\$335	\$605	\$60	\$1			\$1,000
NEW CAPITAL	\$47	\$93	\$47				\$187
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$908</b>	<b>\$1,772</b>	<b>\$171</b>	<b>\$1</b>			<b>\$2,851</b>
<b>2017/2018</b>							
REHABILITATION		\$7,922	\$12,867	\$777	\$7		\$21,573
NEW CAPITAL							\$
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$7,922</b>	<b>\$12,867</b>	<b>\$777</b>	<b>\$7</b>		<b>\$21,573</b>
<b>2018/2019</b>							
REHABILITATION			\$7,598	\$12,722	\$3,695	\$7	\$24,022
NEW CAPITAL							\$
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>			<b>\$7,598</b>	<b>\$12,722</b>	<b>\$3,695</b>	<b>\$7</b>	<b>\$24,022</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>							
REHABILITATION NET OF ROTEM	\$861	\$9,601	\$20,589	\$13,499	\$3,702	\$7	\$48,260
NEW CAPITAL	\$47	\$93	\$47	\$	\$	\$	\$187
<b>TOTAL PROJECTED CASH FLOW BY</b>	<b>\$908</b>	<b>\$9,695</b>	<b>\$20,636</b>	<b>\$13,499</b>	<b>\$3,702</b>	<b>\$7</b>	<b>\$48,447</b>
<b>PROJECT BUDGETS BY FISCAL YEAR</b>	<b>\$2,851</b>	<b>\$21,573</b>	<b>\$24,022</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Note: EXCLUDES ROTEM SETTLEMENT FOR FY 17/18 AND 18/19

## Exhibit 6.7

## VCTC- CAPITAL SUMMARY AND CASH FLOW

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY VCTC SUMMARY			
(\$ Thousands)			
FISCAL YEAR	REHABILITATION PROJECTS	NEW CAPITAL PROJECTS	TOTAL
2016/17	\$2,878	\$94	
ROTEM SETTLEMENT	\$337		
<b>TOTAL 16/17</b>	<b>\$3,216</b>	<b>\$94</b>	<b>\$3,309</b>
<b>2017/18</b>	<b>\$30,521</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$30,521</b>
<b>2018/19</b>	<b>\$32,433</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$32,433</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$66,169</b>	<b>\$94</b>	<b>\$66,263</b>

1. 17/18 AND 18/19 REHAB BUDGETS EXCLUDE ROTEM SETTLEMENT

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY  
VCTC CASH FLOW BY FISCAL YEAR

(\$ Thousands)

BUDGET FISCAL YEAR	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	TOTAL
<b>2016/2017</b>							
REHABILITATION	\$864	\$1,537	\$478				\$2,878
ROTEM SETTLEMENT	\$113	\$204	\$20	\$			\$337
NEW CAPITAL	\$23	\$47	\$24				\$94
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,000</b>	<b>\$1,788</b>	<b>\$522</b>				<b>\$3,309</b>
<b>2017/2018</b>							
REHABILITATION		\$10,683	\$18,482	\$1,344	\$12		\$30,521
NEW CAPITAL							\$
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$10,683</b>	<b>\$18,482</b>	<b>\$1,344</b>	<b>\$12</b>		<b>\$30,521</b>
<b>2018/2019</b>							
REHABILITATION			\$10,162	\$18,549	\$3,710	\$12	\$32,433
NEW CAPITAL							\$
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>			<b>\$10,162</b>	<b>\$18,549</b>	<b>\$3,710</b>	<b>\$12</b>	<b>\$32,433</b>
TOTALS							
REHABILITATION AND ROTEM	\$976	\$12,424	\$29,142	\$19,892	\$3,722	\$12	\$66,170
NEW CAPITAL	\$23	\$47	\$24	\$	\$	\$	\$94
<b>TOTAL PROJECTED CASH FLOW BY</b>	<b>\$1,000</b>	<b>\$12,471</b>	<b>\$29,166</b>	<b>\$19,892</b>	<b>\$3,722</b>	<b>\$12</b>	<b>\$66,263</b>
<b>PROJECT BUDGETS BY FISCAL YEAR</b>	<b>\$3,309</b>	<b>\$30,521</b>	<b>\$32,433</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Note: EXCLUDES ROTEM SETTLEMENT FOR FY 17/18 AND 18/19

Exhibit 6.7  
OTHER- CAPITAL SUMMARY AND CASH FLOW

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY OTHER SUMMARY			
(\$ Thousands)			
FISCAL YEAR	REHABILITATION	NEW CAPITAL	TOTAL
2016/17	\$3,748	\$	\$3,748
2017/18	\$29,175	\$	\$29,175
2018/19	\$29,175	\$	\$29,175
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$62,097</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$62,097</b>

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY OTHER CASH FLOW BY FISCAL YEAR							
(\$ Thousands)							
BUDGET FISCAL YEAR	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	TOTAL
<b>2016/2017</b>							
REHABILITATION	\$1,244	\$2,135	\$368				\$3,748
NEW CAPITAL							\$
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,244</b>	<b>\$2,135</b>	<b>\$368</b>				<b>\$3,748</b>
<b>2017/2018</b>							
REHABILITATION		\$9,766	\$17,644	\$1,750	\$15		\$29,175
NEW CAPITAL							\$
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$9,766</b>	<b>\$17,644</b>	<b>\$1,750</b>	<b>\$15</b>		<b>\$29,175</b>
<b>2018/2019</b>							
REHABILITATION			\$9,766	\$17,644	\$1,750	\$15	\$61,132
NEW CAPITAL							\$
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>			<b>\$9,766</b>	<b>\$17,644</b>	<b>\$1,750</b>	<b>\$15</b>	<b>\$61,132</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>							
REHABILITATION	\$1,244	\$11,900	\$27,778	\$19,394	\$1,765	\$15	\$62,097
NEW CAPITAL	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>TOTAL PROJECTED CASH FLOW BY FISCAL YEAR</b>	<b>\$1,244</b>	<b>\$11,900</b>	<b>\$27,778</b>	<b>\$19,394</b>	<b>\$1,765</b>	<b>\$15</b>	<b>\$62,097</b>
<b>PROJECT BUDGETS BY FISCAL YEAR</b>	<b>\$3,748</b>	<b>\$29,175</b>	<b>\$29,175</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

## *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 5

**Date:** June 9, 2016

**Subject:**

Award Lilac to Rancho Double Track Preliminary Design and Environmental Clearance Contract

**Recommendation:**

That the Transit Committee recommend the Board, acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission:

A. Allocate \$719,381 of Valley State Transit Assistance Funds – Operator Share for the Lilac to Rancho Double Track Project, reducing the previously allocated Proposition 1B Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Funds from \$2,000,000 to \$1,548,487, and funding a cost increase of \$267,868.

B. Approve Contract No. 16-1001411 with Moffatt & Nichol for an eighteen month term in an amount not-to-exceed \$1,695,000 for the Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Clearance of the Lilac to Rancho Double Track Project.

C. Approve contingency of an amount not-to-exceed \$200,000 for Contract No. 16-1001411 and authorize the Executive Director or his designee to release contingency as necessary for the project.

D. Authorize a budget amendment to the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 adopted budget in the amount of \$481,714 to Task 0315 Transit Capital, Subtask 0328 Lilac to Rancho Double Track, funded with State Transit Assistance (STA) Funds – Operator Share for a new task total of \$82,586,365.

E. Authorize a budget amendment reducing the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 adopted budget in the amount \$79,568 to Task 0315 Transit Capital, Subtask 0328 Lilac to Rancho Double Track, funded with Proposition 1B Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement for a new task total of \$82,506,797.

**Background:**

With the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) Board of Directors identifying double tracking of the Metrolink San Bernardino Line as one of its priority projects, staff is moving forward with Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Clearance of the Lilac to Rancho Double Track Project. The scope of this project includes approximately three miles of second mainline track on the Metrolink San Bernardino Line within the Cities of Rialto and San Bernardino; the addition of a second platform at the Metrolink Rialto Station; improvements to eight at-grade crossings; and an analysis to determine the feasibility of implementing a Quiet Zone throughout the project limits. SANBAG staff has selected Moffat & Nichol to assist SANBAG staff in completing preliminary engineering and environmental clearance, including securing environmental and other necessary permits, and providing support services during outreach and coordination with third parties as required for the project.

**Entity:** CTC

The Lilac to Rancho Double Track Project (Project) was originally identified in the *Metrolink San Bernardino Line Infrastructure Improvement Strategic Study* completed in September 2014 by SANBAG and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA). The goal of the study was to identify cost effective infrastructure improvements that lead to increased average commuter train speeds, reduced travel times, and enhanced overall capacity of the Metrolink San Bernardino Line. The Study recommended two second mainline track segments to meet these goals, one within Los Angeles County from Lone Hill Avenue to Control Point (CP) White in the Cities of San Dimas and La Verne and the second from CP Lilac to CP Rancho in San Bernardino County.

SANBAG staff released the Request for Proposal (RFP) 16-1001411 on January 07, 2016, which was sent electronically to consultants registered on PlanetBids. The solicitation was issued in accordance with current SANBAG policies and procedures for Architectural & Engineering services. Ninety-six (96) firms downloaded the RFP Packet from PlanetBids. The RFP was also posted on SANBAG's website.

Five (5) proposals were received by the date and time specified in the RFP. A responsiveness review was conducted by the Procurement Analyst finding that all five (5) proposals met the requirements outlined in the RFP. The Evaluation Committee for this procurement consisted of staff from SANBAG, the City of Rialto, Southern California Regional Rail Authority, and LACMTA. After reviewing the five (5) proposals the Evaluation Committee scored each proposal based on the following evaluation criteria; Qualifications of the Firm – 30 Points, Management Approach – 30 Points, and Technical Approach/Work Plan – 40 Points. Based on the scoring the firms were ranked in order of technical merit, and a short-list was developed. The firms short-listed and invited to interviews were Lockwood, Andrews, & Newman; Railway Surveyors; and Moffatt & Nichol.

Interviews were conducted with the three (3) short-listed firms allowing for a presentation, followed by a question and answer. At the completion of the interviews, the Evaluation Committee separately scored the interviews based on the presentation and responses to the questions. The assigned weighting between the technical proposal and interviews is 40% overall for the technical proposal and 60% overall for interviews.

As a result of the scoring, the Evaluation Committee recommended that the contract to perform the scope of work as outlined in Request for Proposals 16-1001411 be awarded to Moffatt & Nichol due to their clear understanding of the complexities of the project, providing a well-defined work plan, and strong staff, which have strong leadership qualities and a depth of experience in the field of commuter rail. The firm Evaluation forms and reference checks are located in the Contract Audit File.

As this is an Architect & Engineering services procurement, the selection process is based on qualifications, work plan, and staffing. Price proposals were not required to be submitted as part of the initial proposal for selection. SANBAG entered into negotiations with Moffat & Nichol after they were identified as the preferred consultant. The firm was asked to submit a more detailed scope of work based on the scope of work outlined in the RFP. Negotiations followed, at which the price of \$1,695,000 was agreed upon by both parties. In addition, staff is requesting approval of a contract contingency of an amount not-to-exceed \$200,000 for Contract No. 16-

1001411 and authorization for the Executive Director or his designee to release contingency as necessary for the project.

The 2014 Update to the Ten-Year Delivery Plan identified \$2,000,000 of Proposition 1B Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Funds (PTMISEA) for environmental and design efforts and unidentified future funding for the remaining phases of work. Subsequent to approval of the 2014 Update to the Ten-Year Delivery Plan, it was determined the \$2,000,000 estimate was for environmental and preliminary engineering and that PTMISEA cannot be used for environmental or project management. In addition, the total cost to deliver this phase of work, including staff time, project management, Contract No. 16-1001411, and a project contingency has increased to \$2,267,868. Therefore, staff is requesting that the funding plan for the environmental and preliminary engineering phase be revised to \$719,381 Valley State Transit Assistance Funds – Operator Share (STA) and \$1,548,487 PTMISEA for a new phase total of \$2,267,868. A revision to the PTMISEA Expenditure Plan will be presented to the SANBAG Board in September 2016 that will identify reprogramming of the \$451,513 PTMISEA balance.

In preparation of the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Budget it was anticipated that only \$200,000 of STA would be needed for the fiscal year. However, after negotiating the Contract No. 16-1001411 it was determined that the environmental costs, which are not eligible for PTMISEA, were higher than anticipated. As a result a budget amendment is being requested to reflect the increase in STA funding being allocated to the project.

***Financial Impact:***

This item is not consistent with the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 budget. Approval of recommendations D and E will authorize an amendment to the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 budget, Task No. 0315 Transit Capital, Subtask 0328 Lilac to Rancho Double Track resulting in an increase of STA Funds – Operator Share in the amount of \$82,586,365 and a decrease of Proposition 1B PTMISEA in the amount of \$79,568 for a new net task total of \$82,506,797.

***Reviewed By:***

This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee. This item was reviewed and approved by SANBAG General Counsel and Procurement Manager.

***Responsible Staff:***

Justin Fornelli, Chief of Transit and Rail Programs

---

Approved  
 Transit Committee  
 Date: June 9, 2016

Witnessed By:

**Contract Summary Sheet**

**General Contract Information**

Contract No: 16-1001411 Amendment No.: \_\_\_\_\_ Vendor No.: 01449  
 Vendor/Customer Name: Moffatt & Nichol Sole Source?  Yes  No  
 Description: Lilac to Rancho Double Track Preliminary Engineering & Environmental Clearance  
 Start Date: 07/06/2016 Expiration Date: 12/30/2017 Revised Expiration Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Has Contract Term Been Amended?  No  Yes - Please Explain \_\_\_\_\_  
 List Any Related Contracts Nos.: \_\_\_\_\_

Dollar Amount			
Original Contract	\$ 1,695,000.00	Original Contingency	\$ 200,000.00
Revised Contract (Inclusive of Prior Amendments)	\$ -	Revised Contingency (Inclusive of Prior Amendments)	\$ -
Current Amendment	\$ -	Contingency Amendment	\$ -
<b>TOTAL CONTRACT VALUE</b>	<b>\$ 1,695,000.00</b>	<b>TOTAL CONTINGENCY VALUE</b>	<b>\$ 200,000.00</b>
		<b>TOTAL DOLLAR AUTHORITY (Contract Value and Contingency)</b>	<b>\$ 1,895,000.00</b>

**Contract Authorization**

Executive Director Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Executive Director Action: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Board of Directors Date: 07/06/2016  
 Board of Directors Action: Approve Contract 16-1001411

**Contract Management: Payable/Miscellaneous**

Invoice Warning: 20% Renewals: \_\_\_\_\_ Type:  Capital  PAA  Other  
 Retention: \_\_\_\_\_ % Maximum Retention: \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Services:  Construction  Intrgrnt/MOU/COOP  A & E Services  Other Professional Services  
 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Goal \_\_\_\_\_ %

**Contract Management: Receivable**

E-76 and/or CTC Date \_\_\_\_\_ (Attach Copy)  Program Supplement No.: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Finance Letter  Reversion Date: \_\_\_\_\_  EA No.: \_\_\_\_\_

**All of the above MUST be submitted to FINANCE including originals, amendments and miscellaneous transaction changes**

**Additional Information**

Project Manager: Justin Fornelli

Attachment: Contract Summary Sheet [Revision 1] (2642 : Award Double Track Contract)

# Lilac to Rancho

DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

## MOFFATT & NICHOL SCOPE OF WORK

### PROJECT BACKGROUND AND SCOPE OF SERVICES

San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) completed the Metrolink San Bernardino Line (SBL) Infrastructure Improvement Strategic Study in September 2014. The SBL, also known as the San Gabriel Subdivision, is a 55-mile rail corridor operated by Metrolink for the Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) to provide commuter rail service between Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) and the San Bernardino Station. The BNSF Railway and the UPRR also use this critical rail line as shared corridor, which is also the busiest commuter rail line in Southern California, and have several industrial tracks to provide freight service for the region.

The purpose of the SBL Study was to identify cost effective infrastructure improvements to provide increased average train speed, reduced travel times, and enhanced overall capacity of the Metrolink SBL. The Study recommended the construction of a second mainline track within two out of the five existing single track corridors on the SBL: The LA Metro Lone Hill to CP White Double Track Project and the SANBAG CP Lilac to CP Rancho Double Track Project (Project). These projects are critical to regional mobility because they will enhance rail operations on the busiest commuter rail line in Southern California.

SANBAG, as the owner of the rail corridor within San Bernardino County and the lead agency, is proposing to complete the Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Clearance of approximately three (3) miles of a second main line track between Control Point (CP) Lilac Milepost (MP) 52.4 to approximately CP Rancho, near MP 55.1 on the SBL. The Double Track Project consists of the following features:

- The addition of a second passenger platform on the south side of the existing Metrolink Rialto Station with architectural and other station facility required improvements.
- The evaluation of Station pedestrian access alternatives: overpass, underpass or at-grade.
- The addition of a second track through eight (8) at-grade crossings starting at Lilac Avenue in the City of Rialto on the west and ending at Rialto Avenue in the City of San Bernardino on the east, including the necessary associated civil, signals, and PTC improvements. Five crossings are in the City of Rialto and two are in the City of San Bernardino and one crossing (Eucalyptus Avenue) is in both cities as the southbound lane is in the City of Rialto and the northbound lane is in the City of San Bernardino. An initial alternatives analysis for the alignment of second track shall be performed to determine the most feasible track alignment, either north or south of the existing mainline track.
- Traffic including TMP, emergency access, and other ingress/egress issues.
- Quiet Zone Feasibility Study for each of the eight (8) crossings within the double track footprint and any additional crossings required to accomplish a Quiet Zone. Therefore, Cactus Avenue will be evaluated as well.
- The protection in-place of the existing UPRR Colton Cut-off Overpass near Rialto Avenue and the compliance with horizontal and vertical clearances.
- The removal of the existing No. 20 Right-Hand (RH) turnout west of Lilac Avenue, or the consideration of the construction of a crossover. The removal of the existing turnout will require 'straight railing' the track to properly tie into the proposed second main line track on the north side of the existing main line track.

Attachment: SANBAG\_LRDT\_SCOPE\_160531 (2642 : Award Double Track Contract)

# Lilac to Rancho

## DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

- The construction of a new No. 20 Left-Hand (LH) turnout east of Rialto Avenue. The exact location of the proposed east end of the project will be evaluated to provide a 'best fit' alignment on a tangent segment between approximately MP 54.9 and MP 55.06.
- Railroad signals as well as PTC considerations and required improvements.
- Necessary retaining and sound walls.
- Existing Culverts extensions and protection-in place as required. There are 3-24" RCP and 1-42" RCP near the west end of the Rialto station, and 48" and 36" RCP east of Pepper Avenue.
- Civil improvements including grading, drainage, and utilities. Existing SBCFCD "East Rialto Storm Drain" flood control channel on the north side and drainage ditches on the south side of the right-of-way will be evaluated to be protected in-place and mitigated accordingly.

The scope includes coordination with all regulatory agencies to ensure compliance with their permitting requirements, and will evaluate and address the following project activities and requirements:

- Environmental Clearance Document and backup technical studies for both CEQA and NEPA.
- A Field Review and Corridor Assessment of the Project Site
- Data Collection and a Thorough Review of Existing Information
- Railroad and Stakeholders Coordination including SANBAG, Metrolink, BNSF, UPRR, the City of Rialto, the City of San Bernardino, SBCFCD, CPUC, and FRA as required
- Community/Neighborhood and Public Outreach
- Utility Carriers Coordination including MCI (Fiber Optics), Kinder Morgan Petroleum, and others
- Coordination with 3rd parties projects, both current and future
- Project Definition Report (PDR)

### Design Standards

The M&N Team will perform all services in conformance and in compliance with the latest American Railway Engineering and Maintenance of Way Association (AREMA) standards, SCRRA Engineering and Design Standards, the applicable Cities of Rialto and San Bernardino standards, BNSF and UPRR standards, the Standards Specifications for Public Works Construction (SSPWC), CPUC standards and requirements, Authority standards for general provisions, special provisions and technical specifications, and other applicable Authority Standards.

### Project Schedule

The environmental clearance document and the preliminary engineering design plans, based on the following tasks and sub-tasks, are assumed to be completed in 12 months from the Notice to Proceed (NTP).

### Project Assumptions

- SANBAG and SCRRA will provide all existing available project data and other relevant documents.
- Stakeholders review and comments will be provided in a timely manner, consistent with the project proposed schedule.
- Design team will not be responsible for railroad flagging protection services.

# Lilac to Rancho

## DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

- All work will be within railroad (SANBAG) right-of-way, unless directed and/or required otherwise.
- All drainage studies will be performed for facilities within railroad (SANBAG) right-of-way.
- All impacted utility facilities within railroad (SANBAG) right-of-way will be investigated, identified, and evaluated with mitigated proposed measures for further engineering during final design phase.
- The following additional/optional services may be provided when and if requested by SANBAG:
  - Additional engineering alternatives and options
  - Operational analysis, modeling and simulation
  - Right of way and property acquisitions
  - Value Engineering
  - Utility Potholing
  - Unforeseen conditions and other services that project stakeholders may require

DRAFT

Attachment: SANBAG\_LRDT\_SCOPE\_160531 (2642 : Award Double Track Contract)

# Lilac to Rancho

DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

The following describes the project tasks and sub-tasks of the proposed Scope of Services:

## Task 1 – Project Management and Administration

The M&N Team will conduct a field reconnaissance to evaluate and document existing conditions and data collection to thoroughly review and assess all existing information.

### 1.1 Project Management

#### DELIVERABLES:

Project Management Plan (PMP). PMP will communicate the scope of work, constraints, and technical requirements to all project stakeholders. PMP will be developed and submitted for SANBAG's review and approval.

Weekly internal team meetings and/or conference calls will be held to resolve any outstanding issues, ensure quality deliverables and monitor/control scope, budget, and schedule. This task foresees 50 weekly meetings/conference calls, based on our anticipated Sequence of Activities document, including the preparation of meeting agendas and minutes.

### 1.2 Project Administration

Project status will be tracked using an earned value methodology to estimate percentage of work completed and expended hours to budgeted hours. This will ensure clear and accurate monthly invoices, and allows us to identify potential budget or progress issues and realign resources to handle unexpected project developments.

**DELIVERABLES:** M&N will prepare monthly progress reports and invoice development that include summarizing major tasks completed that month and planned activities for the next 60 days. The monthly progress report and invoicing will include upcoming deliverables and actions; graphical updates of planned value, earned value, and actual cost; discussion of unforeseen issues; schedule updates, and when appropriate, an action plan to correct schedule slippage; and staffing resources efforts.

### 1.3 Project Controls

M&N will submit a Master Project Schedule (MPS) to SANBAG for review and approval as the project's baseline schedule. The MPS will be uploaded to the project control system that will be used to maintain project files for accurate reporting requirements. The schedule will be updated monthly in coordination with our progress meetings with SANBAG. Detailed critical path will be developed to track development activities and keep the project on time. Critical path method (CPM) scheduling will allow our team to track both near- and long-term schedule activities, and ensure that we have the flexibility to meet changing priorities as the project progresses.

**DELIVERABLES:** Updated schedules for budget monitoring; schedule monitoring and monitoring of change orders. Scheduling is intended to define all tasks, deliverables, relationships between tasks, and a critical path. We will issue monthly Project Status Reports as well as develop a Resource loaded Project Master Schedule.

### 1.4 Quality Assurance

Our mission is to provide high-quality products and services that exceed our clients' requirements. The M&N Team will provide a Quality Management Plan (QMP) to avoid surprises that could ultimately lead to undesirable project impacts, including cost increases and schedule delays. Our quality assurance system will be fully compliant with SANBAG's processes and requirements. The focus will be on intra-and

# Lilac to Rancho

## DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

interdisciplinary reviews; independent checking; and clear documentation. Our reports and designs will use a “four color” QC process (Originator/Checker/Back checker/Verifier) with check print stamp.

**DELIVERABLES:** A Quality Assurance and Management Plan will be assembled and monitored for compliance.

### 1.5 Stakeholder and Inter-Agency Coordination

M&N team will coordinate with SANBAG and project’s stakeholders including Metrolink, City of Rialto, City of San Bernardino, BNSF, UPRR, CPUC, FRA and others. The M&N Team will provide SANBAG with effective outreach services with all stakeholders and local communities as directed by SANBAG. These services include, but is not limited to public outreach plans, briefings, grassroots canvassing, media relations, electronic communication, social media, and a stakeholder database.

**DELIVERABLES:** This task is focused on non-railroad related meetings and will include meeting agendas and minutes, notices, handouts and fact sheets, and renderings (as needed).

We anticipate twelve public meetings:

- 12 Agency (separate) meetings: 4 each with the Cities of Rialto and San Bernardino; 1 each with the IE Chamber of Commerce and IE Hispanic Chamber of Commerce; and 2 other agency/community support meetings, including SBFCO.

#### 1.5.1 Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)

M&N Team will support SANBAG with any required coordination and reporting activities during this project.

**DELIVERABLES:** for this task will include meeting preparation, agendas and minutes for one (1) meeting.

#### 1.5.2 California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)

The CPUC provides state regulatory oversight for rail safety and will be an integral player during the design process with respect to the addition of the second main line track through the eight (8) at-grade crossings and under the UPRR overpass, and potential future pedestrian at-grade crossing or grade-separation for the proposed second platform at the Rialto Station. In addition, all track improvements must meet safety standards stipulated in their General Orders, which govern items such as minimum clearances and walkways. The M&N Team has full understanding of CPUC requirements. We anticipate conducting preliminary CPUC Field Diagnostic meetings for the proposed project improvements, to obtain all stakeholders’ agreement on the new layout and the proposed modifications. These meetings will set the stage for a smooth GO 88-B application process and facilitate approval in the next design phase.

**DELIVERABLES:** M&N team will coordinate with SANBAG and CPUC and will conduct one (1) CPUC field diagnostic meeting with the appropriate stakeholders (to encompass the eight impacted at-grade public crossings, the station pedestrian crossing and the UPRR overpass). We will organize the meetings; provide minutes and monitor the action items to ensure they are completed in a timely manner.

#### 1.5.3 Railroad Coordination

As directed by SANBAG Project Manager, M&N will coordinate with SCRRA, UPRR, and BNSF.

**DELIVERABLES:** Specific deliverables will include organizing and conducting meetings with SCRRA, BNSF and UPRR; providing minutes as well as monitoring the action items to ensure they are completed in a timely manner. 4 meetings are assumed under this sub-task.

# Lilac to Rancho

DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

## 1.5.4 Cities of Rialto and San Bernardino

The City of Rialto owns and maintains the Rialto Metrolink Station, improvements for which are proposed within this project. In addition, the City of Rialto owns and maintains the following five (5) at-grade crossings including roadway approaches that will be improved by this project: Lilac Avenue, Willow Avenue, Riverside Avenue, Sycamore Avenue, and Acacia Street. While Eucalyptus Avenue is jointly owned by the City of Rialto and the City of San Bernardino, Pepper Avenue and Rialto Avenue, including roadway approaches, are owned and maintained by the City of San Bernardino. As such, both Cities will have a hands-on role in reviewing and approving the proposed improvements. The Cities' Engineering, Public Works, and other Departments will be responsible to ensure that all proposed improvements are in full compliance with their standards and requirements. Proper procedural steps will be followed so improvements within the Cities' jurisdiction are completed in accordance with the aforementioned standards and requirements, and other agencies' (having jurisdiction) requirements. The Cities will have particular concerns in avoiding impacts to the overall quality of life for their local residents and the adjacent businesses in the surrounding area. Another concern for the Cities is that construction is completed with a minimum of impact to pedestrians and roadway traffic and emergency access is maintained at all times. It is critical to coordinate all City owned utilities including water lines, sewer, storm water and drainage facilities, and others are in compliance with Cities' requirements as well as the San Bernardino Flood Control District (SBFCD) requirements where applicable.

**DELIVERABLES:** M&N team's efforts will include organizing meetings with appropriate staff and council members from City of Rialto and the City of San Bernardino; providing minutes as well as monitoring the action items to ensure they are completed in a timely manner. See deliverables for Task 1.5.

## 1.5.5 Private Land Owners

M&N Team understands SANBAG's desire to build strong communication lines with local communities including private land owners. Private land owners will have immense interest in being informed about the development of project. As directed by SANBAG's Project Manager, our team will assist in arranging for and attending meetings with the private land owners that may be impacted by this project.

**DELIVERABLES:** M&N will include organizing meetings with land owners, providing minutes as well as monitoring the action items to ensure they are completed in a timely manner. See deliverables for Task 1.5.

## 1.6 Meetings

A Project Development Team (PDT) will be established consisting of SANBAG and their Consultant, Metrolink, and M&N design team. Other key project stakeholders, including City of Rialto, City of San Bernardino, and others may be added to the PDT and attend certain meetings as deemed appropriate by SANBAG. We will communicate the project status to the stakeholders, discuss any outstanding issues and mitigated measures, and document and follow up with required action items.

As indicated in Task 1.1, our Project Manager will conduct weekly design team meetings/conference calls to ensure that all tasks are completed on time and that any potential roadblocks are averted. Regular PDT meetings, and other necessary progress meetings including design review and technical workshop meetings will be scheduled and conducted as required.

### DELIVERABLES:

Monthly Project Development Team (PDT) meetings. We assume 14 PDT meetings, including a kick-off and a final close-out meetings, to be held at SABAG offices. M&N will prepare agendas, meeting minutes, and follow up on all action items with all stakeholders.

Attachment: SANBAG\_LRDT\_SCOPE\_160531 (2642 : Award Double Track Contract)

# Lilac to Rancho

DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

Coordination/Technical Meetings. These meetings will be coordinated with SANBAG Project Manager to ensure meeting project schedule, address all technical and stakeholders' sensitive issues, and ensure compliance with project requirements. We assume 10 additional meetings.

## Task 2 – Quiet Zone Feasibility Study

M&N team will prepare a quiet zone feasibility study report which defines the necessary improvements and options for quiet zone implementation.

### 2.1 Data Collection, Field Review, and Conceptual Plans

**DELIVERABLES:** This task will include a Draft Quiet Zone Assessment Report which will involve collection and analysis of available and existing project data, studies, plans, inventory sheets, accident history and CAD files related to the existing conditions at the applicable grade crossings in the project area.

### 2.2 Final Quiet Zone Assessment

M&N Team will address review comments and finalize the quiet zone assessment report, in a technical memorandum format.

**DELIVERABLES:** This task will include a Final Quiet Zone Assessment Report *Technical Memorandum*, which will address review comments by updating the proposed improvements (i.e., active warning device protection, supplemental safety measures, etc.), project requirements, process, anticipated stakeholder requirements, permitting requirements, estimate of probable construction cost and anticipated project schedule. In addition, the assessment will be updated to reflect agency review comments as well as diagnostic review comments. This memorandum will incorporate existing conditions and draft updates to the FRA grade crossing inventory forms noting recommended changes to crossings to be improved. The following nine (9) at-grade crossings will be included in the study:

- Cactus Avenue
- Lilac Avenue
- Willow Avenue
- Riverside Avenue
- Sycamore Avenue
- Acacia Avenue
- Eucalyptus Avenue
- Pepper Avenue
- Rialto Avenue

### 2.3 Public Meetings/Presentation

**DELIVERABLES:** M&N Team will assist SANBAG and the Cities involved to present the proposed concepts to local community stakeholders. This task assumes the preparation of graphics and a PowerPoint presentation for presentation to City Council of both affected cities, Rialto and San Bernardino, and the SANBAG Committee and Board. Assume 2 specific meetings for this task.

## Task 3 – Environmental and Preliminary Engineering Design

See attached Exhibit A, CH2MHill - Environmental Scope of Work for details.

# Lilac to Rancho

DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

### 3.1 Survey Control, Aerial Topographic Mapping, Supplemental Ground Control and Right-of-Way Survey

See Exhibit B – Survey and Mapping Scope of Work for details.

### 3.2 Geotechnical Investigation

See Exhibit A, CH2MHill – Geotechnical Scope of Work for details.

### 3.3 Track/Special Track Work

The existing single main line track, between CP Lilac (MP 52.4) and CP Rancho (MP 55.3), is generally centered within a 100-foot wide right-of-way owned by SANBAG and operated by Metrolink. There appears to be an encroachment onto the railroad right-of-way near Willow Avenue. The current operating time table speed is 79 MPH for passenger/commuter trains and 55 MPH for freight trains. The infrastructure of the main line track consists of mainly 119RE Continuous Welded Rail (CWR) with wood ties and some segments of 136RE with concrete ties predominantly through the at-grade crossings. It is noted that some of the at-grade crossings' road profiles peak at the intersection of the track. Additionally, there is a fiber optic line running parallel to and within the right-of-way, the entire length of this three mile segment.

The second main track is to be constructed at a distance of 15 feet (track centerline to track centerline) for much of the three miles. Two preliminary alternative analyses of the alignment of the second track will be provided; one north of the existing main line track from east of Riverside Avenue to west of Rialto Avenue; and one south of the existing mainline track, as currently proposed. In the vicinity of the Willow Avenue at-grade crossing as well as the Rialto Station however, the track centers will need to be spaced at 18 feet to accommodate the additional station side platform and the inter track fence as required by SCRRRA engineering standards. In addition, we will ensure that the proper track center and the required horizontal and vertical clearances are provided when crossing under the UPRR overpass. All special track work will be evaluated and incorporated into the project plans.

Our design will be in accordance with the engineering standards of SCRRRA, AREMA, CPUC, and local jurisdictions.

**DELIVERABLES:** An updated Metrolink Track Chart; conceptual plans; and preliminary engineering design drawings. All design plans and drawings will comply with SANBAG and SCRRRA requirements and will be prepared at a scale of 1":40' on a full size (22"x34") sheet and may also be printed on 11"x17" (half size) sheets. Plans will show all project components including track, civil, structural, etc. , and will include but not limited to the following: plan and profile sheets including all track work; typical sections; cross sections with emphasis at key locations (such as station platform, at-grade crossings, culverts, UPRR overpass, walls, and others); geometry data; special track work details; grade crossings with associated signal device systems and pedestrian treatments; grading plans and work limits; right-of-way limits; drainage and utility plans; station and architectural plans, structural and fencing plans.

### 3.4 Civil Design – Rail Embankment and Drainage

Grading plans will be developed to show existing and proposed drainage systems based on the aerial mapping, field survey, and best available information. Rail embankment for the second main line track will match the existing main line track embankment to ensure consistency, smooth construction transition, and cost effective project. Civil improvements including landscaping and irrigation plans will be incorporated into the 30% design. We will also investigate the needs for retaining walls and/or block walls to accommodate the second track and associated roadbed widening.

Attachment: SANBAG\_LRDT\_SCOPE\_160531 (2642 : Award Double Track Contract)

# Lilac to Rancho

## DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

### 3.4.1 Hydrology and Drainage

**Hydrology:** The proposed project limits are located in Zone 2 of the San Bernardino County Flood Control District (SBCFCD) within the cities of Rialto and San Bernardino. The natural drainage patterns follow historical alluvial channels running predominantly from north to south. The project runs east/west and is flanked by two such channels, the Rialto Channel to the west and the Lytle-Cajon Channel to the east. A portion the project parallels the East Rialto Storm Drain which drains to the east and discharges into the Lytle-Cajon Channel. Just west of Pepper Ave a diversion structure can send runoff from the East Rialto Storm Drain to a series of three basins, Pepper Basin, Mill Basin and Randall Basin. Review of FEMA maps show a risk of low to moderate flooding along the project however the addition of a second track will not increase the runoff within the proposed project. The project should not affect existing drainage patterns and will restore drainage along the south of the rail right of way that has been eroded over the years.

**Drainage:** There are multiple drainage structures within the project limits. The most prominent being the East Rialto Storm Channel. This channel runs parallel and to the north of the existing rail. Since the second track is proposed on the south side no impact is expected to the channel. Multiple corrugated and reinforced concrete pipes (RCP) cross from north to south under the current rail to convey runoff. The construction of a second track to the south will require the extension of these culverts. One of special attention is the Rialto Metro Station. A series of RCPs cross under and manifold just south of the existing track. The addition of a second track and platform will encroach over this outlet structure. Two solutions are possible; relocating the headwall and extending the pipes or spanning the outlet. Since it appears only the new platform will encroach it is recommended to span the outlet structure as extending the pipes would place them very close to the self-storage building to the south. Also, the East Rialto Storm Drain (as labeled in the San Bernardino County Flood Control District (SBCFCD) documents) structure runs parallel to and partially within the SANBAG right-of-way, from approximately MP 53.19 (Sycamore) to MP 54.54 (Rialto).

**DELIVERABLES:** A Project Hydrology Report, in compliance with the standards and requirements of SANBAG, SCRRRA, Cities of Rialto and San Bernardino, and SBFCD will be provided. In addition, conceptual and preliminary drainage plans covering facilities within the railroad right-of-way will be provided.

### 3.5 Utility Investigation and Mapping

Our primary goal will be to avoid / minimize temporary utility relocations, hence reducing project cost. All utility protection plans or utility relocation plans as well as construction windows for the work will be developed and coordinated with the utility owners and incorporated into the project plans and technical specifications.

From our preliminary reconnaissance we are aware of an existing MCI fiber optic line that runs north of and parallel to the south right of way line within the project limits, sanitary sewer lines crossing the rail right-of-way at most of the roadway crossings as well as two additional sanitary sewer crossing one near the UPRR Colton Cutoff Overpass and one sanitary sewer crossing where Castilla Street dead ends at the rail right-of-way. In addition, an existing Kinder Morgan petroleum line crosses the right of way east of the UPRR Colton Cutoff Overpass near Milepost 54.6. The M&N Team will coordinate with the respective owner(s) of these facilities during plan development to ensure that they are properly protected in-place or any temporary or permanent relocations meet with their approval.

In regards to other utilities, our team will coordinate with the City of Rialto, the City and County of San Bernardino and SCRRRA to determine utility ownership, "franchise rights" and acquire utility as-builts to develop a comprehensive utility matrix and database map for the project.

**DELIVERABLES:** We will communicate with impacted utility owners to make them aware of the project objectives and schedule. Our team will prepare a Utility Matrix and provide updates to the Matrix based upon our field investigation, and develop existing and proposed utilities plans.

# Lilac to Rancho

## DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

### 3.6 Railway Structures

Our team will ensure that the existing UPRR overpass and piers will not be impacted by adding the second track. Our design will incorporate any appropriate pier protection, if necessary, such as a crash wall.

Any required retaining and/or sound walls, pedestrian grade separation for the Rialto Station, and culverts extensions or modifications will be designed to accommodate railroad Cooper E-80 loading and will be in full compliance with SCRRA, AREMA, UPRR and BNSF requirements.

**DELIVERABLES:** M&N will prepare conceptual and preliminary design plans for all structural components of the project.

### 3.7 Rail Systems – Signals and Communications

M&N team will evaluate the addition of new equipment and devices to new track work. If the existing locations do not have space to support this, new enclosures and equipment shall be installed. Where wayside signals are added, adjacent locations shall be reviewed for operational efficiency and safe braking and if necessary modifications shall be made to those locations. Railroad signal and communications systems shall conform to regulatory agency requirements as well as SCRRA and industry standards, including PTC requirements. The Rialto Metrolink Station shall be reviewed for changes to the communications system as necessary to meet current SCRRA standards.

**DELIVERABLES:** Preliminary design of wayside signal modifications and a schematic signal design plans, a Matrix of Modifications to Existing Systems, and new warning devise systems for at-grade crossings.

### 3.8 At-Grade Roadway Crossings

At-grade crossing design including crossing warning system relocations and determination if pre-emption requirements will be performed. Consideration for the implementation of Quiet Zones shall be made along with recommendations made during the site diagnostic meetings. Additionally careful thought will be given in the design of the crossings adjacent to the Rialto Passenger Station in order to optimize the flow of traffic at these crossings. These modifications will become part of the new at-grade crossing design. Track crossings shall be designed in accordance with SCRRA standards, CAMUTCD and the recommended practices of AREMA.

The preliminary design will incorporate recommended pedestrian treatments and improvements, and will give consideration for any condition that could require pedestrian gates at crossings that experience significant pedestrian traffic and meets CPUC guidelines. This data will be compiled in a Traffic Impact Study.

#### 3.8.1 Roadway Design

**DELIVERABLES:** Preliminary Design Drawings (30%) for each crossing and associated typical Cross Sections will be developed. The findings of the Quiet Zone Feasibility study will be incorporated. Additionally, a Grade Crossing Information spreadsheet will be provided that contains pertinent information about each of the at-grade crossings, including applicant information, CPUC crossing number, US DOT crossing number, ADT on roadway crossing tracks, train volume, and train speed.

#### 3.8.2 Traffic Impact and Pedestrian Analysis

We will pay special attention to risky behavior particularly at the Rialto Station to determine the need for special treatments. While we will coordinate very closely with both Cities to minimize impacts, proposed roadway realignments and temporary street closures may result in changes to the existing traffic circulation

# Lilac to Rancho

## DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

on local streets and through existing neighborhoods. The traffic impact analysis will include potential impacts to the local roadway network due to the expanded station.

- The following scenarios will be studied for the nine (9) at-grade crossings and the expanded station:
- Existing Conditions (AM and PM peak periods)
- Opening Day (AM and PM peak periods)
- Future Conditions (AM and PM peak periods)

The analysis will measure the level of service at intersections and the amount of delay at grade crossings and determine appropriate mitigation measures for each location. Due to the spacing of the crossings and nearby intersections, this task assumes 9 crossings and 18 intersections will be analyzed. The M&N Team will obtain pedestrian counts for each crossing and develop the design that meets CPUC guidelines for safe pedestrian movement across the railroad right-of-way around crossing warning devices and for an ultimate condition that could include pedestrian gates at crossings that experience significant pedestrian traffic. Consideration will be given to incorporating measures that deter unsafe movements by pedestrians including walkway railing, median railing and special signage.

**DELIVERABLES:** M&N team will provide preliminary design and provide traffic impact analysis including gathering traffic and pedestrian counts at each crossing to identify potential impacts associated with changes to the operation of the grade crossings, requirements for signal preemption, pedestrian safety improvement requirements related to crossings and the station, changes to traffic patterns as a result of potential roadway realignments and median improvements, and temporary traffic disruption during project construction. Deliverables for this task will be consistent with the 'Traffic' scope as detailed in Exhibit A.

### 3.9 Station Design

M&N team will develop the proposed second station platform conceptual and preliminary design to match the aesthetics of the existing station and fixtures, in accordance with SCRRA Engineering Standards.

**DELIVERABLES:** Outline of Performance Specifications, and station Architectural and Engineering preliminary design drawings, as specified in STV's Fee Schedule, including but not limited to:

- Pedestrian Access
- Options to address Pedestrian At-Grade Crossing, Pedestrian Tunnel, or Pedestrian Bridge
- Architectural preliminary design plans, elevations and sections
- Civil preliminary design plans, elevations and sections
- Structural preliminary design plans, elevations and sections
- MEP preliminary design plans
- Platform access study
- 3-D model of the proposed station platform and surrounding area.
- Level Boarding Access Plans (addressing Federal Level Boarding Requirements)
- Fire Life safety plans

### 3.10 Construction Phasing and Staging Diagrams

In coordination with all stakeholders, the M&N Team will develop a recommended construction sequencing plan with safety as the primary driver. We will address: rail operational issues; use of the Rialto Station during construction; available work windows and limits on Form B protection.

# Lilac to Rancho

DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

M&N Team will coordinate with the City and County of San Bernardino and the City of Rialto to obtain a thorough understanding of vital “emergency responder” routes (police, fire, ambulance & etc.) school /transit bus routes and major community events to name just a few community services that are of utmost importance to maintain service during construction.

**DELIVERABLES:** M&N team will develop Construction Phasing and Staging Diagrams for track and signal cut-overs; roadway grade crossings; UPRR overpass pier protection; signaling, station platform and pedestrian access.

### 3.11 Cost Estimate

M&N team will evaluate all project challenges that need to be addressed in the final design to perform enough technical analysis and coordination with stakeholders to capture their true cost to the project.

**DELIVERABLES:** M&N team will prepare a Preliminary Construction Cost Estimate for all project related costs including but not limited to civil, track, structures, railroad signal, station platform, and others in accordance with SCRRA standards

#### Task 4 Preliminary Engineering Design Document

As outlined herein, the M&N Team will provide the following specific deliverables:

- SCRRA Project Definition Report (PDR)
- Draft Preliminary Engineering Design (30% P&E) Document
- Final Preliminary Engineering Design (30% P&E) Document

## EXHIBIT A

### CH2MHill – Environmental, Traffic Analysis, and Geotechnical Scope of Work

This Scope of Services was prepared in response to the San Bernardino Association of Governments' (SANBAG) request to provide preliminary engineering design and environmental clearance for the construction of the Lilac to Rancho Double Track Project. This project will include the addition of a second track from Control Point (CP) Lilac to CP Rancho on the San Gabriel Subdivision within San Bernardino County. The scope of services and assumptions used by CH2M for budget estimating purposes are described below.

#### 1.6.2 Project Development Team (PDT) meetings

CH2M anticipates monthly PDT meetings (maximum of 14), including one Project kick-off meeting, once the contract Notice to Proceed has been issued. One representative from the CH2M team will be in attendance at all PDT meetings. Technical team members will attend PDT meetings selectively, and the technical analysis scope of services discussions provided below provide specific details regarding PDT meeting attendance assumptions. Additionally, individual meetings (maximum of 4) will be held with the resource/regulatory agencies consistent with the natural resources/permitting based services described below. These meeting will take place during the project development and approval process, and will include at least one SANBAG representative and one member of the Moffatt & Nichol design team.

#### 3.2 Geotechnical Investigation

CH2M will conduct a geotechnical desktop study based on exiting information and a site reconnaissance. The site reconnaissance will take place from the public right of way. The collected information will be utilized to prepare a Geologic Hazard Evaluation which will support the project environmental documentation and will follow CEQA/NEPA guidelines. This report will also include preliminary, conceptual level geotechnical recommendations. Once the projects conceptual plans have been finalized, CH2M will prepare a Geotechnical Investigation Plan, which will document the recommended field exploration and laboratory testing. This technical memorandum will include a map(s) showing proposed boring location, depth, and excavation method. CH2M will also provide as-needed geotechnical support for the preliminary designs for retaining walls and the elevated, at-grade, or below grade structures in support of the Rialto Station Platform Design. CH2M will also provide conceptual level remedial grading recommendations based on the projects finalized conceptual plans, these recommendations will be summarized in a technical memorandum.

#### Deliverables

- CH2M will provide Draft and Final Versions of the following (5 hard copies and one electronic copy):
- Geologic Hazard Evaluation Report
- Geotechnical Investigation Plan (Technical Memorandum)
- Geotechnical Preliminary Remedial Grading Recommendations (Technical Memorandum)

#### Assumptions

- A geotechnical investigation is not included. Preliminary geotechnical recommendations will be based on existing data.
- Attendance at the project kick-off meeting and 2-additional technical meetings is included.
- One concurrent review submittal to SANBAG and the Cities of Rialto and San Bernardino are assumed
- The formal cycle will include a clean-up finalization cycle

# Lilac to Rancho

## DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

- Also assumed time to resolve any conflicts between the comments received: 1 meeting/conference call, and 1 follow up electronic concurrence.

### 3.8.3 & 3.8.4 Traffic Analysis

CH2M will perform a traffic impact analysis to assess the potential impacts associated with changes to the operation of the existing at-grade crossings (9 locations) and adjacent intersections (up to 18), an assessment of pedestrian safety improvement data, and an evaluation temporary traffic disruption during project construction. The following tasks will be conducted:

#### Analysis Approach and Data Gathering

In this task, CH2M will finalize the approach for the analysis and gather the required data.

- Prepare a “Methods and Assumptions” memorandum detailing the proposed traffic analysis scope of work. The memorandum will be submitted to SANBAG for review and approval prior to beginning work.
- Collect and gather the data for the analysis:
- Collect existing daily weekday traffic counts at each crossing. Two days of counts will be collected on a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday. Counts will be collected using tubes. Up to nine (9) crossings will be analyzed.
- Estimate (in coordination with SANBAG) the Opening Day and future peak hour traffic counts at each crossing.
- Gather available traffic data (average daily traffic) for local roads near the project (for construction analysis).
- Conduct an inventory of the existing crossings, including lane geometry/channelization, traffic control, roadway speeds, or unique features.
- Collect pedestrian counts at each crossing. For the purposes of this scope, it is assumed that up to four (4) hours of observations will be made on a weekday (Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday) at each location.
- Obtain readily available existing and proposed train volume and frequency information from SANBAG and/or CPUC. Train data will be obtained for both Metro and freight rail.
- Obtain readily available data on train speeds and length, and lead and lag times of gate operation from SANBAG and/or CPUC. Train data will be obtained for both Metro and freight rail.

#### Project Construction Analysis

CH2M will evaluate the potential traffic impacts of constructing the project. The following tasks will be completed:

- Obtain construction data including construction hours and duration, number of truck trips, number of construction workforce, parking and laydown information, etc.
- Determine the construction trip generation based on the information above.
- Estimate the trip distribution on the roadway network, for daily trips.
- Calculate the percentage change in daily traffic with the project on the surrounding road network to assess the potential traffic impacts. Existing counts and traffic data collected as part of the operations analysis will be used.
- Identify potential road closures and related impacts. Document impacts, qualitatively where data are not available.
- Recommend mitigation measures if needed.

#### Project Operations Analysis

# Lilac to Rancho

## DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

*Traffic Impact Analysis* – CH2M will evaluate the changes in operations at the crossings for the existing, Opening Day, and future conditions for the AM and PM peak hours during project operations. The impact of a train movement on the roadway traffic operating conditions (at the crossing) will be measured using average vehicle delay at each crossing.

The traffic analysis will be prepared in compliance with CEQA and NEPA. However, project-specific significance criteria will be identified in coordination with SANBAG to categorize what constitutes a significance traffic impact at the crossings. For example, the City of Rialto General Plan (December, 2010) includes Policy 4-1.20, but that only focuses on Level of Service (LOS), which is not directly applicable for train crossings. A significance criterion based on delay will be identified and included in the analysis.

Next, peak period (AM and PM) vehicle delay will be estimated at up to nine (9) crossings, using the following steps:

- Calculate the average vehicle arrival and departure rates (vehicles per minute per lane).
- Determine the gate down time for the peak period, which is based on the speed and length of the train, the width of the crossing, the clearance distance, and the lead and lag times for gate operation.
- Calculate the vehicle hours of delay (function of vehicle arrival and departure rates, number of traffic lanes, and the square of the gate down time).
- Calculate the queue length, by direction.
- Determine the total number of vehicles arriving per period.
- Determine the total number of vehicles that are delayed.
- Calculate the percentage of vehicles that are delayed and the percentage of time that the crossing is blocked by trains.
- Calculate the average vehicle delay (total delay divided by number of arriving vehicles per time period).
- Summarize the vehicle delay by crossing for each scenario.

The queue length estimates will be used to determine the potential impacts to upstream intersections (the closest intersection north and south to each affected crossing). The evaluation of impacts will be limited to an assessment of the percentage of time when queues will affect operations at the intersection.

*Pedestrian Safety Assessment* – CH2M will provide input to the design of the crossings as follows:

- Provide a summary of the pedestrian counts for each crossing and identify locations with significant pedestrian traffic (“significant” will be determined in consultation with SANBAG).
- Provide an inventory of existing pedestrian features at each crossing (e.g. sidewalk, pedestrian gates)
- Identify any locations on a school route.
- Prioritize locations based on pedestrian activity.
- Pedestrian safety assessment will be incorporated into the Traffic Impact Study.

### **Deliverables**

- Draft Traffic Impact Study (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)
- Final Traffic Impact Study (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)
- Methods and Assumptions Memorandum (electronic only)

### **Assumptions**

- The scope of the train crossing and pedestrian analysis described in the “Methods and Assumptions” memorandum will be consistent with the scope and assumptions presented here.
- No intersection traffic counts will be conducted, and no intersection level-of-service analysis will be conducted. Only estimated queues, and the associated impacts, will be assessed for intersections.

# Lilac to Rancho

## DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

- Construction analysis will be limited to daily volume/capacity assessments. No intersection analysis or peak hour analysis will be conducted.
- One concurrent review submittal to SANBAG and the Cities of Rialto and San Bernardino are assumed.
- The formal cycle will include a clean-up finalization cycle.
- To resolve any conflicts between the comments received, one meeting/conference call, and one follow up electronic concurrence is assumed.
- The scope does not include attendance at any community meetings to present results of the traffic study.

### 3.12.1 Alternatives Analysis – Feasibility Only

CH2M will provide and contribute to a feasibility level alternatives analysis for the proposed project. This analysis will focus on an approximate 1.5 mile stretch of the project corridor, specifically assessing the feasibility and potential environmental challenges associated with placing the second parallel track on the north side of the existing track, from Riverside Ave to a point just west of Rialto Ave (approximately 1.5 miles). This effort will identify, assess, and provide summary text on the likely additional analysis and documentation efforts that would be required, including changes to agency consultation and permitting requirements. These efforts will be provided to Moffatt & Nichol as a contribution to the summary document being prepared for SANBAG's review and approval.

#### Deliverables

- Draft environmental summary as a contributing element to the Alternative Analysis Feasibility Study prepared by Moffatt & Nichol.
- Final environmental summary as a contributing element to the Alternative Analysis Feasibility Study prepared by Moffatt & Nichol.

#### Assumptions

- The draft and final summaries will be submitted electronically to Moffatt & Nichol for inclusion in the Alternative Analysis document they will be preparing and submitting for SANBAG's review and approval.
- The assessment conducted and summary documentation prepared will be based on a feasibility level of analysis only, and detailed analysis will not be required or conducted.

### 3.12.2 CEQA/NEPA

CH2M will provide management, analysis, documentation, and coordination activities associated with the required technical reports and environmental approvals. These efforts will be conducted in concert with the anticipated California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The anticipated CEQA provision (Article 18) applicable to this project is a Statutory Exemption (Section 15275(a)), Specified Mass Transit Projects. The anticipated NEPA document is a Categorical Exclusion (23 CFR 771.117(c)(18)). As briefly discussed the CEQA/NEPA approvals will be supported by a suite of technical studies, as described individually below. The anticipated schedule for completion of the environmental approval efforts, beginning with the Project kick-off meeting, is 12-14 months.

#### Deliverables

- Draft CEQA Statutory Exemption (single sheet – administrative record only)
- Draft NEPA Categorical Exclusion (single sheet approval)
- Draft Continuation Sheets – NEPA only
- Final CEQA Statutory Exemption (single sheet – administrative record only)

# Lilac to Rancho

DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

- Final NEPA Categorical Exclusion (single sheet approval)
- Final Continuation Sheets – NEPA only
- Draft and Final Documents (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)

## Assumptions

- At the initiation of the analysis process, the design of the project will be fixed and there will be no changes to project design.
- One concurrent review submittal to SANBAG and the Cities of Rialto and San Bernardino are assumed
- The formal cycle will include a clean-up finalization cycle
- Also assumed time to resolve any conflicts between the comments received: 1 meeting/conference call, and 1 follow up electronic concurrence.

## 3.12.2 Archaeological Survey Report (ASR)

CH2M will prepare and ASR covering all required prehistoric and historic archaeological assessments. The technical documentation/report will include, but not be limited to, a regional overview of prehistoric, historic, sensitivity; identification and discussion of the thresholds of significance for evaluating cultural resources; Area of Potential Effect (APE) sensitive literature and record searches; a summary of the mitigation strategies for the Project. All documents will be in accordance with CEQA, NEPA, and any additional pertinent state and local regulations and guidelines.

A complete prehistoric and historic archaeological research assessment and record search will be conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC). Located on the campus of California State University, Fullerton, the SCCIC is the State of California's official cultural resource records repository for Los Angeles, Orange, and Ventura counties. Additional research will be conducted pertinent to project needs at local repositories including museums and local historical societies. A qualified CH2M cultural resource specialist, along with a second environmental team member for safety purposes, will conduct full field reconnaissance for the length of the project to assess the APE sensitivity. A complete description of background research and field investigation results will be provided in a Phase I Archaeological Survey Inventory Report. CH2M will develop applicable mitigation measures to address any potential impacts to prehistoric and historic resources. In addition, initial Native American contact will be conducted during the report preparation process in accordance with SB18, if required. Historic Building Assessment will be conducted based on the results of the record search and the field reconnaissance. The applicable results will be incorporated into the Final ASR Report

## Deliverables

- Draft ASR Report (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)
- Final ASR Report (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)
- Appendices and record search results will be provided in electronic versions only

## Assumptions

- Field investigation to characterize potential Cultural resources not scoped as part of this phase. It is expected, all field investigation, if necessary, will be conducted during subsequent phases.
- At the initiation of the analysis process, the design of the project will be fixed and there will be no changes to project design.
- One concurrent review submittal to SANBAG and the Cities of Rialto and San Bernardino are assumed
- The formal cycle will include a clean-up finalization cycle
- Also assumed time to resolve any conflicts between the comments received: 1 meeting/conference

Attachment: SANBAG\_LRDT\_SCOPE\_160531 (2642 : Award Double Track Contract)

# Lilac to Rancho

## DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

call, and 1 follow up electronic concurrence.

### 3.12.3 Natural Environmental Study (NES)

A qualified CH2M biologist will perform preliminary surveys to conduct an assessment of biological habitat quality within the project area and its immediate surrounds. The NES will discuss natural communities, as well as individual plant and animal species of concern. The emphasis of this report will be on the ecological function of the natural communities within the area and their biological value to species of concern, as well as the results of field surveys. It will also include information on any regulations relevant to the natural communities and species. The NES will discuss avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures for the potential biological impacts due to the construction of the proposed project. This technical report will be the basis of regulatory agency coordination and permitting efforts.

#### Deliverables

- Draft NES Report (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)
- Final NES Report (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)
- Field Investigations and Survey Reports for Species of Concern (electronic copy only)

#### Assumptions

- At the initiation of the analysis process, the design of the project will be fixed and there will be no changes to project design.
- One concurrent review submittal to SANBAG and the Cities of Rialto and San Bernardino are assumed
- The formal cycle will include a clean-up finalization cycle
- Also assumed time to resolve any conflicts between the comments received: 1 meeting/conference call, and 1 follow up electronic concurrence.

### 3.12.4 Biological Assessment (BA)

Subsequent to the special status species surveys conducted during the NES phase, CH2M will prepare a Biological Assessment (BA) in accordance with Section 7 of the United States Endangered Species Act (ESA). The BA will discuss federally listed plant and animal species and their potential to occur within the project area. A key part of this report will be early and frequent coordination with the US Fish and Wildlife Service (Agency meetings referenced under the PDT meetings description above). The BA will be submitted to the USFWS for approval, which will be needed prior to any construction activities.

#### Deliverables

- Draft BA (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)
- Final BA (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)
- Field Investigations and Survey Reports associated with the BA efforts (electronic copy only)

#### Assumptions

- At the initiation of the analysis process, the design of the project will be fixed and there will be no changes to project design.
- One concurrent review submittal to SANBAG and the Cities of Rialto and San Bernardino are assumed
- The formal cycle will include a clean-up finalization cycle
- Also assumed time to resolve any conflicts between the comments received: 1 meeting/conference call, and 1 follow up electronic concurrence.

# Lilac to Rancho

## DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

- Two review cycles with USFWS are also assumed with the CH2M response to comments and document revision efforts occurring in parallel with any needed coordination needed with SANBAG and the Cities Rialto and San Bernardino as the BA is being revised.

### 3.12.5 Clean Water Act (CWA) Permitting

Due to the potential impacts to jurisdictional waterways, and through the modification of drainage systems, CH2M will begin the necessary steps to obtain Clean Water Act Section 401 (RWQCB) and Section 404 permit (USACE). In order to aid in the permitting process during the PS&E stage of the Project, quarterly meetings (maximum of 4 meetings) with the regulatory agencies will take place. These meetings will assist in the identification of regulatory agency opportunities and challenges, agreed upon methods to address those challenges, reach concurrence on the applicable opportunities, develop a concept mitigation plan (if necessary), and ultimately expedite the permitting application process.

#### Deliverables

- Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit Application Package (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)
- Clean Water Act Section 404 Nation Wide Permit Package (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)
- Concept Mitigation Plan (one electronic copy)

#### Assumptions

- At the initiation of the analysis process, the design of the project will be fixed and there will be no changes to project design.
- One concurrent review submittal to SANBAG and the Cities of Rialto and San Bernardino are assumed
- The formal cycle will include a clean-up finalization cycle
- Also assumed time to resolve any conflicts between the comments received: 1 meeting/conference call, and 1 follow up electronic concurrence.
- Two review cycles with RWQBD and USACE are also assumed with the CH2M response to comments and document revision efforts occurring in parallel with any needed coordination needed with SANBAG and the Cities Rialto and San Bernardino as the permitting packages are being revised.

### 3.12.6 Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) Technical Memorandum

CH2M will prepare a VIA technical memorandum based on the proposed improvements consisting primarily of a second track that will be built at-grade parallel and within the existing rail right-of-way in a developed urban area. A simple level of visual analysis is anticipated with the exception of the Rialto Station area where a second platform will be added and connected to the existing platform by means of either an at-grade crossing, an underground crossing, or an elevated crossing. The visual changes brought about by these improvements would be more substantial and will require a full level of evaluation to provide an understanding of the visual implications.

The analysis of the project's visual effects will be conducted in compliance with the requirements of the visual impact assessment methodology developed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in a technical memorandum format.

#### Project Initiation

To initiate the project, CH2M HILL and M&N, will meet with City staff to discuss any aesthetic issues related to the project that are important to the city. CH2M HILL will also set up its internal infrastructure for the project, including project instructions and health and safety plan, final work plan, and schedule.

# Lilac to Rancho

DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

## Site Visit

CH2M HILL will gather data provided by the engineering team to create a project area map to guide its field investigations. This map will be prepared on an air photo base on which all proposed project features have been indicated. One CH2M HILL visual specialist will visit the project area to check existing conditions and photograph views that are representative and that are potentially sensitive to the visual changes. After the field visit, the field observations and photographs will be reviewed, Key Observation Points (KOP) will be selected to use as the basis for the analysis, and a single photograph will be selected for preparation of the simulations of the three proposed pedestrian crossings at the Rialto Station between the existing platform and the proposed new platform on the other side of the tracks.

## Prepare Simulations

CH2M HILL's visual simulation specialist will obtain the CAD 3-D models of the alternative crossing structures as well as a description of exterior colors and finishes from SANBAG and the City of Rialto, along with the GIS data needed for preparation of the simulations. A single simulation for each of the three alternative crossing designs will be prepared according to the efforts described above and also based on the input from the project team, including the City of Rialto and Metrolink.

## Evaluate Visual Changes Using VIA Rating Sheets

Following the preparation of the simulations, CH2M HILL will evaluate the existing visual conditions and the with-project visual conditions from each of the KOPs using the FHWA visual quality rating sheets. For the view toward the proposed pedestrian crossing a comparison of the photograph of the existing view with the simulations depicting the view as would appear under the three different scenarios for the pedestrian crossing of the tracks will be used as the basis for determining the degree change to the existing visual character and quality of each view of the view under each of the crossing alternatives.

## Prepare Technical Memorandum

CH2M HILL will prepare a brief technical memorandum that documents the changes the currently proposed project would make to existing visual conditions and which compares those visual changes.

## ***Deliverables***

- Draft Technical Memo (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)
- Final Technical Memo (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)
- Visual Rating Sheets and Photo Inventory (electronic copy)

## ***Assumptions***

- At the initiation of the analysis process, the design of the project will be fixed and there will be no changes to project design.
- One concurrent review submittal to SANBAG and the Cities of Rialto and San Bernardino are assumed
- The formal cycle will include a clean-up finalization cycle
- Also assumed time to resolve any conflicts between the comments received: 1 meeting/conference call, and 1 follow up electronic concurrence.
- CH2M HILL will be provided with a 3-D model that provides sufficient detail to permit development of simulations of the views of the proposed pedestrian crossing at the Rialto Station without the need for additional model development activity.

# Lilac to Rancho

## DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

- CH2M HILL will be provided with information on the colors and surface treatments of any crossing structures that are proposed and other design details that will permit accurate and complete rendering of their appearance.
- CH2M HILL will be provided with an air photo of the project area and with project area GIS data that will support the simulation effort and that will provide a basis for efficient preparation of the field map and the map figure that will be a part of the technical report.
- Meetings with City of Rialto will be restricted to an initial kickoff meeting

### 3.12.7 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases

CH2M will conduct an air quality analysis and evaluate whether the project meet the regional and project level conformity requirements. CO “hot spot” analysis will be performed to determine the localized effects of vehicle emissions from affected intersections. A qualitative CO analysis will be conducted following the Caltrans guidance document, *Transportation Project-level Carbon Monoxide Protocol* (Institute of Transportation Studies, U.C. Davis, December 1997). Localized PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> hot spot analysis will follow the latest FHWA and EPA’s guidance. It is assumed that the project will not be of air quality concern. The analysis will include qualitative discussions using traffic data, and a quantitative PM<sub>10</sub>/PM<sub>2.5</sub> dispersion modeling analysis will not be required.

A qualitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis will be performed following FHWA’s 2012 *Interim Guidance Update on Mobile Source Air Toxic Analysis in NEPA Documents*.

Climate change impacts due to project emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG) will be discussed. A qualitative discussion of project adaptation to the effects of climate change will be included in the analysis.

Short-term air quality impacts from construction will be evaluated qualitatively based on project construction schedule and activities. Emission reduction/minimization measures that will be implemented by the project will be discussed.

#### Deliverables

- Draft Air Quality and GHG Technical Report (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)
- Final Air Quality and GHG Technical Report (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)

#### Assumptions

- At the initiation of the analysis process, the design of the project will be fixed and there will be no changes to project design.
- One concurrent review submittal to SANBAG and the Cities of Rialto and San Bernardino are assumed
- The formal cycle will include a clean-up finalization cycle
- Also assumed time to resolve any conflicts between the comments received: 1 meeting/conference call, and 1 follow up electronic concurrence.
- The project will not trigger quantitative CO hot spot modeling analysis.
- The project will not trigger quantitative PM<sub>10</sub>/PM<sub>2.5</sub> hot spot modeling analysis.
- Short-term construction emissions will not be quantified.
- GHG/climate change discussion will be qualitative, GHG emissions from construction and operation of the project will not be quantified.

### 3.12.8 Water Quality

CH2M will perform a stormwater management review for the Lilac to Rancho Double Track Addition Project and develop a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). As part of the stormwater management review, CH2M will conduct a project evaluation, site design, and Best Management Practice (BMP) selection and

# Lilac to Rancho

## DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

evaluation, consistent with the Technical Guidance Document for Water Quality Management Plans, approved by the Regional Board on June 21, 2013. CH2M will not be responsible for the overall drainage design of the project, which will be prepared by Moffatt & Nichol. CH2M will coordinate with Moffatt & Nichol to identify locations for Low Impact Development (LID) BMPs. LID BMPs will be incorporated into the project to preserve the pre-development hydrology of the project site to the maximum extent practicable (MEP).

CH2M will assess site conditions, identify pollutants of concern, determine Hydrologic Conditions of Concern (HCOC), and identify requirements associated with a regional watershed or local jurisdiction that may affect project planning. CH2M will establish performance criteria as the basis for determining the extent of LID and hydro-modification BMPs needed for the project. Using the information developed, LID practices will be selected and evaluated to meet the minimum performance criteria feasible. Source control BMPs will also be incorporated in the project to reduce the potential for stormwater runoff and pollutants from coming into contact with one another. Lastly, post-construction requirements for operation and maintenance of BMPs will be incorporated into the Project WQMP.

A Preliminary WQMP will be submitted early in the project development process to the Cities of Rialto and San Bernardino for review. A Final WQMP will be submitted to fully address site design measures, LID BMPs, hydro-modification controls, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs to address pollutants or hydrologic conditions of concern.

### **Deliverables:**

- Draft WQMP (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)
- Final WQMP (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)

### **Assumptions:**

- At the initiation of the analysis process, the design of the project will be fixed and there will be no changes to project design.
- One concurrent review submittal to SANBAG and the Cities of Rialto and San Bernardino are assumed
- The formal cycle will include a clean-up finalization cycle
- Also assumed time to resolve any conflicts between the comments received: 1 meeting/conference call, and 1 follow up electronic concurrence.
- CH2M will rely on Moffatt-Nichol for any reports related to drainage, hydrology, and hydraulics.
- Moffatt & Nichol will prepare conceptual drainage plans showing locations of all proposed BMPs for inclusion in the Water Quality Management Plan.
- Two CH2M staff will attend a railroad safety training.
- Meetings with City will be restricted to an initial kickoff meeting and two additional meetings during the project development process

### **3.12.9 Paleontology**

CH2M will conduct a paleontological resources inventory review in support of the environmental analysis and documentation efforts. The literature and record search will include technical documentation and reviews of the geology within one mile of the right-of-way, paleontological finds within those geological units, and an evaluation of the paleontological sensitivity of those units; identification and discussion of the thresholds of significance for evaluating paleontological resources, a summary of the mitigation strategies for the Project. All documents will be in accordance with CEQA, NEPA, and any additional pertinent state and local regulations and guidelines.

Coordination with the engineering team to determine which project components have the potential to affect paleontological resources will be important to the successful completion of this task. An inventory review will

# Lilac to Rancho

## DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

be requested from both the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History (LACM) and the San Bernardino County Museum of Natural History (SBNHM). This will require providing each institution with a map of the Project ROW. These institutions are the local repositories for fossil records found in the

Project area, and their inventory reviews will be integrated into the final Paleontological Resources Inventory Review. A field survey will not be conducted as part of the inventory review; if a field survey is required it will take place during drafting of the Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan. A summary of the affected geology and paleontology will be provided in the Paleontological Resources Inventory Review. CH2M will develop mitigation measures to address potential impacts to paleontological resources.

### **Deliverables**

- Draft Paleontological Resources Inventory Review (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)
- Final Paleontological Resources Inventory Review (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)

### **Assumptions**

- At the initiation of the analysis process, the design of the project will be fixed and there will be no changes to project design.
- One concurrent review submittal to SANBAG and the Cities of Rialto and San Bernardino are assumed
- The formal cycle will include a clean-up finalization cycle
- Also assumed time to resolve any conflicts between the comments received: 1 meeting/conference call, and 1 follow up electronic concurrence.
- Field investigation will not be required.
- The LACM and SDNHM can deliver inventory reviews in a timely manner within 4 weeks of the request being lodged.
- Several references will need to be purchased at SANBAG's expense (approximately \$160)

### **3.12.12 Phase 1 – Initial Site Assessment**

Ninyo & Moore, as a fully integrated member of the consultant team, will provide hazardous materials environmental consulting services for the Project. The ISA will be to evaluate whether hazardous materials or other adverse environmental conditions are present due to past or present use of the site and/or properties in the project site vicinity. The ISA will be generally consistent with applicable sections of the ASTM International (ASTM) 2013 guidance (Designation Number E-1527-13), the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries (AAI), with Chapter 18 of the State of California Department of Transportation Project Development Procedures Manual, and with Attachment A Task 3 of the RFP. Because the ASTM and AAI standards were established to provide innocent landowner liability protection under Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act for the purchaser of a property, and because this project does not involve a purchase transaction, the applicability of the ASTM/AAI standards will be limited.

The ISA will include the following tasks:

- A site visit to visually evaluate site characteristics for possible contaminated surface soil or surface water, improperly stored hazardous materials, possible sources of polychlorinated biphenyls, and possible risks of site contamination from activities at the site.
- Properties within and adjoining the project site will be visually evaluated from public rights-of-way, only.
- A site vicinity reconnaissance to evaluate characteristics of adjacent properties for possible environmental influences on the site.

# Lilac to Rancho

## DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

- A review of a computerized database search of readily available government and regulatory agency environmental lists for the site and for properties located within approximately 1/4 mile of the project site. The objective of the database search will be to evaluate locations where hazardous materials may have been used or stored and their possible effects on the site.
- On-site properties of possible concern will be further evaluated by requesting and reviewing readily available environmental documents for these properties from regulatory agencies, or by interviewing regulatory agency personnel.
- Locations of properties of concern will be shown on maps of the site vicinity.
- Review State of California, Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources oil field maps and review of information provided by the California State Fire Marshal regarding oil and natural gas pipelines.
- Review of site and adjacent historical land use to provide an overview of past uses that likely involved the use or storage of hazardous materials. Ninyo & Moore will attempt to note historical site uses involving the use or storage of hazardous materials from the time when the site was undeveloped.
- Prepare an ISA report. The report will document work scope findings and provide a discussion of findings, conclusions, and recommendations regarding the current environmental condition of the site and recommendations for additional assessment, as appropriate.

The ISA is a screening-level historical study evaluating the current and past uses of the site and potential impacts from hazardous materials. Depending on the results of the ISA, additional subsurface evaluation may be recommended for adverse environmental conditions that are not and cannot be known at this time.

### **Deliverables:**

- Draft Phase 1 ISA (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)
- Final Phase 1 ISA (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)
- Record Search Appendix (electronic copy only)

### **Assumptions:**

- One concurrent review submittal to SANBAG and the Cities of Rialto and San Bernardino are assumed
- The formal cycle will include a clean-up finalization cycle
- Also assumed time to resolve any conflicts between the comments received: 1 meeting/conference call, and 1 follow up electronic concurrence.
- Information that will be used to review the site history will include readily available historical aerial photographs, Sanborn Maps, and historic United States Geological Survey Topographic Maps.
- The draft and final reports will be presented in an appropriate format consistent with reports prepared by Ninyo & Moore for similar projects in California.
- Subsurface sampling or analysis is not anticipated in this scope.
- Copies of title and lease records, maps and reports pertaining to the site will be provided by the SANBAG.
- Assuming that there are no delays due to inclement weather or acquisition of existing data and reports, we anticipate the draft ISA report will take approximately six weeks to complete.
- Scope of work includes review of up to three agency files for site properties.
- Scope of work does not include review of files for off-site properties.

### **3.12.13 Noise and Vibration**

ATS Consulting as an integral member of the consultant team will provide noise and vibration analysis and documentation. The approach for the noise and vibration studies will document the existing noise and

# Lilac to Rancho

## DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

vibration levels, assess the future noise and vibration levels with the second track, recommend mitigation measures where the predicted levels exceed the FRA impact thresholds, and explore the feasibility of incorporating, as part of the project, supplementary noise and vibration control measures for areas already experiencing unusually high noise levels due to train horns, locomotive noise and vibration, or other noise sources related to rail operations within the Project Corridor.

Potential for increased noise and vibration could be critical issues for this project. The increases could come from the second track being located closer to sensitive receivers, from an increase in train frequency that would, indirectly, result in noise increases, or from higher train speeds. The existing noise levels adjacent to the tracks are likely to be relatively high as a result of sounding the train horns before at-grade crossings. Because the FRA noise impact criteria allow for only a small increase in noise levels where existing levels are relatively high (less than 1 dBA in some cases), there is some potential that this project would result in a significant number of noise impacts. The best strategy that will be employed for addressing the potential community concern and the potential for noise impacts involves careful documentation of existing conditions and development of noise predictions that accurately account for changes in the corridor.

The approach used for this project is summarized in the following tasks:

- Identify Sensitive Receivers and Develop Measurement Plan. This task will include visits to the project area to identify sensitive receivers and review of project plans and Google Earth to determine receiver distances from the existing single track and the future second track. Based on the sensitivities identified, a plan for noise and vibration measurements will be developed that will provide an accurate picture of existing conditions in the project corridor.
- Perform Noise and Vibration Measurements. Noise and vibration measurements will be performed at up to ten locations in the corridor using both long-term (24 hours minimum) measurements for residential receptors and short-term measurements (1 hour minimum) for other land uses. The measurement results will be analyzed to determine the typical noise and vibration levels for the existing train traffic in the project corridor along with the existing background noise levels from automotive traffic and other community noise sources.
- Development Prediction Model and Predict Future Noise and Vibration Levels at Sensitive Receivers. The predictions will be based on the measurement results and standard prediction equations provided in the FRA guidance manual (*High-Speed Ground Transportation Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, September 2012) and the FRA guidance manual (*Transit Transportation Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, May 2006). The predictions will account for all changes resulting from the project that could cause changes in the noise and vibration levels. This could include changes in train volumes, changes in the operating conditions (e.g. higher speeds or longer trains), and changes in distances to the two tracks.
- Identify Potential Impacts and Develop Mitigation Recommendations. The FRA impact criteria will be utilized to identify potential impacts and identify mitigation measures that will reduce the predicted levels to below the impact threshold. This task will include considering the feasibility of incorporating, as part of the project, noise and vibration control measures for areas that are currently experiencing relatively high noise and vibration levels.
- Reporting. The results of the measurements, analysis, impact assessment and recommended mitigation measures will be documented in a technical report.

### Deliverables:

# Lilac to Rancho

DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

- Draft Noise and Vibration Technical Report (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)
- Final Noise and Vibration Technical Report (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)
- Detailed Modeling Appendices (electronic copy only)

## **Assumptions:**

- One concurrent review submittal to SANBAG and the Cities of Rialto and San Bernardino are assumed
- The formal cycle will include a clean-up finalization cycle
- Also assumed time to resolve any conflicts between the comments received: 1 meeting/conference call, and 1 follow up electronic concurrence.
- The scope of services and fee estimate allows for attending up to two community meetings to present results of the noise and vibration studies.

## **Railroad Operations (Optional Service)**

For the optional modeling and operations analysis task, CH2M will utilize an existing conditions RTC model provided by the stakeholders (SANBAG and/or Metrolink), and modify the model to reflect the proposed design of the railway alignment, including signals, special trackwork, civil constraints, and other elements that may impact the movement of trains, as submitted by the design team. These infrastructure modifications, along with proposed operating scenarios and conditions, in conjunction with the affected stakeholders, will be input into the model. The output of the simulation runs, will be utilized to analyze the proposed modifications and the overall impact they have on Metrolink, SCRRA, Amtrak, and BNSF/UPRR train movements, and other stakeholder concerns, particularly within the immediate surrounding area to the working limits of the project. The analysis will then be utilized as necessary to provide input to any further design modifications that will ultimately result in a more efficient, and higher capacity operation. As necessary, the process can be an iterative one, to effectively present the best possible alignment and operating conditions.

The operations analysis will review numerous elements of the output, and how train movements are impacted by routings, signals, operating speeds, schedules, etc., as well as the impact associated with train conflicts, delays, terminal capacity and train consists, as well as any other element that impacts the movement of trains. The operations analysis team will keep in close contact with the design team, as well as the stakeholders, to make sure the status of the analysis and modeling effort is kept up-to-date, and to ensure the questions and concerns of each team and stakeholder are understood and acted upon as required, to provide the best possible result of the final design and ultimately of the railway operation.

## **Deliverables:**

- No discrete deliverables associated with this optional task
- Results from the analysis and modeling efforts, if conducted, will be incorporated directly into the engineering documentation prepared by the Moffatt & Nichol design team.

## **Technical Advisory Services/Coordination (Optional Service)**

CH2M will provide technical advisory and coordination/facilitation services regarding owner – operator agreements, needs, shared use requirements, funding, and as-needed discussion regarding the operations, dispatching, temporary timetable adjustments and coordination in this shared passenger\ freight corridor. CH2M will also provide input on best practices approaches regarding similar project development effort and funding strategies. Support staff from CH2M will include David Solow, former CEO of SCRRA/Metrolink, and Hany Haroun, PE, Senior Project Manager.

## **Deliverables:**

Attachment: SANBAG\_LRDT\_SCOPE\_160531 (2642 : Award Double Track Contract)

# Lilac to Rancho

DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

- No discrete deliverables associated with this optional task

DRAFT

Attachment: SANBAG\_LRDT\_SCOPE\_160531 (2642 : Award Double Track Contract)

## EXHIBIT B

### Survey and Mapping Scope of Work

#### 3.1.1 Survey Control, Aerial Topographic Mapping, Supplemental Ground Survey and Right-of-Way Survey, Survey Control

The CONSULTANT will utilize and extend the existing SANBAG geodetic survey control network established for the Downtown San Bernardino Passenger Rail Project as shown on recorded surveys for this project.

Differential leveling - a one-way digital level run will be conducted from the existing survey control network at the historic San Bernardino Santa Fe Depot in a general westerly direction along the San Gabriel Subdivision the length of the project (MP52.1 to MP55.3) in order to establish with certainty precise control station elevations at each of the crossing streets and to verify both the City of San Bernardino and the City of Rialto local benchmark systems.

CONSULTANT will prepare a Survey Control Drawing sheet that will be included in the plan set and at a minimum will show the following:

- Basis of Bearings and Coordinates;
- The primary benchmark(s) for the Project;
- The primary control stations from the overall SANBAG corridor network;
- Secondary control stations set for supplemental design surveys;
- The aerial control (HV) targets that were utilized for the aerial mapping for the Project and the rail alignments and stations.

#### 3.1.2 Aerial Topographic Mapping and Digital Imagery

The CONSULTANT will fly the 3-mile corridor from Lytle Creek Channel (MP55.63) on the east and terminate on the west at Cactus Avenue (MP52.1) and will obtain the following:

- Aerial Photography, Planimetric And Topographic Data Compilation;
- Digital terrain model (DTM);
- Provide high-accuracy ground control, for design-level photogrammetry;
- Provide aerial stereo photography for a 400-foot wide strip centered on the main track to support map scales of 1-inch =40-foot and a 1-foot contour interval;
- Compile digital aerial topographic map with planimetric and vertical contour data for a 400-foot wide strip centered on the main track to meet National Map Accuracy and ASPRS standards for 40 scale, one-foot contour interval mapping;
- Prepare a color digital ortho photo strip map 800-feet wide at approximate scale of 0.25 feet per pixel resolution.

#### 3.1.3 Supplemental Ground Survey

The CONSULTANT will collect additional supplemental field data at the UPRR overhead bridge (MP54.5) and at the nine (9) at-grade crossings (see below):

- S Cactus Ave (MP52.1);
- S Lilac Ave. (MP52.4);

# Lilac to Rancho

DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

- S Willow Ave.(MP52.6);
- S Riverside Ave. (MP53.0);
- S Sycamore Ave. (MP53.1);
- S Acacia Ave. (MP53.4);
- S Eucalyptus Ave. (MP53.6);
- S Pepper Ave. (53.9);
- W Rialto Ave. (MP54.4)

Including the following, but not limited to, centerline, back of walk, sidewalks, top of curb, flow line, lip, driveways, driveway approaches, fences, building FFE's, building corners, parkways, utility markings and utility features. Intervals (will be perpendicular to roadway centerline) and extend a minimum of 120' of each side of the track centerlines (longitudinal to roadway centerline) and will include any readily visible evidence of other existing utility features or mark-outs such as fiber optic lines and miscellaneous items of significance that may not be readily visible from the aerial photography within the existing SCRRA railway.

### 3.1.4 Rail Right-of-Way Survey

The CONSULTANT will collect field data on the top of rail along the existing mainline, siding, and any industry tracks located within the project limits (MP52.1 to MP55.3) based upon the following general criteria:

- All rail shots must be taken pairs (left and right rail directly opposite from each other);
- On tangents, at an approximate 100-foot interval;
- On curves, at an approximate 50-foot interval;
- For short horizontal curves, the point interval should be reduced so that at least 3 points are taken on the circular portion of the curve;
- At turnouts, typically 9 shots are needed: at switch points (PS – 2 shots), at ½" point of frog (PF – 3 shots), and at the center of the last long tie (LLT – 4 shots);
- Turnout sizes should be measured and determined in the field, then noted in the point descriptions for switch point shots (example description: PS #15); and
- All shots along turnouts should be taken on the common rails.

#### Other Track Equipment will be surveyed:

- Location and type of compromise joints;
- Location Rail Lubricators;
- Location and type of Derails;
- Location of Insulated Joints;
- Location of Concrete Crossing;
- Location of Crossing Warning Gates and Equipment;
- Location of Signal House/Case; and
- Location and type of Railroad signs.

#### Other Permanent Obstructions within the right-of-way will be surveyed:

- Manholes;
- Vaults;
- Retaining Walls;
- Drainage Structures (inverts) and Pipes;

# Lilac to Rancho

## DOUBLE TRACK ADDITION PROJECT

- Underground Utility Markers;
- Overhead Wires; and
- Bridge piers at the UPRR grade separated crossing.

### 3.1.5 Supplemental Utility Surveys

The CONSULTANT will collect additional supplemental field data for utilities. This task may include but is not limited to the location of both wet and dry utility manholes and where reasonable and practical may include the measurement of invert data. In addition it may include the location of utility mark-out and/or pothole reference marks from an underground utility locator.

### 3.1.6 Land net / Right-of-Way Retracement Survey

The CONSULTANT will research public records for surveys and subdivision maps, field notes and Valuation railroad maps and documents in the pertinent vicinity of the 9 street crossings within the Lilac to Rancho project limits and beyond of needed for right-of-way line establishments. This will include a field survey and office analysis of available evidence and records in order to determine the Railroad right-of-way for the entire project limit.

### 3.1.7 Record of Survey

A Record of Survey of the complete and final boundary survey of the railroad right-of-way will be prepared and submitted to the County of San Bernardino's County Survey office for checking and filing. The SANBAG railroad right-of-way survey recorded as R.S. Book 155, Page 28 through 30 on file with the County of San Bernardino will be relied upon as practical.

## *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 6

**Date:** June 9, 2016

**Subject:**

Redlands Passenger Rail Project - Procurement of Diesel Multiple Unit Rail Vehicles

**Recommendation:**

That the Transit Committee recommend the Board, acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission, approve the release of Request for Proposals No. 16-1001531 for the procurement of Redlands Passenger Rail Project Diesel Multiple Unit rail vehicles.

**Background:**

With the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) Board of Directors identifying the Redlands Passenger Rail Project (RPRP) as one of its priority projects, staff is moving forward with delivery of the project. The project proposes to implement a nine-mile passenger rail service between the San Bernardino Transit Center (SBTC) and the University of Redlands. The service is envisioned as operating with 30-minute peak and 60-minute off-peak headways during the work week and 60 minute headways on the weekends. Five stations have been identified: the SBTC, Waterman Street Station, New York Street Station, Downtown Redlands Station, and the University Station. A major component of implementing this passenger rail service is the procurement of rail vehicles.

As part of the RPRP Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement, which was completed in March 2015, the Record of Decision (ROD) memorialized the use of diesel multiple unit (DMU) technology as the preferred rail vehicle for RPRP. A number of criteria were used in the determination, including:

- Expected passenger loads;
- Life-cycle maintenance costs;
- Limiting community impacts, such as noise and vibration;
- Compliance with US Environmental Protection Agency Tier 4 emissions standards;
- Ability to operate in co-mingled service with conventional freight and commuter railroad equipment; and
- Daily and annual operating expenses.

A DMU is essentially a self-contained passenger train. A single train or unit contains two passenger sections with a cab at each end and a small propulsion unit in the middle. This type of vehicle may be found in service on the SPRINTER in San Diego County and on commuter lines in Texas and New Jersey. The vehicles are generally perceived by the public to have lower community impacts than conventional passenger trains due to their lower profile and quieter engines. The cars are lighter than conventional passenger rail cars and are able to operate

**Entity:** CTC

effectively using comparatively small engines; resulting in lower emissions, operating costs, and noise impacts when compared to conventional trains, such as those currently used on the connecting Metrolink commuter rail system. The ROD further identified the use of conventional commuter rail equipment, known as Locomotive Hauled Coaches (LHC) for use on up to two roundtrip Metrolink express trains during the morning and afternoon peak periods.

The RPRP Operations/Maintenance and Vehicle Selection Study of July 2015 identified the equipment needs of the proposed service levels. The report recommended a fleet size of at least three trainsets. The fleet allocation would consist of two trainsets in revenue service on thirty minute headways and the third as a ready spare in case of service interruptions. If the ready spare set is not available due to Federal Railroad Administration mandated inspections or extended mechanical issues and a service interruption occurs to the remaining two units, the service would be reduced to hourly headways until two vehicles are again serviceable. In order to ensure that the RPRP is viewed as a reliable travel alternative, the report further recommended the acquisition of a fourth vehicle trainset to avoid service reductions, if additional funding could be identified. SANBAG has applied for grant funding from multiple sources, including Federal Transit Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) and State Transit and Intercity Rail Program (TIRCP) funds and will continue to research other funding opportunities to acquire a fourth DMU.

Staff has explored two procurement approaches to the acquisition of the RPRP vehicles. Due to the limited number of vehicles required, the first approach was to identify an existing procurement by other transit agencies with contract options that could be assigned to SANBAG. Meetings were held with the TEX Rail project team in Fort Worth, Texas and the eBART staff in the San Francisco Bay Area. In both instances, the agencies were willing to assign options if SANBAG could address any Federal Transit Administration (FTA) concerns with the options. However, in discussions with the FTA, they revealed a number of concerns with the procurements already in place. The TEX Rail options were disapproved by the FTA as the number of vehicles exceeded the TEX Rail identified needs by a large margin. The eBART procurement was performed under the procurement rules of the State of California, which raised a number of concerns with FTA over the viability of converting an already completed California procurement to meet federal requirements. There are currently no other DMU procurements underway in the United States. Thus, the “piggy back” procurement approach was eliminated from consideration.

The second approach is for SANBAG to issue a RFP for the DMU vehicles procurement. In developing the RFP, staff applied lessons learned from the recent procurements of the technology by TEX Rail and eBART. Two important lessons learned resulted in the elimination of the industry review phase of the process, as the basic vehicle specification has been vetted and refined in earlier procurements, and the issuing of a performance specification creates a strong potential for challenges from unsuccessful bidders. The RFP for the RPRP vehicles has been adopted from the TEX Rail specification with additional refinements gleaned from the eBART specifications. The RFP includes a base contract of providing 3 DMU vehicles, with two additional options, one for one additional vehicle and a second option to procure two additional vehicles for a total number of 6 vehicles if all options are executed. These options provide flexibility for future expansion if additional funding becomes available.

This RFP also includes an option for SANBAG to have the successful vendor provide the

operations and maintenance of the vehicles. It is a common industry practice for the Original Equipment Manufacturer to provide on-going maintenance. Due to the small size of both the initial RPRP operation and vehicle maintenance, staff has planned to combine both operations and maintenance of the vehicles into a separate contract as either function alone is not expected to be large enough to attract qualified bidders. The spare parts and specialized tooling required to maintain the vehicles will also be acquired as part of this procurement, but will be paid for using operation funds.

Key features of the RFP are:

- A base order of three vehicles;
- Options for up to three additional vehicles;
- Option for vehicle operation and maintenance;
- Tier 4 or better emission standards;
- Ability to convert to alternative fuels or battery power as technology advances;
- Meets crash worthiness standards found in 49CFR Part 238 allowing for operation intermingled with conventional freight and passenger railroad equipment;
- Complies with ADA level boarding requirements without the use of gauntlet tracks;
- Complies with FTA Buy America requirements;
- Ability to meet a late 2019 delivery schedule;
- Spare parts and specialized tooling to maintain the vehicles; and
- Service proven design.

The 2014 cost estimate for passenger rail vehicle equipment was \$14.2 million, however this estimate was based on the use of rehabilitated LHCs. The use of LHCs was deemed infeasible based on the outcome of the EIR/EIS process based on the need to provide Tier 4 diesel engines, and addressing potential community impacts, thus the use of DMU technology was memorialized in the EIR/EIS Record of Decision. An updated cost estimate for the procurement of three new DMU vehicles, is \$22.5 million, excluding any of the additional contract options, specialized tools, and spare parts.

***Financial Impact:***

The funding for the RPRP vehicle procurement is included in the SANBAG Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Budget. The spare parts and specialized tooling required to maintain the vehicles, will be acquired using operating funds for RPRP.

***Reviewed By:***

This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee. SANBAG General Counsel and Procurement Manager will review and approve the RFP prior to release.

***Responsible Staff:***

Justin Fornelli, Chief of Transit and Rail Programs

---

Approved  
Transit Committee  
Date: June 9, 2016

Witnessed By:

## *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 7

**Date:** June 9, 2016

**Subject:**

Redlands Passenger Rail Project - Design of Downtown Redlands Station Betterments

**Recommendation:**

That Transit Committee recommend the Board, acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission:

A. Authorize the Executive Director or his designee to negotiate the final form of and execute Amendment 1 to Memorandum of Understanding, Contract No. 15-1001047 with the City of Redlands, for the design of betterments to the Redlands Passenger Rail Project Downtown Redlands Station, for a not-to-exceed amount still being negotiated, but currently estimated at \$150,000, subject to approval as to form by SANBAG legal counsel.

B. Authorize the Executive Director or his designee to negotiate the final form of and execute Amendment 2 to Contract No. 15-1001093 with HDR Engineering, Inc., contingent upon and commensurate with the final amendment amount of Recommendation A above, for additional design services for betterments to the Redlands Passenger Rail Project Downtown Redlands Station.

C. Approve a budget amendment to the SANBAG Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Budget to increase Task No. 0314, Sub Task 0324 Redlands Passenger Rail Project in the estimated amount of \$150,000 in accordance with the final negotiated value of Amendment 1 to Contract No. 15-1001047 in reimbursable Redlands Passenger Rail Project funds from the City of Redlands for a new Task Total of \$82,656,797.

**Background:**

In February 2015, the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) and the City of Redlands entered into Contract No. 15-1001047, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) defining the roles and responsibilities for each party for the Redlands Passenger Rail Project (RPRP) and memorializing that the City would implement Quiet Zones at the completion of construction and prior to RPRP passenger rail service beginning. Article 11 of the MOU provided for the eventuality of project betterments being requested by the City and being added to the project. The City has requested that betterments to the Downtown Redlands Station be considered and included in the project design and intends to fund the cost of these betterments.

SANBAG has established basic design criteria to be used at all of the RPRP stations, including architectural renderings, which were included and approved as part of the RPRP Environmental Document. Based on the basic design criteria and architectural renderings, SANBAG has budgeted for the associated station costs as part of the implementation of RPRP. The City of Redlands has expressed interest in deviating from the basic station design criteria to complete betterments at the Downtown Redlands Station that incorporate additional features that would

*Entity: CTC*

connect to the history of Redlands.

At the May 3, 2016 City of Redlands Council meeting, the City established an ad-hoc RPRP subcommittee whose role is to provide progress reports on the project back to the Council and, when necessary, aid the Council in making decisions as to how RPRP may impact the City. At the first meeting of the ad-hoc committee the desire to enhance the design of the Downtown Redlands Station was identified as a priority.

As the RPRP design is progressing to a 60% design completion deliverable and in order to ensure that the City's requested betterments do not adversely impact the over-all RPRP design schedule, the City of Redlands has included an agenda item on their June 7<sup>th</sup> Council Meeting to allocate \$150,000 to fund the design of station betterments and delegate authority to the Mayor or Council Member to execute an agreement with SANBAG. In line with the City's desire not to delay the design of RPRP, SANBAG staff is recommending that authority be provided to the Executive Director or his designee to negotiate Amendment 1 to Contract No. 15-1001047 for a not-to-exceed amount commensurate of what the City of Redlands approves on June 7<sup>th</sup> for the betterments at the Downtown Redlands Station.

SANBAG intends to fund the design and construction of the standard RPRP station components, as defined in the RPRP design criteria and the City of Redlands will fund all costs related to the design and construction of any betterments identified. SANBAG will act as the lead agency for the design, construction, and implementation of RPRP, including all improvements at the Station. The final amendment and contract cost will be completed and reviewed by SANBAG Legal Counsel prior to the Executive Director or designee executing the amendment.

A future amendment to the MOU will be required to address the funding contributions from the City of Redlands for constructing the Downtown Redlands Station betterments. This MOU Amendment No. 1 does not affect and will not release the City from previous obligations associated with Contract No. 97-026 executed in October 1996, which requires the City to contribute \$500,000 toward the construction of the Downtown Redlands Station in addition to other responsibilities associated with the RPRP.

On October 7, 2015 the SANBAG Board of Directors awarded Contract No. 15-1001093 to HDR Engineering, Inc. (HDR) for final design services for the RPRP. The scope of work for HDR contract included performing final design, securing environmental and other necessary permits, design services during construction, environmental studies, and support services during outreach and coordination with third parties as required for the construction and implementation of the mainline portion of RPRP. On April 6, 2016 the SANBAG Board of Directors approved the execution of Amendment 1 to HDR's contract for additional design services related to the New York Street Station and betterments at the University Station, funded by Esri and the University of Redlands respectively.

The original HDR contract included the design for the RPRP stations consistent with the project basic design criteria. Amendment No. 2 to the HDR contract, executed by the Executive Director or his designee, would increase HDR's scope and budget to include the design efforts for betterments to the Downtown Redlands Station requested and funded by the City of Redlands. The proposed second amendment to the HDR contract is contingent upon and commensurate with the execution of Amendment 1 to Contract No. 15-1001047 with the City of

Transit Committee Agenda Item

June 9, 2016

Page 3

Redlands, that provides the required additional project funding for the betterments. The final Amendment No. 2 to HDR's contract will be completed and reviewed by SANBAG Legal Counsel prior to the Executive Director or designee executing the amendment.

The budget amendment requested in Recommendation C of this agenda item is required due to the City of Redlands identifying the desire to fund additional enhancements to the Redlands Passenger Rail Project after the SANBAG Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Budget was drafted and approved by the SANBAG Board of Directors.

***Financial Impact:***

This item is not consistent with the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 budget. Approval of Recommendation C will authorize an amendment to the Fiscal Year budget, Task No. 0314, Sub Task 0324 Redlands Passenger Rail Project, to increase funding received from the City of Redlands in an amount estimated to be \$150,000 for a new estimated task total of \$82,656,797.

***Reviewed By:***

This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee. SANBAG General Counsel and Procurement Manager have reviewed this item.

***Responsible Staff:***

Justin Fornelli, Chief of Transit and Rail Programs

---

Approved  
Transit Committee  
Date: June 9, 2016

Witnessed By:

Contract Summary Sheet

General Contract Information

Contract No: 15-1001047 Amendment No.: 1 Vendor No.: 01776
Vendor/Customer Name: City of Redlands Sole Source? Yes No
Description: RPRP MOU Amend. 1 - Downtown Station Betterments
Start Date: 02/12/2015 Expiration Date: 12/31/2020 Revised Expiration Date:
Has Contract Term Been Amended? No Yes - Please Explain
List Any Related Contracts Nos.: 97-026

Table with 4 columns: Contract Type, Dollar Amount, Contingency Type, Dollar Amount. Rows include Original Contract, Revised Contract, Current Amendment, and TOTAL CONTRACT VALUE.

Contract Authorization

Executive Director Date:
Executive Director Action: Execute Amendment 1 to MOU 15-1001047
Board of Directors Date: 07/06/2016
Board of Directors Action: Authorize Executive Director to execute final amendment

Contract Management: Payable/Miscellaneous

Invoice Warning: 20% Renewals: Type: Capital PAA Other
Retention: % Maximum Retention: \$ -
Services: Construction Intragnt/MOU/COOP A & E Services Other Professional Services
Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Goal %

Contract Management: Receivable

E-76 and/or CTC Date (Attach Copy) Program Supplement No.:
Finance Letter Reversion Date: EA No.:

All of the above MUST be submitted to FINANCE including originals, amendments and miscellaneous transaction changes

Additional Information

Project Manager:

Attachment: CSS - City of Redlands [Revision 1] (2841 : Amendment 1 to Contract 15-1001047 with the City of Redlands-station canopy

**Contract Summary Sheet**

**General Contract Information**

Contract No: 15-1001093 Amendment No.: 02 Vendor No.: 00982  
 Vendor/Customer Name: HDR Engineering, Inc. Sole Source?  Yes  No  
 Description: RPRP Final Design Amend 2 - Downtown Redlands Station Betterments  
 Start Date: 10/28/2015 Expiration Date: 06/30/2020 Revised Expiration Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Has Contract Term Been Amended?  No  Yes - Please Explain \_\_\_\_\_  
 List Any Related Contracts Nos.: \_\_\_\_\_

Dollar Amount			
Original Contract	\$ 25,196,824.00	Original Contingency	\$ 2,519,682.00
Revised Contract (Inclusive of Prior Amendments)	\$ 25,978,774.00	Revised Contingency (Inclusive of Prior Amendments)	\$ 95,942.00
Current Amendment	\$ 150,000.00	Contingency Amendment	\$ -
<b>TOTAL CONTRACT VALUE</b>	<b>\$ 26,128,774.00</b>	<b>TOTAL CONTINGENCY VALUE</b>	<b>\$ 2,615,624.00</b>
		<b>TOTAL DOLLAR AUTHORITY (Contract Value and Contingency)</b>	<b>\$ 28,744,398.00</b>

**Contract Authorization**

Executive Director Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Executive Director Action: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Board of Directors Date: 07/06/2016  
 Board of Directors Action: Authorize Executive Director to execute final amendment to 15-1001093

**Contract Management: Payable/Miscellaneous**

Invoice Warning: 20% Renewals: \_\_\_\_\_ Type:  Capital  PAA  Other  
 Retention: \_\_\_\_\_ % Maximum Retention: \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Services:  Construction  Intrgrnt/MOU/COOP  A & E Services  Other Professional Services  
 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Goal \_\_\_\_\_ %

**Contract Management: Receivable**

E-76 and/or CTC Date \_\_\_\_\_ (Attach Copy)  Program Supplement No.: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Finance Letter  Reversion Date: \_\_\_\_\_  EA No.: \_\_\_\_\_

**All of the above MUST be submitted to FINANCE including originals, amendments and miscellaneous transaction changes**

**Additional Information**

Project Manager: \_\_\_\_\_

Attachment: CSS - HDR Amend. 2 [Revision 1] (2841 : Amendment 1 to Contract 15-1001047 with the City of Redlands-station canopy

## *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 8

**Date:** *June 9, 2016*

**Subject:**

San Bernardino Transit Center Emergency Generator and Landscape Modifications Project

**Recommendation:**

That the Transit Committee recommend the Board acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission:

- A. Approve the Plans, Specifications, and Estimate package for construction of the San Bernardino Transit Center Emergency Generator and Landscape Modifications Project.
- B. Authorize advertising the Invitation for Bid No. 16-1001520, subject to approval by SANBAG General Counsel as to form, for the construction bids for the San Bernardino Transit Center Emergency Generator and Landscape Modification Project.
- C. Authorize staff to proceed directly to Board without prior Transit Committee review for award of Construction Contract No. 16-1001520 for the San Bernardino Transit Center Emergency Generator and Landscape Modification Project.

**Background:**

The San Bernardino Transit Center (SBTC) is located at the intersection of Rialto Avenue and E Street in the City of San Bernardino and opened for operations in September 2015. Delivery of the SBTC is being done in partnership with Omnitrans, with SANBAG responsible for delivery of the capital improvements, both agencies providing funding, and Omnitrans operating the facility. In early 2015, as construction of the larger project neared completion, Omnitrans identified the need for an emergency generator and modifications to the landscaping. This need was identified in Amendment No. 1 to Contract No. R14070 approved by the SANBAG Board in April 2015 and prompted development of the SBTC Emergency Generator and Landscape Modifications Project (Project).

The project team has finalized the Plans, Specification & Estimate (PS&E) package for the Project and is recommending the Board approve the PS&E package and authorize advertisements for construction bids. Staff is also requesting authorization to proceed directly to the SANBAG Board for approval of the construction contract to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder without further Committee review. This will allow the execution of the contract and start of construction to occur at the earliest possible dates.

The Project includes construction of an exterior 250 kilowatt emergency generator and generator yard enclosure at the existing SBTC. The Project also includes installation of additional landscaping and irrigation improvements at the site. The estimated cost of construction construct, Contract 16-1001520, is \$650,000. Omnitrans agreed to fund the additional improvements as part of Amendment No. 1 to Contract No. R14070, however it is anticipated that additional

**Entity:** *CTC*

Transit Committee Agenda Item

June 9, 2016

Page 2

funding, approximately \$350,000 will be required. Staff is working with Omnitrans to identify the additional funding required for the Project and anticipates presenting an amendment to Contract No. R14070 to the Board concurrently with the request to award the Construction Contract.

***Financial Impact:***

This item is consistent with the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 SANBAG Budget.

***Reviewed By:***

This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee. SANBAG General Counsel and Procurement Manager have reviewed this item.

***Responsible Staff:***

Carrie Schindler, Director of Transit and Rail

---

Approved  
Transit Committee  
Date: June 9, 2016

Witnessed By:

## *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 9

**Date:** June 9, 2016

**Subject:**

Agreement with City of Rancho Cucamonga and Creative Housing Associates for Exclusive Negotiations Pertaining to a Transit-Oriented Development at the Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station

**Recommendation:**

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

- A. Approve draft Contract No. 16-1001524, an exclusive negotiating agreement, with the City of Rancho Cucamonga and Creative Housing Associates, to establish the terms and conditions of a financeable development ground lease at the Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station.
- B. Authorize the Executive Director or his designee to make changes to the terms of the agreement prior to execution by the Board President as approved by General Counsel.

**Background:**

In June 2015 the SANBAG Board of Directors approved Contract No. 15-1001271 with the City of Rancho Cucamonga (City) detailing the steps, roles and responsibilities necessary to select a private developer and enter a long-term lease to entitle, construct, and operate a transit-oriented, mixed residential and commercial development on the property located adjacent to the Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station (Project). After issuance of a request for qualifications and review of the qualifications submitted, the Review Committee consisting of City and SANBAG staff recommended a follow up interview and investigation of the proposal submitted by Creative Housing Associates (CHA) who is being recommended as the selected developer.

In accordance with Contract No. 15-1001271 final selection of the successful private developer is to be by the Rancho Cucamonga City Council prior to any action taken by SANBAG's Board of Directors to select the developer. Following the final selection of a private developer by the City Council and SANBAG Board of Directors, the plan was for SANBAG, the City, and the selected developer to enter into a development agreement for the entitlement, construction, and operation of the development project. As the proposed selected developer, CHA intends to incur significant costs analyzing and designing the Project, and has requested that the City agree to negotiate on an exclusive basis to establish the terms and conditions of a financeable development ground lease for the property. Contract No. 16-1001524, the Exclusive Negotiation Agreement (ENA), defines the roles and responsibilities among SANBAG, the City, and CHA for the exclusive negotiation of those terms and conditions. The selected development team and LLC partners currently include Creative Housing Associates, Lambert Development and the Gluckstein Family Investments/Apex Realty Inc.

**Entity:** CTC

## Transit Committee Agenda Item

June 9, 2016

Page 2

The City will be the lead on the negotiations and SANBAG will support their efforts through an oversight and approval role as it relates to impacts on rail operations and agreements related to the use of the land. The term of the ENA is eighteen months which may be extended by the mutual written agreement of the developer and the City Manager for up to two additional three (3) month periods. Subsequent to the ENA period it is anticipated SANBAG and the City will enter into a Development Agreement with the selected developer for the entitlement, construction, and operation of the development project. It is also anticipated that a separate agreement between SANBAG and the City will be developed for overall management of the ground lease.

While the details of the land use requirements will not be provided until a later date, certain criteria as it relates to Metrolink were included in the initial agreement between SANBAG and the City. These include at a minimum, maintaining parking spaces for the Metrolink riders and ensuring the necessary right-of-way is maintained for existing and future rail operations. In accordance with Contract No. 93-050, approved by the SANBAG and the City in 1993, SANBAG and the City shall hold in title as tenants in common the non-operating property at the Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station.

Although it is not anticipated SANBAG will incur costs associated with its oversight and approval role identified in the ENA, the ENA does allow for SANBAG to be reimbursed for costs should they occur. Should costs be incurred a budget amendment will be required to add the revenue source to the approved budget.

***Financial Impact:***

This item is consistent with the SANBAG Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Budget. A future budget amendment may be needed if SANBAG incurs reimbursable costs.

***Reviewed By:***

This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee. SANBAG General Counsel has reviewed this item and the draft contract.

***Responsible Staff:***

Carrie Schindler, Director of Transit and Rail

---

Approved  
Transit Committee  
Date: June 9, 2016

Witnessed By:

**Contract Summary Sheet**

**General Contract Information**

Contract No: 16-1001524 Amendment No.: \_\_\_\_\_ Vendor No.: 01755 & TBD  
 Vendor/Customer Name: City of Rancho Cucamonga & CHA/TBD Sole Source?  Yes  No  
 Description: Exclusive Negotiating Agreement for the Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station TOD  
 Start Date: 07/06/2016 Expiration Date: 05/31/2018 Revised Expiration Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Has Contract Term Been Amended?  No  Yes - Please Explain \_\_\_\_\_  
 List Any Related Contracts Nos.: \_\_\_\_\_

Dollar Amount			
Original Contract	\$ 25,000.00	Original Contingency	\$ -
Revised Contract (Inclusive of Prior Amendments)	\$ -	Revised Contingency (Inclusive of Prior Amendments)	\$ -
Current Amendment	\$ -	Contingency Amendment	\$ -
<b>TOTAL CONTRACT VALUE</b>	<b>\$ 25,000.00</b>	<b>TOTAL CONTINGENCY VALUE</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
		<b>TOTAL DOLLAR AUTHORITY (Contract Value and Contingency)</b>	<b>\$ 25,000.00</b>

**Contract Authorization**

Executive Director Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Executive Director Action: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Board of Directors Date: 07/06/2016  
 Board of Directors Action: Approve Contract No. 16-1001524 & Authorize Ex Dir to make changes.

**Contract Management: Payable/Miscellaneous**

Invoice Warning: 20% Renewals: \_\_\_\_\_ Type:  Capital  PAA  Other  
 Retention: \_\_\_\_\_ % Maximum Retention: \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Services:  Construction  Intrgrnt/MOU/COOP  A & E Services  Other Professional Services  
 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Goal \_\_\_\_\_ %

**X Contract Management: Receivable**

E-76 and/or CTC Date \_\_\_\_\_ (Attach Copy)  Program Supplement No.: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Finance Letter  Reversion Date: \_\_\_\_\_  EA No.: \_\_\_\_\_

**All of the above MUST be submitted to FINANCE including originals, amendments and miscellaneous transaction changes**

**Additional Information**

Project Manager: Carrie Schindler

Attachment: Contract Summary Sheet (2848 : Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station TOD ENA)

**EXCLUSIVE NEGOTIATING AGREEMENT FOR A TRANSIT-ORIENTED  
DEVELOPMENT AT THE RANCHO CUCAMONGA METROLINK STATION**

This EXCLUSIVE NEGOTIATING AGREEMENT (“ENA”) is dated as of July 1, 2016, and is entered into by and among the CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA, a municipal corporation (the “City”), SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (“SANBAG”) and CREATIVE HOUSING ASSOCIATES, LLC, a California limited liability company (the “Developer”). The City and SANBAG are collectively referred to herein as the “Owner”. The Owner and Developer are sometimes individually referred to herein as a “Party” and are sometimes collectively referred to herein as the “Parties.”

R E C I T A L S

A. The Owner owns the land in the City of Rancho Cucamonga, California that is described on Exhibit “A” (the Property”).

B. On or about September 21, 2015, the City issued a Request for Qualifications (the “RFQ”) for development of the Property. The Owner reviewed the responses to the RFQ. Developer responded to the RFQ, submitted supplemental information at the request of the Owner, and subsequently was interviewed by the Owner.

C. Following the aforementioned review by the Owner of Developer’s capabilities and Developer’s concepts for future use of the Property, the Owner has received a proposal from Developer for the development of an integrated mixed use development (the “Project”) on the Property.

D. Developer intends to incur significant costs analyzing the Property and designing the Project, and Developer has therefore requested that the Owner agree to negotiate with Developer on an exclusive basis to establish the terms and conditions of a financeable development ground lease (the “Ground Lease”) for the Property and a statutory development agreement (the “Development Agreement”) governing development of the Property.

E. It is anticipated that during the term of this ENA, Owner staff and consultants and attorneys of the Owner will devote substantial time and effort in meeting with Developer and its representatives and consultants, reviewing proposals, plans and reports, negotiating and preparing the Ground Lease and the Development Agreement, obtaining consultant advice and reports (possibly including an appraisal), and complying with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”).

NOW, THEREFORE, the Parties hereto agree as follows:

1. The term of this ENA shall commence on the date hereof and shall end on the earlier of: (i) the date that is one year and six months after the date of this ENA, as may be extended by the City Manager as set forth below under this Section 1, or (ii) the date on which the City or Developer terminates this ENA as provided in Section 2 below (in either case, the “ENA Period”). Provided that neither Party has terminated this ENA pursuant to Section 2 below, the ENA Period shall be extended by the City Manager, in writing, at the written request of Developer, for up to two additional three (3) month periods; provided, however, that: (i) the

Developer is not then in material default under this ENA (following notice to Developer and expiration of cure periods in accordance with Section 3 below), (ii) there are no material issues remaining to be resolved with respect to the Ground Lease or the Development Agreement; and (iii) the applicable extension is necessary to complete the CEQA Documents (as defined in Section 8 below) and then submit the Ground Lease and Development Agreement to the City Council and SANBAG Board for consideration.

2. City is hereby authorized to negotiate exclusively with Developer on behalf of Owner; however, City will regularly communicate and consult with SANBAG regarding the negotiations, and SANBAG will retain rights to oversight as it relates to impacts on rail operations and to prior review and approval of the Ground Lease, Development Agreement, and any and all other agreements or instruments related to the use or development of the Property. The City is also designated as the “lead agency” for purposes of compliance with CEQA.

3. The Owner may terminate this ENA if Developer should fail to comply with or perform any provisions of this ENA and such failure is not cured within ten (10) business days after written notice from the City Manager to Developer, or if substantial progress is not being made in negotiations hereunder as determined by the City Manager in good faith. Developer may terminate this ENA by written notice to Owner if the Developer determines, in its sole discretion, that it does not wish to pursue the Project further.

4. During the ENA Period (as extended under Section 1 above, if applicable), the Owner shall not negotiate with any person or entity other than the Developer for the sale, lease, use or development of the Property.

5. The Project must include the features/elements described on Exhibit “B” attached hereto. Developer may revise those features and/or elements in response to changes in material conditions or to information discovered during the ENA Period, subject to providing notice to the Owner of any such changes. Developer shall deliver the materials and information identified on Attachment No. 1 attached hereto to the City within the times set forth on Attachment No. 1. Within ten (10) days after each calendar month during the ENA Period (as extended under Section 1 above, if applicable), Developer shall provide a written report to the City describing in reasonable detail Developer’s activities with respect to the Project during such calendar month.

6. During the ENA Period, the City shall use good faith efforts to complete (or cause to be completed) the tasks set forth in Attachment No. 2 attached hereto.

7. Developer shall reimburse the Owner for its actual out-of-pocket costs and expenses (including legal fees and costs) incurred in preparing this ENA and fulfilling its obligations under this ENA, including, but not limited to: (i) the costs of negotiating and preparing the Ground Lease and Development Agreement; and (ii) the costs of appraisals, economic consultants and the like used by Owner to evaluate the Project, proposed transaction terms, and/or Ground Lease (collectively, the “Reimbursable Costs”). Prior to executing any consultant contracts incurring any costs in connection with this ENA or the Project, the Owner shall first submit any such contracts and related proposals and cost estimates to Developer for

Developer's prior written approval, not to be unreasonably withheld. Concurrently with its execution of this ENA, Developer shall deposit with the City the sum of Twenty-Five Thousand and No/100 Dollars (\$25,000.00) (the "Reimbursement Funds"). The Reimbursement Funds may be used and applied from time to time by the City to pay or reimburse itself and SANBAG for Reimbursable Costs not otherwise paid or reimbursed by Developer. As between the City and SANBAG, SANBAG shall submit its requests for reimbursement to City, and shall provide such documentation as City may reasonably request for purposes of replenishment of the Reimbursement Funds from Developer hereunder. Developer shall deposit with the City funds sufficient to replenish the Reimbursement Funds held by City within ten (10) days after written demand by the City Manager. The City shall provide Developer with a monthly accounting identifying in reasonable detail the Reimbursable Costs to which Reimbursement Funds have been applied. Any Reimbursement Funds not applied shall be delivered to the Developer (along with a final accounting of the City's application of the Reimbursement Funds) within thirty (30) business days after the earlier of: (i) the execution of the Ground Lease by the Parties, or (ii) the expiration or earlier termination of this ENA. The provisions of this Section shall survive the expiration or earlier termination of this ENA, to the extent that the Owner has incurred actual Reimbursable Costs for which there are insufficient Reimbursement Funds then on deposit with the City, and provided that the Owner shall not enter into any further agreements or incur any further costs for which Developer is responsible subsequent to termination or expiration of this ENA. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this ENA, express or implied, the City shall have the right in its sole and absolute discretion to cease evaluation of submittals relating to the Project, stop any other staff work and/or work of its consultants and stop negotiating or discussing the Project, Ground Lease and Development Agreement, in the event that the City Manager determines that the sums then on deposit with City are not clearly sufficient to pay for all of the projected/established Reimbursable Costs projected/estimated in good faith by the City Manager and Developer has failed to replenish the Reimbursement Funds within the time specified herein following written notice by the City in accordance with Section 3 above.

8. The City and Developer acknowledge that all applicable requirements of CEQA must be met in order for City to approve Project entitlements and enter into the Development Agreement and for the Owner to approve and enter into the Ground Lease, and that this may require an environmental impact report and/or other reports and analyses for CEQA purposes (collectively, the "CEQA Documents"). Developer will, at its cost, fully cooperate with the City in the City's preparation of the CEQA Documents. The City will consult with Developer prior to engaging any consultant to prepare any of the CEQA Documents.

9. Developer shall bear all costs and expenses of any and all title, environmental, physical, engineering, financial, and feasibility investigations, reports and analyses and other analyses or activities performed by or for Developer. Promptly upon commencement of the ENA Period, the Owner shall deliver to Developer complete copies of any and all material non-privileged reports and other material non-privileged documents pertaining to the Property which are in Owner's possession, at no cost to Developer other than the actual cost (if any) of duplicating such documents. Additionally, the City shall, if required to obtain financing (including grant funds), cooperate with the Developer in good faith, but at no cost or liability to Owner, in executing reasonable financing applications; however, the foregoing shall not be construed to require Owner to otherwise help Developer obtain any grants or financing.

10. The Developer and the Owner understand and agree that neither Party is under any obligation whatsoever to enter into a Ground Lease or Development Agreement, and that notwithstanding its approval of this ENA, the Owner shall have the right to disapprove any proposed Ground Lease or Development Agreement in its sole and absolute discretion, and in that regard, Developer hereby expressly agrees that the Owner shall not be bound by any implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing in connection with such approval or disapproval of any proposed Ground Lease or Development Agreement. In the event of the expiration or earlier termination of this ENA, the Owner shall be free to negotiate with any persons or entities with respect to the Property. No consents, approvals, comments or discussions by staff shall diminish, affect or waive: (i) rights of the Owner to later impose conditions and requirements under CEQA; (ii) the right of the Owner not to approve the Ground Lease or Development Agreement; or (iii) the Owner's other governmental rights, powers and obligations.

11. Developer shall indemnify, defend, and hold the Owner and Owner's respective officers, directors, members, employees, agents, contractors and affiliated entities harmless from any and all claims, liabilities, damages, costs and expenses relating to or arising out of this ENA, Developer's failure to perform any obligation of Developer under this ENA, or any challenges to this ENA, the Ground Lease or the Development Agreement (based on CEQA noncompliance or otherwise). Developer's obligations under the preceding sentence shall survive the expiration or earlier termination of this ENA.

12. Developer represents and warrants that its undertakings pursuant to this ENA are for the purpose of development of the Property and not for speculation in land, and Developer recognizes that, in view of the importance of the development of the Property to the general welfare of the community, the qualifications and identity of Developer and its principals are of particular concern to Owner; therefore, this ENA may not be assigned by Developer without the prior express written consent of the City Manager in his sole and absolute discretion. However, the City acknowledges that Developer may form a new entity to be the Developer entity that will be party to the Ground Lease, and such new entity may assign the Ground Lease to another such new entity, provided that each such new entity is controlled and majority-owned by members of the current Developer entity, and/or may add additional members to such new entity or the current Developer entity, or any subsequently formed new entity, and Developer shall have the right to do so without approval of the Owner, provided (A) that Developer first provides the Owner with (i) reasonable documentation of the financial capability of the new or reconstituted Developer entity to perform its obligations under this ENA and (ii) a copy of all the new entity's organizational documents and any amendments thereto; and (B) Creative Housing Associates remains in control of, and a material owner of, Developer or such new entity, as shown by the new entity's organizational documents and any amendments thereto.

13. Any notice, request, approval or other communication to be provided by one Party to the other shall be in writing and provided by certified mail, return receipt requested, or a reputable overnight delivery service (such as Federal Express) and addressed as follows:

If to the Developer:

Creative Housing Associates  
8800 Venice Blvd, Suite 316

Los Angeles, CA 90024  
Attn: Michael Dieden

If to the City:

City of Rancho Cucamonga  
10500 Civic Center Drive  
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730  
Attn: City Manager

If to SANBAG:

San Bernardino Associated Governments  
1170 West 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92410  
Attn: Carrie Schindler, Director of Transit and Rail

Notices shall be deemed delivered: (i) if sent by certified mail, then upon the date of delivery or attempted delivery shown on the return receipt; or (ii) if delivered by overnight delivery service, then one (1) business day after delivery to the service as shown by records of the service.

14. This ENA constitutes the entire agreement of the Parties hereto with respect to the subject matter hereof. There are no agreements or understandings between the Parties and no representations by either Party to the other as an inducement to enter into this ENA, except as may be expressly set forth herein, and any and all prior discussions and negotiations between the Parties are superseded by this ENA.

15. This ENA may not be altered, amended or modified except by a writing duly authorized and executed by all Parties.

16. No provision of this ENA may be waived except by an express written waiver duly authorized and executed by the waiving Party.

17. If any Party should bring any legal action or proceeding relating to this agreement or to enforce any provision hereof, or if the Parties agree to arbitration or mediation relating to this ENA, the Party in whose favor a judgment or decision is rendered shall be entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses from the other. The Parties agree that any legal action or proceeding or agreed-upon arbitration or mediation shall be filed in and shall occur in the County of San Bernardino.

18. The interpretation and enforcement of this ENA shall be governed by the laws of the State of California.

19. Time is of the essence of each and every provision hereof in which time is a factor.

20. This ENA may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which together shall constitute one and the same ENA.

21. All Exhibits and Attachments referenced herein and attached hereto are incorporated herein in their entirety.

22. All Parties represent that the persons executing this ENA are authorized to act on their respective behalves.

23. Executed counterparts of this ENA may be delivered electronically by email to: john.gillison@cityofrc.us (for the Owner), and mdieden@challc.com (for the Developer).

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have executed this ENA as of the day and year first written above.

**OWNER:**

CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
John Gillison, City Manager

**DEVELOPER:**

CREATIVE HOUSING ASSOCIATES, LLC,  
a California limited liability company

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Dieden  
Managing Member

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_, City Clerk

Approved as to Form:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bruce Galloway of Richards, Watson &  
Gershon, Counsel to City

SAN BERNARDINO ASSOCIATED  
GOVERNMENTS COUNTY  
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Print Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved as to Form:

\_\_\_\_\_

Attachment: SB\_Sanbag ENA with CHA (2) [Revision 1] (2848 : Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station TOD ENA)

\_\_\_\_\_, SANBAG  
Legal Counsel

Attachment: SB\_Sanbag ENA with CHA (2) [Revision 1] (2848 : Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station TOD ENA)

**EXHIBIT "A"**  
**DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY**

(Attached.)

Attachment: SB\_Sanbag ENA with CHA (2) [Revision 1] (2848 : Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station TOD ENA)



Attachment: SB\_Sanbag ENA with CHA (2) [Revision 1] (2848 : Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station TOD ENA)

**DRAFT**

**EXHIBIT "B"**

**REQUIRED PROJECT FEATURES/ELEMENTS**

(Attached.)

Attachment: SB\_Sanbag ENA with CHA (2) [Revision 1] (2848 : Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station TOD ENA)

Exhibit "B"  
Page 1 of 5

**Project Concept:** A multi-modal transit village combining residential and commercial (retail, entertainment restaurant) uses surrounding a public plaza that creates a sense of place and engagement, thereby intended to attract Metrolink commuters, Empire Lakes and Project residents, and also patrons from throughout the Inland Empire. Developer shall have some limited, reasonable flexibility provided Developer shows by reasonable evidence delivered to Owner that a design feature herein must be altered; however, stated minimums described below may not be reduced and features described below may not be eliminated (unless otherwise agreed in writing by Owner).

- Developer will offer a variety of different housing types at diverse price points (sale and rental) and at various densities, but there shall be a minimum of 200 dwelling units, to be located on the residential land depicted on the preliminary site plan delivered by Developer and tentatively approved by Owner in accordance with Paragraph 1 of Attachment No. 1.
- It is anticipated a certain number of the residential units will be offered at affordable rates, to be agreed upon between the Parties.
- The retail/commercial uses may include dining, commercial office space, and a cinema. There shall be a minimum of fifteen thousand (15,000) useable square feet of retail and commercial service uses.
- A parking program will be agreed upon by the City and Developer under which the parking will be sustainable both economically and environmentally and may include a fully automated parking structure.
- The Project will prioritize the pedestrian experience, with buildings and spaces designed to be inviting to pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.
- The Project will provide convenient access to parking and the train platform for Metrolink riders. The rail platform is preliminary planned to be relocated approximately twenty-five (25) feet to the south of its current location, as part of Alternative A-4 Rail Alignment of the Ontario Airport Rail Access Study.
- The parking facilities and program will be designed to accommodate a minimum of nine hundred sixty (960) parking spaces for Metrolink commuters and visitors to the Project, subject to a shared parking program to be agreed upon by the Parties. This will include a paid parking permit system for Metrolink riders and commuters.
- The Project will provide multi-modal connections to adjacent developments and facilities in the area, including the proposed Empire Lakes mixed-use project to the west and Milliken Avenue to the east.
- The Project will seek to achieve a very high sustainability standard that will include water-wise landscaping that complements the various architectural styles and themes of the project. The City actively supports water conservation in the

Exhibit "B"  
Page 2 of 5

landscape as not only a short-term response to the current drought but also as a long-term sustainability practice;

- Empire Yards will offer a Project phasing program, subject to approval by the Owner, that offers sufficient parking for Metrolink commuters during all phases of project implementation and construction.

**ATTACHMENT NO. 1**

**SPECIFIC DEVELOPER TASKS**

1. Within sixty (60) days, Developer shall deliver the following items for Owner staff review and preliminary approval:
  - i) Preliminary site plan and revised architectural concept drawings identifying the location, building envelopes, general configuration, uses of the buildings and site, parking and traffic circulation, and proposed design characteristics of the Project.
  - ii) Conceptual development program (“Development Program”) for the Project that include a breakdown of the proposed scope of development including a range of building square footage by land use and range of square footage and number of parking spaces and landscaped areas, improvements, approximate number and mix of any residential units, proposed public amenities, circulation, and other general uses.
2. Within sixty (60) days, Developer and City staff shall determine the likely type and schedule for obtaining entitlements necessary for construction of the Project including, but not limited to, discretionary permits.
3. Within one hundred and twenty (120) days, Developer shall deliver to the City for Owner staff review and approval, a preliminary financing plan for the proposed Project.
4. Within one hundred and eighty (180) days, Developer shall submit to the Owner a schedule of development setting forth the proposed timetable for the commencement, substantial completion and final completion of the Project (the “Development Schedule”).
5. Within one hundred and eighty (180) days, Developer shall deliver to City for Owner staff review and approval, an organizational chart of the proposed Developer entity proposed to be a party to the Ground Lease and Development Agreement.
6. Within three hundred (300) days, Developer shall deliver to the City a fully completed and executed development application.
7. Within one hundred and eighty (180) days, Developer shall obtain and review a preliminary report for the Property from a title company selected by Developer and copies of the documents listed as title exceptions therein and an ALTA survey and shall deliver copies of the reports, documents and survey to the Owner together with a written description of any objections Developer may have to any of the title exceptions (and the rationale for the objections).
8. Within one hundred and eighty (180) days, Developer shall obtain and review a Phase I environmental (hazmat) report for the Property, and if recommended by the Phase I, Developer shall promptly obtain a Phase II report subject to entering into a reasonable right of entry agreement with City and SANBAG. Developer shall promptly deliver copies to the City when received.

Exhibit “B”  
Page 4 of 5

**ATTACHMENT NO. 2****SPECIFIC CITY TASKS**

1. Within thirty (30) days, City shall provide to Developer copies of all currently existing plans, studies and other written information regarding the Site in its possession, to the extent not previously delivered to Developer and to the extent material to the Project and not subject to any attorney-client or attorney work product privilege or other privilege.
2. City shall use good faith efforts to prepare and process the required CEQA Documents as soon as reasonably possible after submission by Developer of a complete development application and payment of applicable fees/deposits.
3. City shall provide initial drafts of the Ground Lease and Development Agreement to Developer and shall thereafter revise them to the extent reasonably permitted by the negotiations.

## *Minute Action*

### AGENDA ITEM: 10

**Date:** June 9, 2016

**Subject:**

Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account Program Fund Allocation for the City of Needles

**Recommendation:**

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

- A. Approve a swap of \$169,014 Valley State Transit Assistance funds for \$169,014 Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) funds with the City of Needles for the purchase of replacement vehicles.
- B. Approve an amendment to the PTMISEA Expenditure Plan for San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) as shown in Attachment A, increasing the overall allocation to SANBAG by \$169,014 for the Redlands Passenger Rail Project.
- C. Approve an amendment to the PTMISEA Expenditure Plan for the City of Needles as shown in Attachment B, decreasing the overall allocation to the City of Needles by \$169,014.

**Background:**

Allocations from the Proposition 1B Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) provide capital funds to SANBAG and all of the transit operators throughout the county. This includes the Morongo Basin Transit Authority (MBTA), Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority (MARTA), Needles Area Transit (NAT), Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA), Victor Valley Transit Authority (VVTA), and Omnitrans.

On October 30, 2009, the California State Controller provided a schedule of the estimated remaining eligible amounts available to each regional entity for the duration of the PTMISEA Program. The estimated remaining eligible amount for the San Bernardino region was approximately \$70 million. The SANBAG Board approved the distribution and allocation of these funds to the transit operators and SANBAG on February 3, 2010. The City of Needles received a total allocation of \$369,014. To date, on behalf of the City of Needles, SANBAG has applied for and received \$200,000 in PTMISEA funds for the rehabilitation of the El Garces Intermodal Transit Center.

There are certain administrative and fiscal responsibilities associated with receiving PTMISEA Funds. Under the adopted guidelines for the PTMISEA grant program, the recipient of these funds is required to submit progress reports, fiscal and compliance audits, and a close-out report once the project is complete. The City of Needles currently plans to purchase replacement vehicles with the PTMISEA funds. Staff recommends allocating State Transit Assistance (STA)

**Entity:** CTC

## Transit Committee Agenda Item

June 9, 2016

Page 2

funds for the purchase of the replacement vehicles in lieu of the PTMISEA funds to minimize the administrative burden on the City of Needles. Because the PTMISEA funds would be used for the Redlands Passenger Rail Project, the City of Needles would be allocated STA funds from the Valley share. With approval, this allocation will be included in their Fiscal Year 2016/2017 operator allocation.

Assembly Bill 1072, Statutes of 2009, and PTMISEA Guidelines require that operators and SANBAG submit to Caltrans a PTMISEA Program Expenditure Plan that contains a list of all projects the agency intends to fund with its share of PTMISEA for the life of the bond, including the amount for each project and the year in which the funds will be requested. Approval of this item will amend the current Expenditure Plans for SANBAG and the City of Needles. In summary the changes consist of:

SANBAG – increase the overall PTMISEA allocation for SANBAG by \$169,014, and increase the allocation to the Redlands Passenger Rail Project by the same amount.

City of Needles – decrease the overall PTMISEA allocation for the City of Needles by \$169,014, eliminating PTMISEA funds for replacement vehicles for the City of Needles. As noted above, the replacement vehicles will be funded with an equal amount of STA funds.

***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:***

Vanessa Jezik, Management Analyst II

---

Approved  
Transit Committee  
Date: June 9, 2016

Witnessed By:

# ATTACHMENT A



## Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, & Service Enhancement Program (PTMISEA) PTMISEA Program Expenditure Plan Worksheet

Sponsor Agency: SANBAG/Southern California Regional Rail Authority  
 City/County: Los Angeles/San Bernardino  
 Sponsor Contact: Joanna Capelle  
 Email: [capellej@scrra.net](mailto:capellej@scrra.net)  
 Phone: 213 247-8049

Total PTMISEA Appropriation: 6799128 + 28142875+169014 (This is the total amount of PTMISEA funding that was listed in the October 30, 2009 letter from the California State Controller, John Chiang.)

Project Name	Project Description	PTMISEA Funds by FY										Other Fund Sources			Estimated Project Cost				
		Prior	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	Total	Federal	State	Local					
<b>Operator Allocation</b>		<b>GC 8879.55(a)(3)</b>																	
1. Positive Train Control (PTC)	PTC is a predictive collision avoidance technology designed to stop a train before a train movement that may result in an accident can occur. The Rail Safety Improvement Act of 2008 mandates the installation of PTC on passenger rail systems by 12/31/2015.		\$874,339	\$2,623,022											\$3,497,361	\$73,614,650	\$81,621,734	\$25,605,587	\$184,339,332
2. Rehab/Renovation	Rehab of Metrolink infrastructure, rolling stock, and equipment to extend useful life.			\$620,035						\$1,030,848					\$1,650,883				\$1,650,883
3. SB Line Sealed Corridor - SB County	Installation of fencing, barriers and other Safety Improvements			\$620,036						\$1,030,848					\$1,650,884				\$1,650,884
<b>Population Allocation</b>		<b>GC 8879.55(a)(2) - Funds from SANBAG</b>																	
1. Positive Train Control (PTC)	(see above)	\$5,500,000				\$18,798									\$18,798				\$18,798
2. Safety Retrofits on Rail Cars	(see above)	\$3,309,525						\$458,074	\$458,074	\$458,074	\$458,074				\$1,832,294				\$1,832,294
3. SB Line Extension	Extends SB Line to San Bernardino Transit Station (Rialto & E)			\$1,000,000	\$5,419,844										\$6,419,844	\$22,306,000	\$16,621,156	\$27,211,000	\$72,558,000
4. Redlands Line Construction	Reconstruct 9 miles, grade crossings, signal system & 8 stations									\$544,939					\$544,939	\$85,586,000	\$4,794,000	\$109,125,986	\$200,050,925
5. Redlands Rail Equipment	Acquire Redlands Rail vehicles									\$15,827,000					\$15,827,000				\$15,827,000
6. Redlands Passenger Rail Project	Redlands Passenger Rail Project vehicle procurement, construction, and equipment												\$169,014		\$169,014				\$169,014
7. Rialto Metrolink Parking	Acquire property and construct additional surface parking			\$1,500,000											\$1,500,000	\$3,485,000		\$800,000	\$5,785,000
8. Double Tracking Projects	Lilac to Rancho, 3 miles & 9 x-ings; Central to Archibald, 5.5 miles & 12 x-ings				\$2,000,000										\$2,000,000				\$2,000,000
															\$0				\$0
															\$0				\$0
															\$0				\$0
															\$0				\$0
<b>Totals:</b>		<b>\$8,809,525</b>	<b>\$874,339</b>	<b>\$6,363,093</b>	<b>\$7,419,844</b>	<b>\$18,798</b>	<b>\$458,074</b>	<b>\$18,891,709</b>	<b>\$458,074</b>	<b>\$627,088</b>	<b>\$35,111,017</b>	<b>\$184,991,650</b>	<b>\$103,036,890</b>	<b>\$162,742,573</b>	<b>\$485,882,130</b>				

**Description:**  
 Each project sponsor shall complete the above table listing each project to be funded with PTMISEA funds. These projects should represent the sponsor's entire share of PTMISEA funds for the life of the Bond. The total amount in the blue highlighted cell (below) should equal the project sponsor's total PTMISEA appropriation (above).

Shaded areas are pre calculated. Please do not change the formulas.

Sponsor Agency Signature : \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Caltrans Signature : \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Attachment: SANBAG Expenditure Plan - Attachment A June 2016 Committee (2434 : PTMISEA Swap with



## *Minute Action*

### AGENDA ITEM: 11

**Date:** June 9, 2016

**Subject:**

Allocation of Transportation Development Act Funds for Fiscal Year 2016/2017

**Recommendation:**

That the Transit Committee recommend the Board, acting as the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission, adopt Resolution No. 17-001 authorizing the allocation of Local Transportation Funds and State Transit Assistance Funds for Fiscal Year 2016/2017.

**Background:**

Section 99214 of the California Public Utilities Code designates the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the purpose of administering the Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds. This responsibility includes the approval of the Local Transportation Fund (LTF) and State Transit Assistance Fund (STAF) apportionments, issuance of LTF and STAF allocation instructions to the County of San Bernardino Auditor-Controller/Treasurer/Tax Collector, and authorization of LTF and STAF payments in accordance with the claim amounts filed by the claimants.

Title 21, Sections 6659 and 6753 of the California Code of Regulations, requires that the governing body adopt a resolution authorizing the issuance of LTF and STAF allocation instructions. Resolution 17-001 fulfills this requirement. The issuance of LTF and STAF allocation instructions will allocate funding for TDA administration, transportation planning and programming functions, and operating and capital assistance for the SANBAG Transit Program and other eligible TDA claimants.

Throughout the course of the year, staff receives claims from eligible TDA claimants and verifies the claim amounts against planning documents. The planning documents that are used as the basis for approving the statutory claims of TDA funding include the transit operator Short Range Transit Plans and the SANBAG 10-Year Delivery Plan.

Following approval of a transit claim, staff issues allocation instructions to the County Auditor-Controller/Treasurer/Tax Collector, authorizing the use of the funds by the claimant for specific purposes. Staff requests disbursements of funds from the County, in accordance with disbursement requests submitted by the claimants, throughout the year.

In March 2016, the Board approved the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 LTF and STAF apportionments. The apportionment was subsequently incorporated into the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Budget.

*Entity: CTC*

Transit Committee Agenda Item

June 9, 2016

Page 2

***Financial Impact:***

This item is consistent with the SANBAG Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Budget. Adoption of the resolution by the Board will authorize the issuance of LTF and STAF allocation instructions, providing funding for TDA administration, transportation planning and programming functions, and operating and capital assistance for the SANBAG Transit Program and other eligible TDA claimants as approved in the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Budget.

***Reviewed By:***

This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee. SANBAG General Counsel has reviewed this item and the Resolution.

***Responsible Staff:***

Nancy Strickert, Management Analyst III

---

Approved  
Transit Committee  
Date: June 9, 2016

Witnessed By:

**RESOLUTION NO. 17-001**

**RESOLUTION OF THE  
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
AUTHORIZING THE ALLOCATION OF  
LOCAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDS AND  
STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUNDS  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016/2017**

WHEREAS, the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission (SANBAG) is the designated transportation planning agency for the administration of the Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds within San Bernardino County; and

WHEREAS, the Southern California Association of Governments Executive Committee has adopted a Regional Transportation Plan directed toward the achievement of a coordinated and balanced transportation system; and

WHEREAS, the SANBAG Board of Directors (Board) adopts Short Range Transit Plans for each of the San Bernardino County transit operators; and

WHEREAS, the Board has adopted the SANBAG 10-Year Delivery Plan documenting anticipated capital expenditures for SANBAG's rail program; and

WHEREAS, claims may be submitted under the Transportation Development Act for allocations from the Local Transportation Funds and State Transit Assistance Funds consistent with the adopted plans, apportionments, and allocations; and

WHEREAS, the Short Range Transit Plans and the SANBAG 10-Year Delivery Plan include planned expenditures of transportation funds, including Local Transportation Funds and State Transit Assistance Funds; and

WHEREAS, the award of Transportation Development Act Article 3 funds for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and transit stop access improvement projects, pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99233.3, is typically approved in a separate Board action following a biennial call for projects and project evaluation process;

WHEREAS, SANBAG has incorporated the amount to be allocated to each of the transit operators and SANBAG into its Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Budget;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission:

Section 1. That the allocation of Local Transportation Funds and State Transit Assistance Funds for Fiscal Year 2016/2017 is hereby approved subject to those claims conforming to adopted apportionments and all other requirements of the Transportation Development Act, including but not limited to the following determinations:

1. The claimant's proposed expenditures are in conformity with the Regional Transportation Plan, the claimant's Short Range Transit Plan, and SANBAG's 10-Year Delivery Plan, as applicable, and as amended through subsequent Board action.
2. The level of passenger fares and charges is sufficient to enable the operator or transit service claimant to meet the applicable fare revenue to operating expense (operating ratio) requirements as required by the Transportation Development Act.
3. The claimant is making full use of federal funds available pursuant to the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act.
4. The sum of the claimant's allocations from the State Transit Assistance Fund and Local Transportation Fund does not exceed the amount the claimant is eligible to receive during the fiscal year.
5. Priority consideration has been given to claims to offset reductions in federal operating assistance and the unanticipated increase in the cost of fuel, to enhance existing public transportation services, and to meet high priority regional, countywide, or area-wide public transportation needs.
6. The claimant has made reasonable efforts to implement the productivity improvements recommended pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99244, including the specific reference to the improvements recommended and the efforts made by the claimant to implement them.
7. The claimant submits a certification issued by the Department of California Highway Patrol within the last 13 months verifying that the claimant is in compliance with Section 1808.1 of the Vehicle Code (Drivers Pull Notice Program), as required by Public Utilities Code Section 99251.
8. The claimant is in compliance with the qualifying criteria pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99314.6 (use of State Transit Assistance Fund for operating purposes).
9. The transportation services contracted for under Public Utilities Code Section 99400(c) are responding to a transportation need not otherwise being met within the community or jurisdiction of the claimant and that, where appropriate, the services are coordinated with the existing transportation service.

Section 2. That such approval does not include allocations for local streets and roads unless the provisions of Sections 99401.5 and 99401.6 of the Public Utilities Code have been met; and

Section 3. That the Executive Director or his designee is authorized to transmit allocation instructions to the San Bernardino County Auditor/Controller, having first determined that the required allocation meets all requirements of this Resolution and the Transportation Development Act.

Section 4. The foregoing recitals are true and correct.

Section 5. This resolution is effective upon its approval.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a meeting of the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission held on July 6, 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ryan McEachron, Commission Chairperson

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vicki Watson,  
Clerk of the Commission

Attachment: Res 17-001 [Revision 2] (2863 : Allocation of TDA Funds for Fiscal Year 2016/2017)

## *Minute Action*

### AGENDA ITEM: 12

**Date:** June 9, 2016

**Subject:**

Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Transit Operator Allocations

**Recommendation:**

That the Transit Committee recommend the Board, acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission and San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, approve Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Transit Operator Funding Allocations, as indicated in Attachment 1, to the City of Needles, Morongo Basin Transit Authority, Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority, Omnitrans, and Victor Valley Transit Authority.

**Background:**

San Bernardino Associated Government (SANBAG) staff has worked with each of the transit operators to determine their funding needs for Fiscal Year (FY) 2016/2017. Attachment 1 outlines the proposed FY 2016/2017 transit funding allocations for the individual transit operators aside from SANBAG and Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA). SANBAG and SCRRA allocations are addressed in separate Board actions.

On an annual basis SANBAG allocates a variety of funds to the transit operators in San Bernardino County. SANBAG's role in each of the fund sources varies as well as the parameters by which the operators can use the funds. Below is a summary of each fund source and detailed information on how the allocation amount is determined, SANBAG's role, and how the funds can be used.

Local Transportation Fund (LTF) - LTF is derived from a ¼ cent of the general sales tax collected statewide enacted as part of the Transportation Development Act (TDA) of 1971. LTF is the most flexible funding source available for transit as it can be used for capital and operations with minimal restrictions and does not require matching funds. The main qualifying requirement is that an operator must maintain a minimum ratio of fare revenue to operating cost of at least 20% in an urban area and 10% in a rural area, unless an alternate ratio has been adopted.

In March of each year, staff presents the SANBAG Board with the recommended LTF apportionment for the following year. This includes the estimated amount available and recommended set-asides for reserve and priority uses per the TDA. Set-asides for priority uses prior to apportioning based on population include TDA administrative costs as needed, 3% for SANBAG planning efforts, ¾% for SCAG planning efforts, and 2% for pedestrian and bike facilities. In accordance with TDA, the remainder of LTF can be set aside for rail passenger service operations, capital improvements and community transit services prior to area

*Entity: CTC*

apportionment. However, SANBAG does not elect to use that set-aside and allocates to rail after apportioning the remaining balance geographically based on population.

In the Valley Subarea LTF is entirely used for transit purposes with the focus on maintaining a steady flow of operation funding available into the future. In the Mountain/Desert Region, LTF is allocated to the individual transit operators based on population of their service areas. The amount identified in Attachment 1 is the total LTF available to the Mountain/Desert operators. The LTF allocations to Barstow are included with Victor Valley Transit Authority (VVTA) allocations as the City of Barstow joined the VVTA's Joint Powers Agreement on July 1, 2015. It is estimated that after using the available LTF for transit purposes VVTA and Morongo Basin Transit Authority (MBTA) will have surplus LTF available that can, in accordance with the TDA unmet needs process, be returned to the local jurisdictions in their service area for road maintenance purposes.

State Transit Assistance (STA) – STA funding is derived from the statewide sales tax on diesel fuel enacted as part of the TDA. STA funds are allocated to SANBAG in accordance with California Public Utility Code (PUC) as follows: 1) 50% under PUC Section 99313, STA-Population Share, based on the ratio of the population of the area under its jurisdiction to the total population of the state and 2) 50% under PUC Section 99314, STA-Operator Share, which is specific funding for operators, and allocated based on the ratio of the total region's prior year transit operator passenger fare and local support revenues, including revenue from member agencies, to the total revenue of all operators in the state and member agencies. The amount of STA-Operator Share funds available to each transit operator on an annual basis is determined by the State, and SANBAG functions as a pass through agency for this portion of STA for all operators but SCRRA. Each January the State provides a STA-Population Share revenue estimate for the following year. The STA-Population Share revenue is further apportioned to the Valley and Mountain/Desert regions based on population. STA-Population Share is then allocated to the operators on an as-needed basis as approved by the SANBAG Board. The STA-Population Share is typically limited to funding capital projects unless the operator can demonstrate compliance with a specific efficiency calculation.

Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) – LCTOP is a new source of State funding and one of several programs that are part of the Transit, Affordable Housing, and Sustainable Communities Program established by the California Legislature in 2014 by Senate Bill 862. The LCTOP was created to provide transit operating and capital assistance to eligible project sponsors in an effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve mobility, with a priority on serving disadvantaged communities. This program is funded by auction proceeds from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Cap-and-Trade Program where proceeds are deposited into the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF). Although 5% of future annual GGRF proceeds will continue to be appropriated to the LCTOP, staff is cautious to become reliant upon this source of funding as the overall availability is market driven.

Example projects include new or expanded bus or rail service, expanded intermodal transit facilities, free or reduced-fare transit passes/vouchers, and may include equipment acquisition, fueling, maintenance and other costs to operate those services or facilities, with each project required to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. For agencies whose service area includes disadvantaged communities, at least 50% of the total moneys received shall be expended on projects that will benefit disadvantaged communities.

As with STA Funds, LCTOP funding is allocated pursuant to CPUC Section 99313 and 99314. A County Transportation Commission (CTC), such as SANBAG, that is eligible to receive STA funds per CPUC 99313 is eligible to receive LCTOP funds by formula based on the ratio of the population of the area under the CTC's jurisdiction to the total population of the state. A transit operator that is eligible to receive STA funds per CPUC 99314 is eligible to receive LCTOP funds by formula based on the ratio of the revenue of the transit operator's jurisdiction to the total revenue of all operators in the state. The transit operators receiving LCTOP funds per CPUC Section 99314 work directly with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to receive their LCTOP funds. In San Bernardino County that includes MBTA, Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority (MARTA), VVTA, Omnitrans, and SCRRA.

Annually, staff recommends that LCTOP funds received under the population formula be further apportioned to the Valley and Mountain/Desert based on population, the same as the STA funds that SANBAG receives per CPUC Section 99313. After apportionment, LCTOP funds are allocated on a case-by-case basis as approved by the SANBAG Board. LCTOP funds do not require matching funds.

Proposition 1B Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) - PTMISEA is State funding for specific transit capital projects such as rehabilitation, service enhancement or expansion, buildings, bus shelters, transit centers, operation and maintenance facilities, bus rapid transit, and rolling stock. The SANBAG Board approved the overall allocation of these funds in February 2010 to the following operators; City of Barstow, MBTA, MARTA, City of Needles, Omnitrans, SCRRA and VVTA. The PTMISEA allocations included in Attachment 1 represent the allocation amounts the operators expect to request from Caltrans in FY 2016/2017. PTMISEA Guidelines require that operators and SANBAG submit to Caltrans a PTMISEA Program Expenditure Plan that contains a list of all projects the agency intends to fund with its share of PTMISEA for the life of the bond, including the amount for each project and the year in which the funds will be requested. The PTMISEA Program Plans have been approved by the SANBAG Board and updates are presented for approval on a case-by-case basis. This is the last year for PTMISEA funding from the State.

Proposition 1B California Transit Security Grant Program (CTSGP) – CTSGP is State funding for specific transit capital projects that provide increased protection against security and safety threats, and for capital expenditures to increase the capacity of transit operators to develop disaster response transportation systems. The California Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) administers such funds deposited in the Transit System Safety, Security and Disaster Response Account under the CTSGP and California Transit Assistance Fund (CTAF). SANBAG is responsible for calculating the available allocation for each transit operator and applying for funds. Board approval of projects and fiscal year-specific resolutions are required prior to submitting a grant application. This is the last year for CTSGP funding.

Measure I Senior and Disabled Transit Program (SDT) – SDT is local funding derived from one-half of one percent general sales and use tax collected countywide for transportation purposes. In the Valley Subarea, 8% of the total Measure I collected is dedicated for SDT of which 2% is specifically dedicated to Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) operations. In the Victor Valley Subarea and Rural Mountain/Desert Subareas, initially 5% of

## Transit Committee Agenda Item

June 9, 2016

Page 4

the total Measure I collected was dedicated to SDT. In the Victor Valley Subarea, the percentage for SDT funding increased by 0.5% in FY 2015/2016, with additional increases of 0.5% every five years thereafter to a maximum of 7.5%. In the Rural Mountain/Desert Subareas, local representatives may provide additional funding beyond 5% upon finding that such increase is required to address unmet transit needs of senior and disabled transit services. In both cases, all increases above the 5% initial revenue collected come from the Local Streets Program. Currently, all of the annual SDT funds available in the Victor Valley and Rural Mountain/Desert Subareas are allocated to the transit operators.

Measure I Metrolink/Rail Service (MSI Rail) – MSI Rail is local funding derived from one-half of one percent general sales and use tax collected countywide for transportation purposes. In the Valley Subarea, 8% of the total Measure I collected is dedicated for MSI Rail. Eligible expenditures for MSI Rail include purchase of additional commuter rail passenger cars and locomotives for use on Metrolink lines serving San Bernardino County; construction of additional track capacity necessary to operate more passenger trains on Metrolink lines serving San Bernardino County; construction of additional parking spaces at Metrolink stations in San Bernardino County; and provision of funds to match State and Federal funds used to maintain the railroad track, signal systems, and road crossings for passenger rail service in San Bernardino County, construction and operation of a new passenger rail service between the cities of San Bernardino and Redlands, and construction and operation of an extension of the Gold Line to Montclair Transit Center for San Bernardino County passengers traveling to San Gabriel Valley cities, Pasadena, and Los Angeles.

Omnitrans will be operating the Redlands Passenger Rail and the \$400,000 that is being allocated to them will be used for legal services and obtaining the appropriate staff to create a rail department at Omnitrans.

Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 Urban Area Formula Funds – Section 5307 funds are Federal urban formula funds apportioned by Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) to SANBAG for the Riverside/San Bernardino Urbanized Area (UZA) and the Los Angeles/Long Beach/Anaheim UZA. The Victor Valley UZA funds are apportioned directly to VVTA. The formula for areas with populations of 200,000 or more is based on a combination of bus revenue vehicle miles, bus passenger miles, fixed guide-way revenue vehicle miles, and fixed guide-way route miles, as well as population and population density and number of low-income individuals. Eligible activities include public transportation capital, planning, job access and reverse commute projects, as well as operating expenses under certain circumstances that do not exist in the San Bernardino Valley. This program requires a 20% local match. SANBAG is responsible for allocating the funds available to the Riverside/San Bernardino UZA and Los Angeles/Long Beach UZA. SANBAG is also responsible for updating the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), the implementation document that lists projects to be funded with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and FTA funds for the next one- to four-year period. This fiscal year Omnitrans will only be eligible to apply for \$14,761,361. In FY 2014/2015 they received \$19,121,039 in Section 5307 funds instead of the allocated amount of \$16,941,200. The funding from FY 2014/2015 is still available and eligible to cover costs for projects in FY 2016/2017.

FTA Section 5339 Urban Area Formula Funds for Bus and Bus Facilities – Section 5339 funds are Federal urban formula funds apportioned by SCAG to SANBAG for the

Riverside/San Bernardino UZA and the Los Angeles/Long Beach/Anaheim UZA. The Victor Valley UZA funds are apportioned directly to VVTA. The formula is based on population, vehicle revenue miles and passenger miles. This capital program provides funding to replace, rehabilitate, and purchase buses and related equipment, and to construct bus-related facilities. This program requires a 20% local match.

FTA Section 5311 Rural Area Formula Funds (Regional Apportionment) – Section 5311 funds are rural formula funds apportioned by Caltrans to the San Bernardino County region based on population. Eligible activities include public transportation planning, capital, operating, job access and reverse commute projects and the acquisition of public transportation services. This program requires a 20% local match for capital projects and 50% match for operating assistance. SANBAG further apportions the funds to the four rural operators based on population. SANBAG is responsible for ensuring proposed projects are selected and eligible, as well as preparation of the Program of Projects (POP) that is submitted to Caltrans and updating the FTIP. As Caltrans releases the final apportionment amount in January of each fiscal year, the amounts included in Attachment 1 are estimates.

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Funds (CMAQ) – CMAQ funds are Federal formula funds apportioned by Caltrans based on population and emissions weighting factors to specific air basins such as the South Coast Air Basin and Mojave Desert Air Basin. SANBAG receives annual apportionments of CMAQ and is the agency responsible for selecting projects. Activities typically eligible for CMAQ funding include high occupancy vehicle lanes, transit improvements, travel demand management strategies, traffic flow improvements such as signal synchronization, and public fleet conversions to cleaner fuels. SANBAG is responsible for updating CMAQ funding in the FTIP as well as submitting a CMAQ annual report to FHWA and Caltrans. The annual report documents the results of emission reduction assessment for projects in San Bernardino County using CMAQ funding for each federal fiscal year. Each CMAQ project must be analyzed using calculation methodologies recommended and approved by Caltrans and CARB.

The SANBAG Board has identified filling funding gaps for transit as a high priority for allocation of CMAQ funds. Additionally, the SANBAG Board approved Policy No. 40023 in February 2015 to further apportion CMAQ funds to Measure I Subareas based on population in order to ensure a proportional share of State and Federal funds are available for each subarea in accordance with the Measure I 2010-2040 Expenditure Plan. The SANBAG Board adopts a ten-year allocation plan for CMAQ funds to transit operators with the biennial updates of the Ten-Year Delivery Plan. The CMAQ allocations included in Attachment 1 are consistent with that allocation except as noted below.

Currently, MBTA has only been allocated \$3,196,380 of CMAQ funds for FY 2015/2016 through 2022/2023. As part of the upcoming update to the delivery plan, there will be a request for an additional \$836,252 in CMAQ funds for vehicles needed by MBTA for a total amount of \$4,032,632. At this time, the CMAQ information is included to show the additional need in the Morongo Basin, and not for final approval of the additional funds.

Additional fund sources available to the transit operators that are not included above or identified in Attachment 1 are FTA Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors & Individuals with

## Transit Committee Agenda Item

June 9, 2016

Page 6

Disabilities Program and LTF Article 3 funds. Both fund sources are allocated to eligible recipients through a call for projects process under separate SANBAG Board action.

Measure I, LTF, and STA available for allocation to the individual transit operators are included in the SANBAG FY 2016/2017 Budget. The various other FTA, CMAQ, and Proposition 1B funds are received directly by the transit operators and, therefore, are not included in the SANBAG FY 2016/2017 Budget.

***Financial Impact:***

Allocations of the pass through LTF, STAF and 2010-2040 Measure I funds are consistent with the SANBAG Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Budget.

***Reviewed By:***

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

***Responsible Staff:***

Nancy Strickert, Management Analyst III

---

Approved  
Transit Committee  
Date: June 9, 2016

Witnessed By:

Attachment 1

Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Transit Operator Allocations

	MBTA	MARTA	Needles	Omnitrans	VVTA*	Total
LTF	\$ 3,431,487	\$ 2,625,305	\$ 234,760	\$ 39,974,380	\$ 21,281,084	\$ 67,547,016
STA - Population	\$ 267,634	\$ 110,000	TBD	\$ 3,100,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 3,877,634
STA - Operator	\$ 25,342	\$ 14,388	\$ 1,763	\$ 568,452	\$ 137,385	\$ 747,330
LCTOP Operator	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	\$ -
LCTOP Population	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	\$ -
Prop 1B - PTMISEA					\$ 3,440,503	\$ 3,440,503
Prop 1B - Security	\$ 4,888	\$ 3,287		\$ 128,566	\$ 18,692	\$ 155,433
Measure I - SDT	\$ 128,698	\$ 180,374	\$ 22,761	\$ 5,800,000	\$ 2,445,431	\$ 8,577,264
Measure I - CTSA				\$ 2,466,308		\$ 2,466,308
Measure I - Rail				\$ 400,000		\$ 400,000
FTA 5307**				\$ 16,941,200	\$ 6,161,019	\$ 23,102,219
FTA 5339				\$ 1,848,880	\$ 630,956	\$ 2,479,836
FTA 5311	\$ 288,271	\$ 214,235	\$ 31,157	Not Eligible	\$ 463,178	\$ 996,841
CMAQ	\$ 855,961	\$ 665,547			\$ 2,434,575	\$ 3,956,083
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$ 5,002,281</b>	<b>\$ 3,813,136</b>	<b>\$ 290,441</b>	<b>\$ 71,227,786</b>	<b>\$ 37,412,823</b>	<b>\$ 117,746,467</b>

TBD = To Be Determined

\* Funding for Barstow is now included with VVTA. The City of Barstow joined VVTA JPA 07/01/15

\*\* Omnitrans will only be eligible to apply for \$14,761,361 for FY16/17. In FY14/15 they received \$19,121,039 in Section 5307 funds. The funding from FY14/15 is still available to cover costs for projects in FY16/17.

Attachment 2

CMAQ Funding Allocations for Transit Operators

	FY 2015/2016	FY 2016/2017	FY 2017/2018	FY 2018/2019	FY 2019/2020	FY 2020/2021	FY 2021/2022	FY 2022/2023	Total
<b>MBTA (Revised)*</b>	\$409,479	\$855,961	\$760,628	\$0	\$140,360	\$0	\$1,040,875	\$825,329	\$4,032,632
<b>Omnitrans</b>	\$19,522,000	\$0	\$0	\$3,347,026	\$7,622,976	\$7,011,654	\$8,384,112	\$7,000,000	\$52,887,768
<b>VVTA (Revised)</b>	\$0	\$0	\$2,713,067	\$3,378,000	\$2,071,773	\$2,483,000	\$1,946,000	\$2,500,000	\$15,091,840
<b>MARTA (Revised)</b>	\$454,453	\$665,547	\$560,000	\$560,000	\$560,000	\$560,000	\$560,000	\$560,000	\$4,480,000
<b>Barstow (Revised)</b>		\$2,434,575	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$790,895	\$3,225,470
<b>Total</b>	\$20,385,932	\$3,956,083	\$4,033,695	\$7,285,026	\$10,395,109	\$10,054,654	\$11,930,987	\$11,676,224	\$79,717,710

\*MBTA has only been allocated \$3,196,380 of CMAQ funds for FY 2015/2016 through 2022/2023. The allocation will be increased to \$4,032,632 with adoption of the update to the Ten-Year Delivery Plan in 2017.

Attachment: FY2017 CMAQ [Revision 2] (2231 : FY 2016/2017 Operator Allocations)

## *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 13

**Date:** June 9, 2016

**Subject:**

Policy Amendment for Senior and Disabled Allocations

**Recommendation:**

That the Transit Committee recommend the Board, acting as the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, amend Policies 40009, 40014, and 40018 concerning the Measure I Senior and Disabled Transit Programs to change the disbursement schedule from monthly to quarterly and include a section on Accounting Requirements.

**Background:**

Policies 40009, 40014, and 40018 in the Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan establish requirements for the Valley, Victor Valley, and Rural Mountain/Desert subareas Senior and Disabled Transit Programs, respectively, for expenditure eligibility, fare subsidy program, maintenance of effort, and allocations and disbursements of funds.

SANBAG staff recommends adding a section on Accounting Requirements to establish audit requirements and consequences of not completing audits timely and issuance of an audit opinion other than unmodified as follows:

**Policy VSDD/VVSDD/MDSDD-16: Compliance Audit Deadline**

A transit operator's annual Compliance Audit must be completed within six (6) months after the end of the transit operator's fiscal year (Compliance Audit Deadline). SANBAG staff shall monitor the scheduling and progress of the audit to ensure prompt communication by the Auditor after information submittals by the transit operator, and timely completion of the final MSI audit report. If a transit operator is not able to meet the information submittal deadlines set by the Auditor or the Compliance Audit Deadline, the transit operator may submit a request to SANBAG's Executive Director no later than thirty days prior to the submittal deadline set by the Auditor or the Compliance Audit Deadline, whichever extension is required, and a two (2) month automatic extension will be granted. Any further requests for extensions of the Compliance Audit Deadline are subject to approval by the Board. The Board may approve further Compliance Audit Deadline extensions, if the Board finds: (1) the Compliance Audit was not completed timely for reasons outside of the transit operator's control, such as federal, state, and Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) reporting requirements, or catastrophic events; or (2) it is in the best interests of SANBAG to grant the extension. SANBAG staff shall be responsible for requesting extensions related to Auditor performance.

**Entity:** CTA

## Policy VSdT/VVSdT/MDSdT -17: Remedies

- a. If a transit operator's annual Compliance Audit determines that the transit operator used Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Funds for ineligible expenses, the transit operator shall repay the Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund, in the amount of the ineligible expenses, immediately from another source through an internal fund transfer.
- b. If a transit operator's annual Compliance Audit fails to be completed with an unmodified opinion by the Compliance Audit Deadline, as extended pursuant to Policy VSdT/VVSdT/MDSdT -16, the transit operator shall repay the Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund, in the amount of the Measure I Senior and Disabled Allocation for the fiscal year subject of annual Compliance Audit findings of unsubstantiated or questioned costs, immediately from another source through an internal fund transfer.
- c. If the transit operator is unable to make such immediate repayment under VSdT/VVSdT/MDSdT-17 (a) or (b), the transit operator shall not receive its Senior and Disabled Allocation pass-through payments until the repayment amount of ineligible expenses, unsubstantiated costs, or questioned costs, have been withheld by SANBAG.
- d. If the transit operator enters into a Repayment Agreement with SANBAG, as approved by the transit operator and the SANBAG Board of Directors, providing for repayment of the amounts owed under VSdT/VVSdT/MDSdT-17 (a) or (b) over a period not to exceed five (5) years, SANBAG will return any pass-through funds withheld. SANBAG will recommence withholding Senior and Disabled Allocation pass-through funds if the transit operator fails to comply with the terms of the Repayment Agreement.

***Financial Impact:***

This item imposes no financial impact on the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Budget.

***Reviewed By:***

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

***Responsible Staff:***

Hilda Flores, Chief of Fiscal Resources

---

Approved  
Transit Committee  
Date: June 9, 2016

Witnessed By:

San Bernardino Associated Governments	<b>Policy</b>	<b>40009</b>
Adopted by the Board of Directors April 1, 2009	Revised	04/01/09
<b>Valley Senior and Disabled Transit (VSDT) Program Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan</b>	Revision No.	0

**Important Notice: A hardcopy of this document may not be the document currently in effect. The current version is always the version on the SANBAG Intranet.**

#### Table of Contents

[Purpose](#) | [References](#) | [Definitions](#) | [Policies for Valley Subarea Senior and Disabled Transit Program](#) | [Revision History](#) |

## I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to delineate the requirements for administration of the Valley Subarea Senior and Disabled Transit Program for Measure I 2010-2040. The policy establishes the funding allocation process, reimbursement mechanisms, project eligibility, and limitations on eligible expenditures.

## II. REFERENCES

Ordinance No. 04-01 of the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, Exhibit A – Transportation Expenditure Plan

## III. DEFINITIONS

**Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP)** – A five-year financially constrained plan of projected transit service levels, operating and capital improvement expenses, updated biennially and submitted to SANBAG by local transit systems.

**Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA)** – An agency designated pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 15975 of the California Government Code responsible for the coordination of social service transportation.

## IV. POLICIES FOR THE VALLEY SUBAREA SENIOR AND DISABLED TRANSIT PROGRAM

### A. Organization of the Valley Subarea Senior and Disabled Transit Program

Policy VSDT-1: The Valley Subarea Senior and Disabled Transit Program shall follow the intent of Ordinance 04-01, i.e., to reduce fares and enhance service for senior citizens and persons with disabilities and to support the creation and operation of a Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) which will be responsible for the coordination of transit services provided to seniors and persons with disabilities.

Policy VSDT-2: Six percent (6%) of the revenue collected within the Valley subarea shall be apportioned to the Senior and Disabled Transit Program account. A minimum of two percent (2%) of the revenue collected within the Valley shall be made available for the creation and operation of a CTSA.

### B. Eligible Expenditures

Policy VSDT-3: The following shall be eligible expenditures under the Valley Subarea Senior and Disabled Transit Program:

#### 1. CTSA Program:

At least 25% of the Valley Senior and Disabled Transit Program (2% of total Valley revenue) shall be made available for the formation and operation of a CTSA.

## 2. Fare Subsidy Program.

- a. Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds may be used for fare stabilization or subsidy for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities using the Omnitrans transit services. Future fare increases for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities may be offset through a local fare subsidy using Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds. It is the intent of the Valley fare subsidy program that the amount of fare subsidy provided per eligible passenger trip will be the same without regard to the mode of travel (fixed route, Access, or Omnalink).
- b. The amount of Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds contributed as a fare subsidy shall qualify as fare revenue for purposes of calculating the ratio of passenger fares to operating cost required by the Transportation Development Act.

## 3. Service and Capital Subsidy Program.

- a. Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds may be used to support existing, new, expanded, or enhanced transportation services, including capital projects, for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities operated by Omnitrans and/or the CTSA. Examples would include direct operating subsidy for the provision of ADA complimentary paratransit service and demand responsive service for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities.
- b. For general public transportation services, the percentage of Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds used to support operating expenses cannot exceed the percentage of elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities carried by the system in the fiscal year preceding the year in which the annual operating budget is being prepared.
- c. Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds may be used to support social service agency transportation for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities provided such service is coordinated with the Omnitrans and/or the CTSA.
- d. Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds may be used to support education and marketing of transportation services for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities with the intent to increase consumer's awareness and knowledge of how to use the most cost-effective service available as well as to provide education opportunities to operators that help improve the quality and effectiveness of the services provided. These program funds may also be used for complaint mediation services for transportation services to elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities.
- e. Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds may be used by Omnitrans and/or the CTSA as local matching funds to federal and state capital grant programs for the procurement of equipment used primarily for transportation service provided to elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities. Lacking access to federal and/or state grants, program funds may be used for the procurement of equipment used primarily for transportation service provided to elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities. These program funds may also be used for the incremental cost of accessible features associated with vehicle acquisitions.

## C. Maintenance of Effort

Policy VSDT-4: Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds shall not be used to supplant existing federal, state and local (Local Transportation Fund) funds committed to transit and social service transportation services.

Policy VSDT-5: The maintenance of effort shall be determined by calculating the amount of Local Transportation Fund (LTF) and other funds used to support social service transportation contributed toward transportation operating expenses in Fiscal Year 2008/2009 adjusted by the Los Angeles, Riverside and Orange Counties area Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all items as determined by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Policy VSDT-6: Exceptions to Maintenance of Effort

An exception to the maintenance of effort shall apply if: (1) all of the LTF apportioned to the Valley is being used to support transit services; (2) the amount of federal and state transportation funding is reduced from the amount received in the prior year; or (3) the amount of social service funding provided for transportation purposes is reduced from the amount received in the prior year.

#### D. Allocation of Valley Subarea Senior and Disabled Program Funding

Policy VSDT-7: The SANBAG Board of Directors shall annually allocate funding to specific transit projects and programs as approved in the Omnitrans and/or CTSA SRTP.

Policy VSDT-8: Allocations to a specified project or program shall be limited to the annual forecast of revenues available within the Valley, unless there is also a residual balance of revenue available.

#### E. Disbursement of Valley Subarea Senior and Disabled Transit Program Funds

Policy VSDT-9: Funds approved for allocation for operating subsidies shall be disbursed to Omnitrans and/or the CTSA within thirty (30) days of the beginningend of each monthquarter, except as arranged through other agreements.

Policy VSDT-10: Funds approved for allocation for fare subsidy for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities shall be disbursed to Omnitrans and/or the CTSA within thirty (30) days of the beginningend of each monthquarter, except as arranged through other agreements. The amount ~~to be~~ disbursed shall be substantiated in the subsequent quarterdetermined through the receipt of a reportan invoice from ~~the~~ Omnitrans and/or the CTSA documenting the number of elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities using the service in the prior quarter and the amount of fare subsidy applied for each counted passenger.

Policy VSDT-11: Funds approved for allocation for capital purposes shall be disbursed within thirty (30) days of receipt of a copy of the procurement invoice from Omnitrans and/or the CTSA.

#### F. Accounting Requirements

Policy VSDT-12: Omnitrans and/or the CTSA shall establish a Special Measure I 2010-2040 Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund. This fund is a special revenue fund utilized to account for proceeds of specific revenue sources that are legally restricted to expenditures for Senior and Disabled transit purposes. The modified accrual basis of accounting should be used.

Policy VSDT-13: The following requirements are to provide guidance on the specific accounting treatment as it relates to the Special Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund.

- a. All apportionments shall be deposited directly into the Special Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund.
- b. Interest received from the investment of money in its Special Measure I Sales Tax Fund shall be deposited in the fund and shall be used for Senior and Disabled transit purposes.
- c. If other revenues are commingled in the Special Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund, it is the responsibility of Omnitrans and/or the CTSA to provide accurate and adequate documentation to support revenue and expenditure allocation, as well as segregated balances.
- d. It is allowable to fund prior year expenditures with current year revenues and/or fund balance as long as expenditures are allowable.
- e. If an expenditure is deemed ineligible in the annual Compliance Audit, the Measure I funds used must be repaid to the Special Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund.

Policy VSDT-14: Any interest earned on investment of Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Funds must be deposited into that fund. If Omnitrans and/or the CTSA elects to not invest its Measure I funds but at the same time invests most of its other available funds, the Measure I funds should be deposited in a separate account to clearly indicate that no such monies were invested. If Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax funds are invested, they must receive their equitable proration of interest earned on the total funds invested. Several methods are available to determine an equitable distribution of interest earned. Whatever method is employed, it will be analyzed during audit to determine reasonableness and confirm distribution to the Special Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund. It is recommended that a distribution based on average month end cash balances be employed. In addition, if the interest distribution methodology allows for negative distributions, they will be disallowed. No interest charges based on negative cash and fund balances will be allowed.

Policy VSDT-15: Records:

- a. Source Documentation - All expenditures charged to the Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund must be supported by a warrant or other source document (invoice, requisition, time sheet) clearly identifying the project, services rendered, item purchased, and other pertinent data to establish a clear audit trail.
- b. Retention Period - All source documents, together with the accounting records, are deemed to be the official records of Omnitrans and/or the CTSA and must be retained by Omnitrans and/or the CTSA for five (5) years.

Policy VSDT-16: Compliance Audit Deadline

An annual Compliance Audit must be completed within six (6) months after the end of the fiscal year (Compliance Audit Deadline). SANBAG staff shall monitor the scheduling and progress of the audits to ensure prompt communication by the Auditor after information submittals by Omnitrans and/or the CTSA, and timely completion of the final MSI audit report. If Omnitrans and/or the CTSA is not able to meet the information submittal deadlines set by the Auditor or the Compliance Audit Deadline, Omnitrans and/or the CTSA may submit a request to SANBAG’s Executive Director no later than thirty days prior to the submittal deadline set by the Auditor or the Compliance Audit Deadline, whichever extension is required, and a two (2) month automatic extension will be granted. Any further requests for extensions of the Compliance Audit Deadline are subject to approval by the Board. The Board may approve further Compliance Audit Deadline extensions, if the Board finds: (1) the Compliance Audit was not completed timely for reasons outside of Omnitrans’ and/or the CTSA’s control, such as federal, state, and GASB reporting requirements, or catastrophic events; or (2) it is in the best interests of SANBAG to grant the extension. SANBAG staff shall be responsible for requesting extensions related to Auditor performance.

Policy VSDT-17: Remedies

- a. If Omnitrans’ and/or the CTSA’s annual Compliance Audit determines that Omnitrans and/or the CTSA used Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Funds for ineligible expenses, Omnitrans and/or the CTSA shall repay the Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund, in the amount of the ineligible expenses, immediately from another source through an internal fund transfer.
- b. If Omnitrans’ and/or the CTSA’s annual Compliance Audit fails to be completed with an unmodified opinion by the Compliance Audit Deadline, as extended pursuant to Policy VLS-16, Omnitrans and/or the CTSA shall repay the Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund, in the amount of the Measure I Senior and Disabled Allocation for the fiscal year subject of annual Compliance Audit findings of unsubstantiated or questioned costs, immediately from another source through an internal fund transfer.
- c. If Omnitrans and/or the CTSA is unable to make such immediate repayment under VLS-17 (a) or (b), Omnitrans and/or the CTSA shall not receive its Senior and Disabled Allocation pass-through payments until the repayment amount of ineligible expenses, unsubstantiated costs, or questioned costs, have been withheld by SANBAG.
- d. If Omnitrans and/or the CTSA enters into a Repayment Agreement with SANBAG, as approved by Omnitrans and/or the CTSA and the SANBAG Board of Directors, providing for repayment of the amounts owed under VLS-17 (a) or (b) over a period not to exceed five (5) years, SANBAG will return any pass-through funds withheld. SANBAG will recommence withholding Senior and Disabled Allocation pass-through funds if Omnitrans and/or the CTSA fails to comply with the terms of the Repayment Agreement.

**V. REVISION HISTORY**

Revision No.	Revisions	Adopted
0	Adopted by the Board of Directors.	04/01/2009

San Bernardino Associated Governments	<b>Policy</b>	<b>40014</b>
Adopted by the Board of Directors April 1, 2009	Revised	04/01/09
<b>Victor Valley Senior and Disabled Transit (VVSDT) Program Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan</b>	Revision No.	0

**Important Notice: A hardcopy of this document may not be the document currently in effect. The current version is always the version on the SANBAG website.**

<p><b>Table of Contents</b></p> <p><a href="#">Purpose</a>   <a href="#">References</a>   <a href="#">Definitions</a>   <a href="#">Policies for the Victor Valley Senior and Disabled Transit Program</a>   <a href="#">Revision History</a>  </p>
---

**I. PURPOSE**

The purpose of this policy is to delineate the requirements for administration of the Victor Valley Subarea Senior and Disabled Transit Program for Measure I 2010-2040. The policy establishes the funding allocation process, reimbursement mechanisms, project eligibility, and limitations on eligible expenditures.

**II. REFERENCES**

Ordinance No. 04-01 of the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, Exhibit A – Transportation Expenditure Plan

**III. DEFINITIONS**

**Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP)** – A five-year financially constrained plan of projected transit service levels, operating and capital improvement expenses, updated biennially and submitted to SANBAG by local transit systems.

**Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA)** – A agency designated pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 15975 of the California Government Code responsible for the coordination of social service transportation.

**Transportation Reimbursement Escort Program (TREP)** – A volunteer travel reimbursement program for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities.

**IV. POLICIES FOR THE VICTOR VALLEY SENIOR AND DISABLED TRANSIT PROGRAM**

**A. Organization of the Victor Valley Subarea Senior and Disabled Transit Program**

Policy VVSDT-1: The Victor Valley Senior and Disabled Transit Program shall follow the intent of Ordinance 04-01, i.e., “Senior and Disabled Transit is defined as contributions to transit operators for fare subsidies for senior citizens and persons with disabilities or enhancements to transit service provided to seniors and persons with disabilities.”

Policy VVSDT-2: Five percent (5%) of the revenue collected within the Victor Valley subarea shall be apportioned to the Senior and Disabled Transit Program account. The apportionment shall be increased by five tenths of a percent (0.5%) every five years to a maximum of seven and a half percent (7.5%). Such increases shall automatically occur unless each jurisdiction makes a finding that such an increase is not required to address the unmet transit needs of elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities.

## B. Eligible Expenditures

Policy VVSDT-3: The following expenditures shall be eligible under the Victor Valley Senior and Disabled Transit Program:

### 1. Fare Subsidies

- a. Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds may be used for fare stabilization or subsidy for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities. Future fare increases for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities may be offset through a local fare subsidy using Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds.
- b. The amount of Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds contributed as a fare subsidy shall qualify as fare revenue for purposes of calculating the ratio of passenger fares to operating cost required by the Transportation Development Act.

### 2. Service and Capital Subsidies

- a. Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds may be used to support existing, new, expanded, or enhanced transportation services, including capital projects, for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities. Examples would include direct operating subsidy for the provision of ADA complimentary paratransit service and demand responsive service for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities.
- b. For general public transportation services, the percentage of Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds used to support operating expenses cannot exceed the percentage of elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities carried by the system in the fiscal year preceding the year in which the annual operating budget is being prepared.
- c. Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds may be used to support social service agency transportation for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities provided such service is coordinated with and are not duplicative of the VVTA and/or the CTSA services.
- d. Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds may be used to support education and marketing of transportation services for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities with the intent to increase consumer's awareness and knowledge of how to use the most cost-effective service available as well as to provide education opportunities to operators that help improve the quality and effectiveness of the services provided.
- e. Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds may be used as local matching funds to federal and state capital grant programs for the procurement of equipment used primarily for transportation service provided to elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities. Lacking access to federal and/or state grants, program funds may be used for the procurement of equipment used primarily for transportation service provided to elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities. These program funds may also be used for the incremental cost of accessible features associated with vehicle acquisitions.

## C. Maintenance of Effort

Policy VVSDT-4: Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds shall not be used to supplant existing federal, state and local (Local Transportation Fund) funds committed to transit services.

Policy VVSDT-5: The maintenance of effort shall be determined by calculating the amount of Local Transportation Fund (LTF) each jurisdiction contributed toward transit operating expenses in Fiscal Year 2008/2009 adjusted by the Los Angeles, Riverside and Orange County's area Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all items as determined by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Policy VVSDT-6: Exceptions to Maintenance of Effort:

1. Upon the incorporation of a new city or town, the combined contribution of LTF by the County and the newly incorporated jurisdiction for the transit system's operating subsidy must meet the maintenance of effort requirement that would have otherwise applied to the County alone. Subsequent maintenance of effort determinations shall be made by apportioning the CPI adjusted maintenance of effort amount the County and newly incorporated jurisdiction based upon the initial population used for apportioning LTF.

2. An exception to the maintenance of effort shall apply if a jurisdiction is spending all of its LTF apportionment for transit purposes.

#### **D. Allocation of Victor Valley Subarea Senior and Disabled Program Funding**

Policy VVSDT-7: The SANBAG Board of Directors shall annually allocate funding to specific transit projects and programs as approved in each transit system's SRTP and may allocate funding to a CTSA, if one is formed, or a public entity (city or county) providing or contracting for transportation services for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities provided those services are coordinated with and do not duplicate the services provided by the VVTA and/or CTSA.

Policy VVSDT-8: Allocations to a specified project or program shall be limited to the annual forecast of revenues available within each subarea, unless there is also a residual balance of revenue available.

#### **E. Disbursement of Victor Valley Subarea Senior and Disabled Transit Program Funds**

Policy VVSDT-9: Funds approved for allocation for operating subsidies shall be disbursed to each transit system, CTSA, and/or city and county through the VVTA and/or CTSA within thirty (30) days of the beginning of each quarter~~end of each month~~.

Policy VVSDT-10: Funds approved for allocation for fare subsidy for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities shall be disbursed to the transit system, CTSA, and/or city and county within thirty (30) days of the beginning of each quarter~~end of each month~~. The amount ~~to be~~ disbursed shall be substantiated in the subsequent quarter~~determined~~ through the receipt of a report~~an invoice~~ from the transit system, CTSA, and /or city and county through the VVTA documenting the number of elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities using the service in the prior month and the amount of fare subsidy applied for each counted passenger.

Policy VVSDT-11: Funds approved for allocation for capital purposes shall be disbursed within thirty (30) days of receipt of a copy of the procurement invoice from the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county, through the VVTA and/or CTSA.

#### **F. Accounting Requirements**

Policy VVSDT-12: Each transit system, CTSA and/or city and county shall establish a Special Measure I 2010-2040 Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund. This fund is a special revenue fund utilized to account for proceeds of specific revenue sources that are legally restricted to expenditures for Senior and Disabled transit purposes. Jurisdictions should use the modified accrual basis of accounting.

Policy VVSDT-13: The following requirements are to provide guidance on the specific accounting treatment as it relates to the Special Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund.

- a. All apportionments shall be deposited directly into the Special Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund.
- b. Interest received from the investment of money in its Special Measure I Sales Tax Fund shall be deposited in the fund and shall be used for Senior and Disabled transit purposes.
- c. If other revenues are commingled in the Special Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund, it is the responsibility of the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county to provide accurate and adequate documentation to support revenue and expenditure allocation, as well as segregated balances.
- d. It is allowable to fund prior year expenditures with current year revenues and/or fund balance as long as expenditures are allowable.
- e. If an expenditure is deemed ineligible in the annual Compliance Audit, the Measure I funds used must be repaid to the Special Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund.

Policy VVSDT-14: Any interest earned on investment of Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Funds must be deposited into that fund. Any transit system, CTSA and/or city and county not electing to invest its Measure I funds but at the same time investing most of its other available funds should deposit the Measure I funds in a separate account to clearly indicate that no such monies were invested. If Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax funds are invested, they must receive their equitable proration of interest earned on the total funds invested. Several methods are available to

determine an equitable distribution of interest earned. Whatever method is employed, it will be analyzed during audit to determine reasonableness and confirm distribution to the Special Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund. It is recommended that a distribution based on average month end cash balances be employed. In addition, if the interest distribution methodology allows for negative distributions, they will be disallowed. No interest charges based on negative cash and fund balances will be allowed.

Policy VVSDT-15: Records:

- a. Source Documentation - All expenditures charged to the Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund must be supported by a warrant or other source document (invoice, requisition, time sheet) clearly identifying the project, services rendered, item purchased, and other pertinent data to establish a clear audit trail.
- b. Retention Period - All source documents, together with the accounting records, are deemed to be the official records of the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county and must be retained by the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county for five (5) years.

Policy VVSDT-16: Compliance Audit Deadline

An annual Compliance Audit must be completed within six (6) months after the end of the fiscal year (Compliance Audit Deadline). SANBAG staff shall monitor the scheduling and progress of the audits to ensure prompt communication by the Auditor after information submittals by the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county, and timely completion of the final MSI audit report. If a transit system, CTSA and/or city and county is not able to meet the information submittal deadlines set by the Auditor or the Compliance Audit Deadline, the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county may submit a request to SANBAG's Executive Director no later than thirty days prior to the submittal deadline set by the Auditor or the Compliance Audit Deadline, whichever extension is required, and a two (2) month automatic extension will be granted. Any further requests for extensions of the Compliance Audit Deadline are subject to approval by the Board. The Board may approve further Compliance Audit Deadline extensions, if the Board finds: (1) the Compliance Audit was not completed timely for reasons outside of the control of the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county, such as federal, state, and GASB reporting requirements, or catastrophic events; or (2) it is in the best interests of SANBAG to grant the extension. SANBAG staff shall be responsible for requesting extensions related to Auditor performance.

Policy VVSDT-17: Remedies

- a. If the annual Compliance Audit determines that the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county used Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Funds for ineligible expenses, the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county shall repay the Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund, in the amount of the ineligible expenses, immediately from another source through an internal fund transfer.
- b. If the annual Compliance Audit fails to be completed with an unmodified opinion by the Compliance Audit Deadline, as extended pursuant to Policy VVSDT-16, the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county shall repay the Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund, in the amount of the Measure I Senior and Disabled Allocation for the fiscal year subject of annual Compliance Audit findings of unsubstantiated or questioned costs, immediately from another source through an internal fund transfer.
- c. If the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county is unable to make such immediate repayment under VVSDT-17 (a) or (b), the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county shall not receive its Senior and Disabled Allocation pass-through payments until the repayment amount of ineligible expenses, unsubstantiated costs, or questioned costs, have been withheld by SANBAG.
- d. If the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county enters into a Repayment Agreement with SANBAG, as approved by the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county and the SANBAG Board of Directors, providing for repayment of the amounts owed under VVSDT-17 (a) or (b) over a period not to exceed five (5) years, SANBAG will return any pass-through funds withheld.

SANBAG will recommence withholding Senior and Disabled Allocation pass-through funds if the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county fails to comply with the terms of the Repayment Agreement.

**V. REVISION HISTORY**

Revision No.	Revisions	Adopted
0	Adopted by the Board of Directors.	04/01/2009

Attachment: Policy40014 [Revision 1] (1963 : S&D Policy Amendment)

San Bernardino Associated Governments	<b>Policy</b>	<b>40018</b>
Adopted by the Board of Directors April 1, 2009	Revised	04/01/09
<b>Rural Mountain/Desert Subareas Senior and Disabled Transit (MDSDT) Program Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan</b>	Revision No.	0

**Important Notice: A hardcopy of this document may not be the document currently in effect. The current version is always the version on the SANBAG Intranet.**

<b>Table of Contents</b> <a href="#">Purpose</a>   <a href="#">References</a>   <a href="#">Definitions</a>   <a href="#">Policies for Rural Mountain/Desert Subareas Senior and Disabled Transit Program</a>   <a href="#">Revision History</a>
---

**I. PURPOSE**

The purpose of this policy is to delineate the requirements for administration of the Rural Mountain/Desert Subarea Senior and Disabled Transit Program for Measure I 2010-2040. The policy establishes the funding allocation process, reimbursement mechanisms, project eligibility, and limitations on eligible expenditures. The policy applies to the following four subareas: Colorado River, Morongo Basin, Mountains, and North Desert.

**II. REFERENCES**

Ordinance No. 04-01 of the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, Exhibit A – Transportation Expenditure Plan.

**III. DEFINITIONS**

**Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP):** A five-year financially constrained plan of projected transit service levels, operating and capital improvement expenses, updated biennially and submitted to SANBAG by local transit systems.

**Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA):** A agency designated pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 15975 of the California Government Code responsible for the coordination of social service transportation.

**Transportation Reimbursement Escort Program (TREP):** A volunteer travel reimbursement program for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities.

**IV. POLICIES FOR RURAL MOUNTAIN/DESERT SUBAREAS SENIOR AND DISABLED TRANSIT PROGRAM**

**A. Organization of the Rural Mountain/Desert Subarea Senior and Disabled Transit Program**

Policy MDSDT-1: The policies for the expenditure of the Rural Mountain/Desert Subarea Senior and Disabled Transit Program shall follow the intent as contained in the approved ordinance, i.e., “Senior and Disabled Transit is defined as contributions to transit operators for fare subsidies for senior citizens and persons with disabilities or enhancements to transit service provided to seniors and persons with disabilities.”

Policy MDSDT-2: Five percent (5%) of the revenue collected within each subarea shall be apportioned to the Senior and Disabled Transit Program account. Local representatives may provide additional funding beyond the five percent (5%) upon a finding that such an increase is required to address the unmet transit needs of elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities.

## B. Eligible Expenditures

Policy MDSDT-3: The following expenditures shall be eligible under the Rural Mountain/Desert Senior and Disabled Transit Program.

### 1. Fare Subsidies

- a. Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds may be used for fare stabilization or subsidy for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities. Future fare increases for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities may be offset through a local fare subsidy using Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds.
- b. The amount of Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds contributed as a fare subsidy shall qualify as fare revenue for purposes of calculating the ratio of passenger fares to operating cost required by the Transportation Development Act.

### 2. Service and Capital Subsidies

- a. Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds may be used to support existing, new, expanded, or enhanced transportation services, including capital projects, for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities. Examples would include direct operating subsidy for the provision of ADA complimentary paratransit service and demand responsive service for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities.
- b. For general public transportation services, the percentage of Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds used to support operating expenses cannot exceed the percentage of elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities carried by the system in the fiscal year preceding the year in which the annual operating budget is being prepared.
- c. Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds may be used to support social service agency transportation for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities provided such service is coordinated with and are not duplicative of the subarea public transit system or CTSA services.
- d. Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds may be used to support education and marketing of transportation services for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities with the intent to increase consumer's awareness and knowledge of how to use the most cost-effective service available as well as to provide education opportunities to operators that help improve the quality and effectiveness of the services provided.
- e. Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds may be used as local matching funds to federal and state capital grant programs for the procurement of equipment used primarily for transportation service provided to elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities. Lacking access to federal and/or state grants, program funds may be used for the procurement of equipment used primarily for transportation service provided to elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities. These program funds may also be used for the incremental cost of accessible features associated with vehicle acquisitions.

## C. Maintenance of Effort

Policy MDSDT-4: Senior and Disabled Transit Program funds shall not be used to supplant existing federal, state and local (Local Transportation Fund) funds committed to transit services.

Policy MDSDT-5: The maintenance of effort shall be determined by calculating the amount of Local Transportation Fund (LTF) each jurisdiction contributed toward transit operating expenses in Fiscal Year 2008-2009 adjusted by the Los Angeles, Riverside and Orange Counties area Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all items as determined by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Policy MDSDT-6: Exceptions to Maintenance of Effort

1. Upon the incorporation of a new city or town, the combined contribution of LTF by the County and the newly incorporated jurisdiction for the transit system's operating subsidy must meet the maintenance of effort requirement that would have otherwise applied to the County alone. Subsequent maintenance of effort determinations shall be made by apportioning the CPI adjusted

maintenance of effort amount the County and newly incorporated jurisdiction based upon the initial population used for apportioning LTF.

2. An exception to the maintenance of effort shall apply if a jurisdiction is spending all of its LTF apportionment for transit purposes.

#### **D. Allocation of Rural Mountain/Desert Subarea Senior and Disabled Program Funding**

Policy MDSDT-7: The SANBAG Board of Directors shall annually allocate funding to specific transit projects and programs as approved in each transit system's SRTP and may allocate funding to a CTSA, if one is formed, or a public entity (city or county) providing or contracting for transportation services for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities provided those services are coordinated with and do not duplicate the services provided by the subarea transit system, and/or the CTSA.

Policy MDSDT-8: Allocations to a specified project or program shall be limited to the annual forecast of revenues available within each subarea, unless there is also a residual balance of revenue available.

#### **E. Disbursement of Rural Mountain/Desert Subarea Senior and Disabled Transit Program Funds**

Policy MDSDT-9: Funds approved for allocation for operating subsidies shall be disbursed to each transit system, CTSA, and/or city and county through the subarea transit system and/or the CTSA within thirty (30) days of the beginning of each quarter~~end of the month~~.

Policy MDSDT-10: Funds approved for allocation for fare subsidy for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities shall be disbursed to the transit system, CTSA, and/or city and county within thirty (30) days of the beginning of each quarter~~end of each month~~. The amount ~~to be~~ disbursed shall be substantiated in the subsequent quarter~~determine~~ through the receipt of a report an invoice from the transit system, CTSA, and/or city and county through the subarea transit system and/or CTSA documenting the number of elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities using the service in the prior month and the amount of fare subsidy applied for each counted passenger.

Policy MDSDT-11: Funds approved for allocation for capital purposes shall be disbursed within thirty (30) days of receipt of a copy of the procurement invoice from the subarea transit system, CTSA and/or city and county, through the subarea transit system and/or CTSA.

#### **F. Accounting Requirements**

Policy MDSDT-12: Each transit system, CTSA and/or city and county shall establish a Special Measure I 2010-2040 Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund. This fund is a special revenue fund utilized to account for proceeds of specific revenue sources that are legally restricted to expenditures for Senior and Disabled transit purposes. Jurisdictions should use the modified accrual basis of accounting.

Policy MDSDT-13: The following requirements are to provide guidance on the specific accounting treatment as it relates to the Special Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund.

- a. All apportionments shall be deposited directly into the Special Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund.
- b. Interest received from the investment of money in its Special Measure I Sales Tax Fund shall be deposited in the fund and shall be used for Senior and Disabled transit purposes.
- c. If other revenues are commingled in the Special Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund, it is the responsibility of the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county to provide accurate and adequate documentation to support revenue and expenditure allocation, as well as segregated balances.
- d. It is allowable to fund prior year expenditures with current year revenues and/or fund balance as long as expenditures are allowable.
- e. If an expenditure is deemed ineligible in the annual Compliance Audit, the Measure I funds used must be repaid to the Special Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund.

Policy MDSDT-14: Any interest earned on investment of Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Funds must be deposited into that fund. Any transit system, CTSA and/or city and county not electing to invest its Measure I funds but at the same time investing most of its other available funds should

deposit the Measure I funds in a separate account to clearly indicate that no such monies were invested. If Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax funds are invested, they must receive their equitable proration of interest earned on the total funds invested. Several methods are available to determine an equitable distribution of interest earned. Whatever method is employed, it will be analyzed during audit to determine reasonableness and confirm distribution to the Special Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund. It is recommended that a distribution based on average month end cash balances be employed. In addition, if the interest distribution methodology allows for negative distributions, they will be disallowed. No interest charges based on negative cash and fund balances will be allowed.

Policy MDSDT-15: Records:

- a. Source Documentation - All expenditures charged to the Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund must be supported by a warrant or other source document (invoice, requisition, time sheet) clearly identifying the project, services rendered, item purchased, and other pertinent data to establish a clear audit trail.
- b. Retention Period - All source documents, together with the accounting records, are deemed to be the official records of the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county and must be retained by the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county for five (5) years.

Policy MDSDT-16: Compliance Audit Deadline

An annual Compliance Audit must be completed within six (6) months after the end of the fiscal year (Compliance Audit Deadline). SANBAG staff shall monitor the scheduling and progress of the audits to ensure prompt communication by the Auditor after information submittals by the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county, and timely completion of the final MSI audit report. If a transit system, CTSA and/or city and county is not able to meet the information submittal deadlines set by the Auditor or the Compliance Audit Deadline, the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county may submit a request to SANBAG's Executive Director no later than thirty days prior to the submittal deadline set by the Auditor or the Compliance Audit Deadline, whichever extension is required, and a two (2) month automatic extension will be granted. Any further requests for extensions of the Compliance Audit Deadline are subject to approval by the Board. The Board may approve further Compliance Audit Deadline extensions, if the Board finds: (1) the Compliance Audit was not completed timely for reasons outside of the control of the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county, such as federal, state, and GASB reporting requirements, or catastrophic events; or (2) it is in the best interests of SANBAG to grant the extension. SANBAG staff shall be responsible for requesting extensions related to Auditor performance.

Policy MDSDT-17: Remedies

- a. If the annual Compliance Audit determines that the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county used Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Funds for ineligible expenses, the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county shall repay the Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund, in the amount of the ineligible expenses, immediately from another source through an internal fund transfer.
- b. If the annual Compliance Audit fails to be completed with an unmodified opinion by the Compliance Audit Deadline, as extended pursuant to Policy MDSDT-16, the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county shall repay the Measure I Senior and Disabled Sales Tax Fund, in the amount of the Measure I Senior and Disabled Allocation for the fiscal year subject of annual Compliance Audit findings of unsubstantiated or questioned costs, immediately from another source through an internal fund transfer.
- c. If the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county is unable to make such immediate repayment under MDSDT-17 (a) or (b), the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county shall not receive its Senior and Disabled Allocation pass-through payments until the repayment amount of ineligible expenses, unsubstantiated costs, or questioned costs, have been withheld by SANBAG.
- d. If the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county enters into a Repayment Agreement with SANBAG, as approved by the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county and the SANBAG

Board of Directors, providing for repayment of the amounts owed under MDSDT-17 (a) or (b) over a period not to exceed five (5) years, SANBAG will return any pass-through funds withheld. SANBAG will recommence withholding Senior and Disabled Allocation pass-through funds if the transit system, CTSA and/or city and county fails to comply with the terms of the Repayment Agreement.

**V. REVISION HISTORY**

Revision No.	Revisions	Adopted
0	Adopted by the Board of Directors.	04/01/2009

Attachment: Policy40018 [Revision 1] (1963 : S&D Policy Amendment)

## TRANSIT POLICY COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE RECORD – 2016

Name	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
<b>Paul Eaton</b> City of Montclair	X	X	X	X								
<b>James Ramos</b> County of San Bernardino	X	X	X		X							
<b>Jon Harrison</b> City of Redlands	X	X	X	X	X							
<b>Bill Jahn</b> City of Big Bear Lake	X	X	X	X	X							
<b>Robert Lovingood</b> County of San Bernardino	X	X	X		X							
<b>Larry McCallon</b> City of Highland	X			X	X							
<b>L. Dennis Michael</b> City of Rancho Cucamonga		X	X	X	X							
<b>Ray Musser</b> City of Upland	X	X	X	X	X							
<b>Richard Riddell</b> City of Yucaipa	X	X	X	X	X							
<b>Alan Wapner</b> City of Ontario	X	X	X	X	X							
<b>Deborah Robertson</b> City of Rialto		X										

X = Member attended meeting.

\* = Alternate member attended meeting

Empty box = Member did not attend meeting.

Crossed out box = Not a member at the time.

CRTC-ATT16

Communication: Attendance (Additional Information)

*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.*

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
IIEP	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
SRTP	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 <sup>st</sup> Century
TMC	Transportation Management Center
TMEE	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