MEETINGS OF THE
Transit Management Committees

| TMC/RMC Joint Meeting | Transit Management Committee (TMC) | Rail Management Committee (RMC) |

Date

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Starting time

11:00 a.m.

Meetings to occur sequentially

Location

Valley Metro
Lake Powell Conference Room (10A)
101 N. 1st Avenue, 10th Floor
Phoenix

If you require assistance accessing the meetings on the 10th floor, please go to the 13th floor or call 602-262-7433.
Joint Meeting Agenda
Transit Management Committee and Rail Management Committee

Wednesday, June 7, 2017
Lake Powell Conference Room
101 N. 1st Avenue, 10th Floor
11:00 a.m.

1. **Items from Citizens Present (yellow card)**

An opportunity will be provided to members of the public at the beginning of the meeting to address the Board on non-agenda items. Up to three minutes will be provided per speaker or a total of 15 minutes for all speakers.

2. **Chief Executive Officer’s (CEO) Report**

Scott Smith, CEO, will brief the TMC/RMC on current issues.

3. **Minutes**

Minutes from the May 3, 2017 Joint TMC/RMC meeting are presented for approval.

4. **Public Comment on Agenda Action Items (blue card)**

The public will be provided with an opportunity at this time to address the Board on all action agenda items. Up to three minutes will be provided per speaker to address all agenda items unless the Chair allows more at his/her discretion. A total of 15 minutes for all speakers will be provided.

5. **Fare Policy Change Regarding Ticket Partnerships**

Scott Smith CEO, will introduce Hillary Foose, Director, Communication and Marketing, who will request that the TMC/RMC forward to the Boards of Directors authorization to amend the regional fare policy to allow for additional ticket partnerships with events and event venues to operate similar to the arrangement with Talking Stick Resort Arena.

1. For information

2. For information

3. For action

4. For information

5. For action
6. **Customer Service Call Center and NextRide Technology**

Memo currently under development.

7. **Arizona State University (ASU) Student Ridership Trends**

Scott Smith, CEO, will introduce Wulf Grote, Director, Capital and Service Development, who will provide an overview of ASU student ridership trends and influencers on the Valley Metro system.

8. **Travel, Expenditures and Solicitations**

The monthly travel, expenditures and solicitations for Valley Metro RPTA and Valley Metro Rail are presented for information.

9. **Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events**

Chairs Zuercher and Methvin will request future agenda items from members, and members may provide a report on current events.

Qualified sign language interpreters are available with 72 hours notice. Materials in alternative formats (large print, audiocassette, or computer diskette) are available upon request. For further information, please call Valley Metro at 602-262-7433 or TTY at 602-251-2039. To attend this meeting via teleconference, contact the receptionist at 602-262-7433 for the dial-in-information. The supporting information for this agenda can be found on our web site at [www.valleymetro.org](http://www.valleymetro.org).
DATE
May 24, 2017

SUBJECT
Items from Citizens Present

PURPOSE
An opportunity will be provided to members of the public at the beginning of the meeting to address the TMC/RMC on non-agenda items. Up to three minutes will be provided per speaker or a total of 15 minutes for all speakers.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
None

COST AND BUDGET
None

COMMITTEE PROCESS
None

RECOMMENDATION
This item is presented for information only.

CONTACT
Scott Smith
Chief Executive Officer
602-262-7433
ssmith@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
None
DATE
May 24, 2017

SUBJECT
Chief Executive Officer’s Report

PURPOSE
Scott Smith, Chief Executive Officer, will brief the TMC/RMC on current issues.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
None

COST AND BUDGET
None

COMMITTEE PROCESS
None

RECOMMENDATION
This item is presented for information only.

CONTACT
Scott Smith
Chief Executive Officer
602-262-7433
ssmith@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
None
Minutes of a Joint Meeting of Transit Management Committee and Rail Management Committee
Wednesday, April 5, 2017
11:00 a.m.

Transit Management Committee Meeting Participants
Ed Zuercher, City of Phoenix, Chair
Gina Montes, City of Avondale
Roger Klingler, City of Buckeye
Ryan Peters for Marsha Reed, City of Chandler
James Shano, City of El Mirage
Kristen Myers for Marc Skocypec, Town of Gilbert (phone)
Kevin Link for Kevin Phelps, City of Glendale
Rob Bohr for Brian Dalke, City of Goodyear
Chris Brady, City of Mesa
Stuart Ken for Jeff Tyne, City of Peoria
Mike Nevarez for Steven Methvin, City of Tempe
Martin Soto for Nicole Lance, City of Surprise
Sara Allred, ADOT

Members Not Present
Reed Kempton, Maricopa County
Paul Basha, City of Scottsdale
City of Tolleson

Rail Management Committee Meeting Participants
Steven Methvin, City of Tempe, Chair
Scott Butler for Chris Brady, City of Mesa, Vice Chair
Ryan Peters for Marsha Reed, City of Chandler
Kevin Phelps, City of Glendale
Ed Zuercher, City of Phoenix

Chair Zuercher called the joint meeting to order at 11:01 a.m.

Good morning and welcome to the joint meeting of the Transit Management Committee and the Rail Management Committee.

1. Items from Citizens Present

None.
2. Chief Executive Officer's Report

Mr. Smith provided an update on the following items:

- Peoria Park-and-Ride
- Tempe Streetcar
- Design a Transit Wrap
- Gilbert Road Extension
- Rail Rodeo Winners

Mr. Methvin said Mr. Smith, I just wanted to personally thank you on behalf of the city for your work and the work of staff on the Tempe Streetcar project. I know it didn't just happen organically, and we know that you had many conversations with folks in D.C., and we just want to thank you very much for your advocacy.

Mr. Smith said thank you. And I appreciate that. And yes, there's a lot of points of contact and we worked hard.

I was happy to be back in D.C. actually last Tuesday and Wednesday in some of those meetings and on Capitol Hill. And I will tell you the one thing that I appreciate is that when you go back and talk Valley Metro in Washington, D.C., Valley Metro has a very good reputation with FTA, and we are looked on as sort of a shining star and that's because over the years there's been a lot of people involved who have done a lot of good things to create the system that we have.

And I'm happy and honored to be able to take a really good, you know, someone took it to the five-yard line and if I can help take it over the goal line I'm happy to do that, but, you know, a lot of other people, including people in this room, were involved in taking this down the field, so thank you very much. I appreciate that.

Chair Zuercher said thank you. Are there any other questions or comments? Okay. Thank you, Mr. Smith.

Chair Zuercher said Mr. Crowley, you came a little bit late. You've asked to have a public comment on the minutes. I will allow that this time.

Mr. Crowley said part of the reason I'm late is the multimodal part of this building and every single story on the elevator we got people, so I'm sorry that I was late.

But it is on the minutes that I do want to make the comments. And it's not that I speak incoherently, but on those minutes in my statements last time, I asked that some of the activities of our staff and the moneys spent and what was done. I was hoping that I could get back something from either staff or the committee on some of those expenditures.

As I expressed when comparing our two facilities between Seattle and here, when I look
at all the things they have and all the things we have, as I said in the minutes, we're on a tricycle and they're on a locomotive. What is it that we have to learn from them? Isn't it our own that we're supposed to be dealing with.

But then also one of the things that didn't make the agenda, and I wish that you could have also put on so that we could find out in the minutes, that security is one of the things you're bringing up and showing what you're doing. Well, there was a murder yesterday at one of our stations. I know that it wasn't the bus or the bus stop or any of those parts that equate to it, but then when we're doing all of this safety at the light rail -- which was where in proximity to the murder, across the street. I just think that it's something else that you should've had on the agenda to let you know what happened.

But more than that, I would like to get the response of what happened at that legislative conference and how that helped us and why going into Seattle gets us a better security system. And then, most of all, the communities of what you're doing and what you have, what you're not getting done. Thank you.

3. Minutes

Minutes from the April 5, 2017 TMC/RMC meeting were presented for approval.

IT WAS MOVED BY STEVEN METHVIN, SECONDED BY STUART KENT AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE APRIL 5, 2017 TMC/RMC MEETING MINUTES.

4. Public Comment on Action Item Agendas

None.

5. Fiscal Year 2017 Quarterly Reports

This item was presented for information.

6. Travel Expenditures and Task Order Changes

This item was presented for information.

7. Future Agenda Items Request

None.

With no further discussion the meeting adjourned at 11:17 a.m.
DATE
May 24, 2017

SUBJECT
Public Comment on Agenda Action Items

PURPOSE
The public will be provided with an opportunity at this time to address the TMC/RMC on all action agenda items. Up to three minutes will be provided per speaker to address all agenda items unless the Chair allows more at his/her discretion. A total of 15 minutes for all speakers will be provided.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
None

COST AND BUDGET
None

COMMITTEE PROCESS
None

RECOMMENDATION
This item is presented for information only.

CONTACT
Scott Smith
Chief Executive Officer
602-262-7433
ssmith@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
None
DATE
May 31, 2017

AGENDA ITEM 5

SUBJECT
Fare Policy Change Regarding Ticket Partnerships

PURPOSE
To request authorization to amend the regional fare policy to allow for additional ticket partnerships with events and event venues to operate similar to the arrangement with Talking Stick Resort Arena.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
In September 2009, and renewed again in 2015, Valley Metro Rail executed a ticket partnership with Talking Stick Resort Arena (TSRA) that allows event tickets to serve as valid light rail fare on the day of the event. Fare revenue is collected on a monthly basis at 31-cent per ticket/attendee, which has proven to support ridership and the regional fare recovery goal of 25%.

Other events and event venues have expressed interest in a similar partnership to serve as a benefit to their attendees, support parking limitations, mitigate event congestion, generate positive public relations and/or, in some cases, align with “green” or sustainability initiatives of the event. Valley Metro Rail also finds benefit in ticket partnerships of this kind, including:

- Supporting fare collection from reliable funding sources
- Easing boarding and fare inspection during major events
- Further integrating light rail into nightlife/entertainment activities and reputable brands
- Helping to attract ridership and positive attention to the system

The event expressing current interest is the Lost Lake Festival, operated by Cactus Festival, LLC, taking place at Steele Indian School Park in central Phoenix on October 20 – 22, 2017. This is a three-day music festival that has committed to the Phoenix area over the next several years. Due to the location, Valley Metro Rail will be the primary transportation solution to connect the tens of thousands of daily attendees to this event. The event organizer is committed to supporting the fare revenue required for their attendees to ride at no charge with their event ticket in hand.

With this and other opportunities in mind, Valley Metro proposes to amend the regional fare policy to give staff the ability to execute ticket partnerships that support regional ridership and the region’s fare recovery goal, while maximizing the interests of new events and event venues. Today, the language in the policy is specific to TSRA and staff proposes to generalize to provide guidance, yet flexibility to create these agreements.
COST AND BUDGET
There is no cost associated with this item. All ticket partnerships will use the same or similar methodology used for TSRA in deriving the fare revenue per attendee to ensure the fare revenue paid by the event/venue supports the region’s fare recovery goal.

COMMITTEE PROCESS
Fare Policy Working Group: May 25, 2017 for information
RTAG: May 16, 2017 for information
TMC/RMC: June 7, 2017 for action
Boards of Directors: June 22, 2017 for action

STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT
This item relates to the following goals and strategies in the Five-Year Strategic Plan, FY 2016 – 2020:

- Goal 1: Increase customer focus
  - Tactic A: Improve customer satisfaction
  - Tactic C: Enhance customer service to member cities
- Goal 3: Grow transit ridership
  - Tactic A: Expand and improve transit services to reach new markets
  - Tactic C: Communicate availability, attractiveness and safety of transit service

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the TMC/RMC forward to the Boards of Directors authorization to amend the regional fare policy to allow for additional ticket partnerships with events and event venues to operate similar to the arrangement with Talking Stick Resort Arena.

CONTACTS
Paul Hodgins
Chief Financial Officer
602-523-6043
phodgins@valleymetro.org

Hillary Foose
Director, Communication and Marketing
602-322-4468
hfoose@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
Fare Policy
# VALLEY METRO REGIONAL PUBLIC TRANSIT FARE POLICY AND UNIFORM FARE STRUCTURE

## FARE STRUCTURE
Effective March 1, 2013

### Full Fare Regional Bus and Light Rail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Type</th>
<th>Fare Structure</th>
<th>Fare Policy Rules/Multiples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Ride</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>Base 1-Ride fare for bus or light rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Day*</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>2 x base fare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Day</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>3 x All-Day off-board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Day</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>5 x All-Day off-board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Day</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>16.5 x base fare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Day</td>
<td>$64.00</td>
<td>32 x local base fare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPRESS/RAPID</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Ride**</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
<td>Base 1-Ride fare + $1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Day*</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
<td>Local off-board All-Day + $2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Day</td>
<td>$104.00</td>
<td>31 x Express/RAPID cash fare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* On June 1, 2017, the “on-board” premium to purchase an All-Day pass at the bus farebox was discontinued. It was 3 x base fare (= $6.00 for Local Full Fare; $8.50 for Express/RAPID).

** Passengers using a full fare local bus/rail pass for Express/RAPID service are required to pay the difference in fares based on the 1-Ride fares ($3.25 – f $2.00 = $1.25).
## Reduced Fare Regional Bus and Light Rail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Type</th>
<th>Fare Structure</th>
<th>Fare Policy Rules/Multiples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REduced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Ride</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>0.5 x base fare, rounded down to nearest $0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Day*</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>0.5 x local off-board All-Day, rounded down to nearest $0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Day</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Day</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>0.5 x 7-Day rounded down to nearest $0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Day</td>
<td>$16.50</td>
<td>0.5 x local 15-Day rounded down to nearest $0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Day</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>0.5 x local 31-Day, rounded down to nearest $0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* On June 1, 2017, the “on-board” premium to purchase an All-Day pass at the bus farebox was discontinued. It was 3 x base fare (= $3.00 for Local Reduced Fare).

Reduced Fare Eligibility – Youth ages six to 18, seniors age 65 and over, persons with disabilities and people who have been issued a Medicare card by the Social Security Administration are eligible for Reduced Fares. Any photo ID showing an individual's age is acceptable proof of age for youth and seniors. The Valley Metro Reduced Fare Identification Card is available for $5.00 and is also acceptable as proof of eligibility.

No Reduced Fare is offered on Express/RAPID. A passenger using a Reduced Fare local bus/rail pass for Express/RAPID service is required to pay the difference in fares based on 1-Ride fares ($3.25 – $1.00 = $2.25).

### Semester Passes – Regional Local Bus and Light Rail

Semester Passes can be purchased by high schools for students at no cost to students and by full-time students enrolled in high schools, technical, trade, college or graduate courses at participating schools. Passes are good for unlimited rides on local bus/rail service for the time period printed on the pass.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Type</th>
<th>Fare Structure</th>
<th>Fare Policy Rules/Multiples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEMester PASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring/Fall</td>
<td>$230.00</td>
<td>Local 31-Day pass x 4.5 months less 20% discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Spring/Fall</td>
<td>$115.00</td>
<td>0.5 x Spring/Fall Semester pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>$154.00</td>
<td>Local 31-Day pass x 3.0 months less 20% discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Summer</td>
<td>$77.00</td>
<td>0.5 x Summer Semester pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full fare Semester Passes are valid on Express/RAPID for an additional $1.65 per boarding. Reduced Fare Semester Passes are valid on Express/RAPID for an additional $2.45 per boarding.
Free Fare
Children five years of age or younger are not charged a fare for local bus/rail or Express/RAPID service when accompanied by a responsible, fare-paying adult. Free fares do not apply to Dial-a-Ride service. Free fares are also provided via the Group Field Trip Program for preschool through elementary school classes using local bus/rail service during non-peak hours of service. Neighborhood circulators are also free to ride.

Changes in Fare Structure
For each fare change, the federally-required Title VI analysis evaluates the proposal for equity among ridership demographics. The analysis ensures that any fare change is administered in an equitable manner among all riders.

Proposed changes to fare structure are implemented to equitably support the cost of transit operations. The current regional fare recovery target is 25 percent, which is the ratio of fares collected for regional fixed route services divided by the operating cost of fixed route services. Locally-funded circulator services that do not comply with the regional fare policy are not included in the fare recovery calculation.

The Valley Metro RPTA Board of Directors must approve changes to regional fare structure and programs. The Valley Metro Rail Board of Directors can approve or be presented with information regarding changes relevant to the rail/high-capacity transit program, however, it is not required.

PROGRAMS

Platinum Pass Program (administered by City of Phoenix)
Platinum Pass is a transit credit card available to companies or organizations for their employees or students. The cardholder is charged the appropriate fare for each boarding on local bus/rail and Express/RAPID bus service. At the end of the month, a bill and an itemized statement is issued for each boarding up to the monthly cap for each pass’s usage. Local boardings are capped at the maximum price of a 31-Day local pass. Combination of local and Express/RAPID boardings are capped at the maximum price of an Express/RAPID 31-Day pass. Cards are encoded with a start date, expiration date, company account number and serial card number. These cards are valid for up to three years and are not available at transit centers. A detailed report of actual boardings charged can be purchased for $25 per month. The company or organization is solely responsible for the cost of the program. Reduced Fare Platinum Passes are available for passengers meeting the Reduced Fare criteria.

Homeless Provider Program (administered by City of Phoenix)
Homeless service providers are eligible to receive Full Fare passes at half price. An agency or organization must be a homeless service provider with IRS 501(c)(3) status or a governmental agency that provides community or social service assistance to homeless persons. Clients must meet the definition of "homeless" or "homeless individual or homeless person" as set forth in Title 42, Chapter 119, Subchapter I, and Section 11302 of the United States Code.
Arizona State University (ASU) U-Pass Program (administered by City of Phoenix in collaboration with ASU)
The U-Pass is provided to ASU students by ASU. ASU pays a fixed rate per boarding to the City of Phoenix Regional Fare Depository for students based on the average Platinum Pass fare per boarding for the prior period. The rate is adjusted annually.

Ticket Partnership Program (administered by Valley Metro)
With the Ticket Partnership Program, patrons possessing tickets or identifiable media issued by event officials from a participating event will be able to ride Valley Metro Rail on the day of the event at no additional charge. Event tickets will be honored as valid Valley Metro Rail fare for a pre-determined time in advance of the event and through the end of the transit day. Participating event venues/events pay an amount per attendee commensurate with the current average fare to support regional fare recovery goals. A qualifying event generates a minimum of 5,000 attendees; similarly, for a venue, a single event at this facility must generate a minimum of 5,000 attendees. This program can be extended to bus route(s) if the aforementioned criteria is maintained and the service can be supported by operations. Valley Metro must receive notice of interest in the Ticket Partnership Program from event organizers at least four months in advance of the event and agreements must be completed by 60 days prior to the event.

Group Field Trip Program (administered by Valley Metro Customer Service)
Free fares are provided via the Group Field Trip Pass Program for preschool through elementary school classes using local bus/rail service during non-peak hours of service (8:30 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.). The pass allows for up to 35 students and adults to travel on bus or rail Monday – Friday for field trips. Trip planning and program administration occurs through Valley Metro Customer Service.

Tempe Youth Transit Pass Program (administered by City of Tempe)
The Tempe Youth Transit Pass allows youth ages six to 18 residing in the City of Tempe to ride local bus/rail for free. The pass issued is a Platinum Pass effective for 12 months and subsidized by the City of Tempe. If under 18, the young person must be accompanied by a parent or guardian with proof of residency. Passes can be applied and received from the Tempe Transit Store.

Rural Route Fare (administered by Valley Metro)
Rural Route fares are based on distance travelled. 1-Way travel within the same city is $2.00; 1-Way travel within multiple cities is $4.00. Reduced Fare is available to passengers meeting the Reduced Fare criteria.
Special Event Pass Program (administered by City of Phoenix)
The Special Event Pass Program supports major, special events and conventions in Maricopa County interested in sponsoring public transportation travel for their attendees. This program is available to events of two or more days in length and 100 or more participants (or cards). Operating as a Platinum Pass, the event sponsor is charged an up-front fee currently set at $1.50/card; customization of the card’s exterior graphics is available with a 4 – 8 week lead time, depending on card volume. Post-event, the event sponsor is charged for actual rides taken via these passes, up to a maximum price of $4.00/day. For events of four or more days, the daily cap adjusts to a lower rate consistent with average daily pricing of other pass types (see table below). Interested event sponsors must complete an application and eventually an agreement to take part in this program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Event Duration</th>
<th>Daily Maximum (and Regional Fare Equivalent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 – 3 days</td>
<td>$4.00 (All-Day pass price)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 7 days</td>
<td>$2.85 (7-Day pass price per day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – 15 days</td>
<td>$2.20 (15-Day pass price per day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more days</td>
<td>$2.00 (31-Day pass price per day)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FARE MEDIA DISTRIBUTION

For Passengers
All passes (except for Platinum Passes, Semester Passes and U-Passes) are sold at locations Valleywide.

- The cities of Avondale, Mesa, Phoenix, Scottsdale and Tempe and the Town of Gilbert have at least one public outlet for passengers to purchase fare media.
- The City of Phoenix currently sells fare media at Central Station, Ed Pastor, Sunnyslope and Metrocenter Transit Centers.

For Public Outlets (administered by City of Phoenix)
Public Sales Outlets sell fare media to the general public and receive a four percent commission. Public Outlets are provided with Transit Books and other marketing materials to help promote the sale of passes.

For Private Outlets (administered by City of Phoenix)
Private Sales Outlets are able to sell or offer fare media to their employees, students or clients. Private Outlets are provided with Transit Books and other marketing materials to help promote the sale of passes.

Refunds
No refunds are offered for lost or unused portions of passes.
### VALLEY METRO DIAL-A-RIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Type</th>
<th>Fare Structure</th>
<th>Fare Policy Rules/Multiples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIAL-A-RIDE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Ride</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>2 x local base fare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADA Dial-a-Ride

There are several ADA Dial-a-Ride providers serving the Maricopa County region. ADA certified passengers pay a flat-rate fare for ADA trips to the Dial-a-Ride provider serving the area where their trip begins. ADA trip rates vary by provider. Regional trips crossing Dial-a-Ride jurisdictions are a flat-rate of $4.00 for a one-way trip.

### ADA Platinum Pass Program

Valley Metro offers the free use of local bus and rail for individuals who are eligible for ADA Dial-a-Ride service and who reside in cities that have elected to participate in the program. ADA Platinum Pass program participants receive a photo ID card which operates as a Platinum Pass. If an individual is eligible to travel with a Personal Care Attendant (PCA), the PCA may also ride for free. If the pass used for Express/RAPID service, the passenger pays the difference in fares. The card itself is initially free, but there is a $5.00 charge to replace a lost or stolen pass. The program is funded with Regional Public Transit (Proposition 400) Funds.

### Non-ADA Dial-a-Ride

A number of cities offer additional Dial-a-Ride services for seniors, persons with disabilities and other residents over and above ADA-required Dial-a-Ride. Non-ADA Dial-a-Ride is funded locally by the cities who offer it. Eligibility for service, service hours, service area(s), fares and other policies do vary.
Fare Policy Change Regarding Ticket Partnerships

June 2017

Background

• Successful ticket partnership w/ Talking Stick Resort Arena
  – Since 2009; most recently renewed in 2015 for up to seven years
  – Achieves fare recovery goal
    • Approximately $300k – $400k annually based on attendance & ridership
Additional Interest

• Other events/venues have expressed interest
  – To benefit their attendees & support event travel
• Lost Lake Festival is presently interested
  – October 20 – 22, 2017
  – Steele Indian School Park, Phoenix
  – Long-term commitment to this market/location

Fare Policy Amendment Request

• Generalize fare policy language for Ticket Partnerships
  – Remove specificity of TSRA
  – Generalize language to provide guidance, yet flexibility to execute agreement(s)
• Ticket partnerships are beneficial to:
  – Attracting new ridership
  – Easing boarding & fare inspection during major events
  – Creating positive attention for system
Recommendation

Staff recommends that the TMC/RMC forward to the Boards of Directors authorization to amend the regional fare policy to allow for additional ticket partnerships with events and event venues to operate similar to the arrangement with Talking Stick Resort Arena.
DATE
May 24, 2017

SUBJECT
Arizona State University (ASU) Student Ridership Trends

PURPOSE
To provide an overview of ASU student ridership trends and influencers on the Valley Metro system.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
At the joint February 2017 Transit Management Committee/Rail Management Committee requested an update of ASU student ridership and its impact on the Valley Metro system.

ASU students have historically comprised a substantial component of the overall Valley Metro bus and light rail ridership. Recent ridership analysis and a comparison of the 2010 and 2015 Origin and Destination surveys show a decline in student ridership on the Valley Metro system. Staff will provide a presentation that summarizes ASU student ridership over the years and review key influencers that may be impacting student transit ridership. This includes the cost of the U-Pass, new student housing near the various campuses, the expanding ASU shuttle service and other factors.

COST AND BUDGET
Not applicable.

STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT
Not applicable.

COMMITTEE ACTION
RTAG: May 16, 2017 for information
TMC/RMC: June 7, 2017 for information
Board of Directors: June 22, 2017 for information

RECOMMENDATION
This item is for information only.

CONTACT
Wulf Grote, P.E.
Director, Capital and Service Development
602-322-4420
wgrote@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
None
ASU Student Ridership

June 2017

Valley Metro Origin & Destination Studies

ASU Student Ridership on a Weekday

- 2011: 14% Student trips, 86% Non-student trips
- 2015: 8% Student trips, 92% Non-student trips
ASU Student Ridership on Valley Metro

This decrease represents a drop of about 3.3M annual weekday trips.

ASU Factors Impacting VM Ridership

- ASU Shuttles
- Student complimentary services
- Residential units near campuses
- U-Pass cost
- On-line classes
The shuttle will run on an as-needed basis during this time. Note: The shuttle does not run during university holidays.
ASU Shuttle Amenities

- Free
- ASU Student/Staff Only
- WiFi
- Five-stall bike rack
- Real-time tracking
- Alerts
- Tandem and Double Decker service
- On-board Restroom

Student Complimentary Services

- Tempe Apartment Courtesy Vans to ASU
Student Complimentary Services

- **Downtown Phoenix Student Government Sponsored** Free Shuttle
  - Parking
  - Grocery

ASU Downtown Phoenix Campus

Where students attending Phoenix campus live (~10K students)
ASU Downtown
Phoenix Campus

Additional Housing in Downtown Phoenix 2007 to 2016 (Campus Opened in 2006)

Image: Skyline Lofts Apartments (Fillmore & 3rd)

ASU Tempe Campus

Where students attending Tempe campus live (~50K students)

Students per Square Mile

0 - 13
14 - 66
67 - 184
185 - 407
408 - 696
697 - 1,076
1,077 - 1,562
1,563 - 2,126
2,127 - 2,730
>2,730

2008 Main Campus
2017 Main Campus
Student Parking and Transit Passes

ASU Student U-Pass Price

- U-Pass Price
- Rate Per Boarding Paid by ASU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>U-Pass Price</th>
<th>Rate Per Boarding Paid by ASU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td>$1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>$1.29</td>
<td>$1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>$1.32</td>
<td>$1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>$1.28</td>
<td>$1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>$1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rate changed to $1.33 in April

ASU Parking Permits and Transit Passes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Parking Permits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>20,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>29,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>29,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>23,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>23,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>23,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>23,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>24,788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FY17 as of 3/22/17

ASU Student U-Pass Price

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>U-Pass Price</th>
<th>Rate Per Boarding Paid by ASU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>$1.32</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>$1.41</td>
<td>$1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>$1.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rate changed to $1.33 in April

ASU Shuttle Ridership – Maroon & Gold

Maroon (Tempe, Downtown PHX, West) and Gold (Tempe, Polytechnic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASU Shuttle Ridership

Maroon - Tempe, Downtown PHX, West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gold - Tempe, Polytechnic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASU Online Enrollment

• ASU currently serves
  – Over 80,000 students
  – More than 20,000 of which are online students
Next Steps Discussion

How to improve ASU ridership on the Valley Metro system

• Conduct a focused survey of ASU students
• Increase focused marketing
• Enhance security perceptions
• Work with ASU to address student fares
• Improve route connectivity, revisit campus circulation
• Invite ASU as Management Committee ex-officio participant
• Collaborate with ASU staff and faculty on further analysis

Discussion

Contact
Carol Ketcherside, Deputy Director
Service Planning & Accessible Transit
cketcherside@valleymetro.org
DATE
May 24, 2017

SUBJECT
Travel, Expenditures and Solicitations

PURPOSE
The monthly travel, expenditures and solicitations are presented for information.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
None

COST AND BUDGET
None

COMMITTEE PROCESS
None

RECOMMENDATION
This item is presented for information only.

CONTACT
Paul Hodgins
Chief Financial Officer
602-262-7433
phodgins@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENTS
Valley Metro Travel Reimbursement Report
Valley Metro RPTA and Valley Metro Rail Monthly Accounts Payable over $25,000
Active Requests for Proposals, Qualifications and Invitations for Bids
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Purpose of Travel</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates Traveled</th>
<th>Total Travel Cost</th>
<th>Airfare</th>
<th>Other Transport</th>
<th>Lodging</th>
<th>Meals</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>TFLE Ex Workshop</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>4/23/17-4/25/14</td>
<td>$798.42</td>
<td>$218.40</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$408.52</td>
<td>$138.50</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner I</td>
<td>NTI Planning Course</td>
<td>Tucson, AZ</td>
<td>4/19/17-4/21/17</td>
<td>$320.06</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$172.56</td>
<td>$147.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Project Compliance Coordinator</td>
<td>TSI-Transit Rail Incident Investigation Course</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>4/16/17-4/21/17</td>
<td>$1,509.50</td>
<td>$353.88</td>
<td>$32.55</td>
<td>$793.90</td>
<td>$324.50</td>
<td>$4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Accessible Transit Services</td>
<td>APTA Bus &amp; Paratransit Conference</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>5/6/17-5/10/17</td>
<td>$1,160.32</td>
<td>$292.40</td>
<td>$10.43</td>
<td>$542.49</td>
<td>$260.00</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Operations Program Representative</td>
<td>NTD Training</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>4/17/17-4/19/17</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet and Facility Coordinator</td>
<td>Pilot Bus Inspection</td>
<td>St. Cloud, MN</td>
<td>5/8/17-5/10/17</td>
<td>$652.00</td>
<td>$319.96</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$204.54</td>
<td>$127.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services Delivery Manager</td>
<td>Pilot Bus Inspection</td>
<td>St. Cloud, MN</td>
<td>5/8/17-5/10/17</td>
<td>$652.00</td>
<td>$319.96</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$204.54</td>
<td>$127.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Capital &amp; Service Development</td>
<td>APTA Bus &amp; Paratransit Conference</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>5/6/17-5/10/17</td>
<td>$960.00</td>
<td>$258.40</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$361.60</td>
<td>$288.00</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Financial Reporting</td>
<td>111th GFOA Annual Conference</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>5/18/17-5/24/17</td>
<td>$1,767.73</td>
<td>$157.67</td>
<td>$34.00</td>
<td>$1,225.56</td>
<td>$350.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>APTA Bus &amp; Paratransit Conference</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>5/7/17-5/10/17</td>
<td>$808.52</td>
<td>$268.40</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$372.12</td>
<td>$168.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report reflects Out of State (AZ) Travel

1. Airport Parking
2. Baggage
3. Tips
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Transaction Description</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Transaction Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20170428W001</td>
<td>FirstGroup America, Inc.</td>
<td>March 2017 Express, Circulator, Local, Link &amp; Flash Routes</td>
<td>4/28/2017</td>
<td>5,237,869.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170512W</td>
<td>City of Phoenix</td>
<td>May 2017 Fixed Route Bus Service</td>
<td>5/12/2017</td>
<td>2,197,669.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36736</td>
<td>City of Tempe</td>
<td>E Valley Bus Operations &amp; Maintenance Costs</td>
<td>5/11/2017</td>
<td>1,254,453.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36779</td>
<td>Extreme Integration, LLC</td>
<td>Smart Net for Cisco Equipment 3 year Co-terminus</td>
<td>5/17/2017</td>
<td>507,425.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170512W004</td>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>PPE 5-7-17 Wages Payable - Reverse Wire</td>
<td>5/12/2017</td>
<td>449,596.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170512W005</td>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>PPE 4-23-17 ADP Wages Payable</td>
<td>4/28/2017</td>
<td>445,908.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170512W003</td>
<td>United Healthcare</td>
<td>May 2017 Dental, Medical and Vision Premiums</td>
<td>5/12/2017</td>
<td>315,520.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170421W003</td>
<td>Total Transit Enterprises, LLC</td>
<td>March 2017 West Valley Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>4/21/2017</td>
<td>275,074.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170428W005</td>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>PPE 4-23-17 ADP Payroll Taxes-ACH</td>
<td>4/28/2017</td>
<td>194,353.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170512W004</td>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>PPE 5-7-17 Federal, State, SS/Med EE/ER Tax - ACH</td>
<td>5/12/2017</td>
<td>191,807.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36794</td>
<td>Trend Offset Printing Services</td>
<td>April 2017 Transit Book Printing</td>
<td>5/17/2017</td>
<td>120,171.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170512W005</td>
<td>ASRS</td>
<td>PPE 5-7-17 ASRS Contributions Employee</td>
<td>5/12/2017</td>
<td>81,421.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170512W005</td>
<td>ASRS</td>
<td>PPE 5-7-17 ASRS Contributions Employer</td>
<td>5/12/2017</td>
<td>81,421.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170428W006</td>
<td>ASRS</td>
<td>PPE 4-23-17 ASRS Contributions Employer</td>
<td>4/28/2017</td>
<td>80,414.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170428W006</td>
<td>ASRS</td>
<td>PPE 4-23-17 ASRS Contributions Employee</td>
<td>4/28/2017</td>
<td>80,414.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170430W002</td>
<td>City of Mesa</td>
<td>April 2017 Utilities</td>
<td>4/30/2017</td>
<td>58,634.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170421W001</td>
<td>Second Generation, Inc. dba Ajo Transportation</td>
<td>March 2017 Rural Connector Route</td>
<td>4/21/2017</td>
<td>55,111.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170519W006</td>
<td>Second Generation, Inc. dba Ajo Transportation</td>
<td>April 2017 Rural Connector Route</td>
<td>5/19/2017</td>
<td>49,880.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36721</td>
<td>vRide, Inc.</td>
<td>Jan 2017 Vanpool Services</td>
<td>5/3/2017</td>
<td>44,711.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36721</td>
<td>vRide, Inc.</td>
<td>Feb 2017 Vanpool Services</td>
<td>5/3/2017</td>
<td>44,541.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170428W</td>
<td>CopperPoint Mutual Insurance Company</td>
<td>May 2017 Rent for Call Center/Mobility Center</td>
<td>4/28/2017</td>
<td>44,026.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36737</td>
<td>Creative Bus Sales dba Arizona Bus Sales</td>
<td>48838 2017 Ford Transit Van Silver</td>
<td>5/11/2017</td>
<td>40,386.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36737</td>
<td>Creative Bus Sales dba Arizona Bus Sales</td>
<td>48843 2017 Ford Transit Van Silver</td>
<td>5/11/2017</td>
<td>40,386.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36737</td>
<td>Creative Bus Sales dba Arizona Bus Sales</td>
<td>48852 2017 Ford Transit Van Silver</td>
<td>5/11/2017</td>
<td>40,386.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36671</td>
<td>Creative Bus Sales dba Arizona Bus Sales</td>
<td>48836 2017 Ford Transit Van Silver</td>
<td>4/26/2017</td>
<td>40,106.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5152017</td>
<td>Wells Fargo</td>
<td>April 2017 Wells Fargo Credit Card Purchases</td>
<td>5/15/2017</td>
<td>32,831.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36711</td>
<td>Knowledge Services</td>
<td>March 2017 IT Services Consultant</td>
<td>5/3/2017</td>
<td>30,573.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $12,867,985.44
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Transaction Description</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Transaction Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20170512W005</td>
<td>Stacy and Witbeck-Sundt JV GRE</td>
<td>March 2017 Stacy and Witbeck Gilbert Rd Extension</td>
<td>5/12/2017</td>
<td>2,612,944.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170519W001</td>
<td>Alternate Concepts Inc.</td>
<td>March 2017 Transportation Services</td>
<td>5/19/2017</td>
<td>1,022,507.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170512W001</td>
<td>HDR/SR Beard &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Jan 2017 HDR Planning and Community Relations</td>
<td>5/12/2017</td>
<td>655,064.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028683</td>
<td>Qognify Inc.</td>
<td>Suspect Search Software-Qognify</td>
<td>5/17/2017</td>
<td>526,741.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170519W</td>
<td>Allied Universal Security Services</td>
<td>April 2017 Fare Inspection and Security Services</td>
<td>5/19/2017</td>
<td>399,465.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170505W002</td>
<td>City of Mesa</td>
<td>April 2017 Costs for Gilbert Road Extension</td>
<td>5/5/2017</td>
<td>384,545.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170505W</td>
<td>Allied Universal Security Services</td>
<td>March 2017 Fare Inspection and Security Services</td>
<td>5/5/2017</td>
<td>383,025.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170421W002</td>
<td>DMS - Facility Services, Inc.</td>
<td>March 2017 Facilities and LRV Cleaning Services</td>
<td>4/21/2017</td>
<td>171,905.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170512W003</td>
<td>PB-Wong Joint Venture</td>
<td>March 2017 TO 19 GRE Project Mngt Constr. Mngt</td>
<td>5/12/2017</td>
<td>163,203.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028672</td>
<td>Level 3 Audio Visual, LLC</td>
<td>32 Network PTZ Dome Cameras, 97 Network Box Cameras and</td>
<td>5/17/2017</td>
<td>125,384.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Varifocal Infrared Lens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170519W007</td>
<td>USBC Real Estate LLC</td>
<td>June 2017 Rent 101 Bldg</td>
<td>5/19/2017</td>
<td>121,126.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170421W005</td>
<td>USBC Real Estate LLC</td>
<td>May 2017 101 Bldg Rent</td>
<td>4/21/2017</td>
<td>121,126.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170512W004</td>
<td>Stacy and Witbeck 50th St/Tempe SC</td>
<td>April 2017 Tempe Streetcar Project</td>
<td>5/12/2017</td>
<td>120,227.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170430W</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>April 2017 Utilities</td>
<td>4/30/2017</td>
<td>104,725.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028565</td>
<td>Siemens Industry Inc.</td>
<td>SQL Server and Circuit Breakers</td>
<td>4/27/2017</td>
<td>80,319.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028672</td>
<td>Level 3 Audio Visual, LLC</td>
<td>112 Network Infrared Dome Cameras</td>
<td>5/17/2017</td>
<td>72,367.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170512W004</td>
<td>Stacy and Witbeck 50th St/Tempe SC</td>
<td>March 2017 50th St Station Preconstruction</td>
<td>5/12/2017</td>
<td>64,963.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170430W019</td>
<td>SRP</td>
<td>April 2017 Utilities</td>
<td>4/30/2017</td>
<td>59,285.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028596</td>
<td>ABB Enterprise Software, Inc.</td>
<td>6/24/17-6/23/18 Renewal for Ellipse Software at OMC</td>
<td>5/10/2017</td>
<td>56,086.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170512W003</td>
<td>PB-Wong Joint Venture</td>
<td>March 2017 TO 1C Prjct Mngt Const. Mngt</td>
<td>5/12/2017</td>
<td>55,796.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028561</td>
<td>Parsons Transportation Group Inc.</td>
<td>1/1/-3/31/17 Consulting Services for SCADA Upgrade</td>
<td>4/27/2017</td>
<td>54,503.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170421W002</td>
<td>DMS - Facility Services, Inc.</td>
<td>March 2017 Facilities Maintenance Services</td>
<td>4/21/2017</td>
<td>53,346.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028685</td>
<td>Riddle Painting &amp; Coatings Company</td>
<td>80% Complete on Paint and Coat 134 OCS Poles Downtown</td>
<td>5/17/2017</td>
<td>35,393.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028682</td>
<td>Penn Machine Company, LLC</td>
<td>Tire Kit</td>
<td>5/17/2017</td>
<td>34,312.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028582</td>
<td>City of Phoenix</td>
<td>April 2017 Fare Handling Fee</td>
<td>5/3/2017</td>
<td>33,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170519W003</td>
<td>Gannett Fleming, Inc.</td>
<td>March 2017 50th St. Design Services</td>
<td>5/19/2017</td>
<td>32,047.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028572</td>
<td>United Right-of-Way</td>
<td>March 2017 Facilities Landskeeping Services</td>
<td>4/27/2017</td>
<td>32,042.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170428W001</td>
<td>URS Corp</td>
<td>Sept 2016 Capitol I-10 Planning and Conceptual Engineering</td>
<td>4/28/2017</td>
<td>31,319.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5152017</td>
<td>Wells Fargo Bank</td>
<td>April 2017 Wells Fargo Credit Card Purchases</td>
<td>5/15/2017</td>
<td>27,919.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8,542,253.78
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solicitation Type</th>
<th>Solicitation Title</th>
<th>Release Date</th>
<th>Proposal Due Date</th>
<th>Targeted Board Award Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Heavy Duty Transit Buses</td>
<td>7/21/2016</td>
<td>1/19/2017</td>
<td>6/22/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFQ/RFP</td>
<td>South Central LRT Extension - CM@Risk</td>
<td>2/9/2017</td>
<td>5/2/2017</td>
<td>8/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFQ/RFP</td>
<td>Northwest Extension CM@R</td>
<td>3/22/2017</td>
<td>4/27/2017</td>
<td>8/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFQ</td>
<td>Northwest Extension Design</td>
<td>4/25/2017</td>
<td>6/7/2017</td>
<td>8/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFQ</td>
<td>System Design Services</td>
<td>5/12/2017</td>
<td>6/14/2017</td>
<td>8/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFQ</td>
<td>JOC/Construction Contract</td>
<td>5/12/2017</td>
<td>6/21/2017</td>
<td>8/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFB</td>
<td>Center Truck Overhaul Parts</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>9/21/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFB</td>
<td>Motor Truck Overhaul Parts</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>9/21/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Transit Book Storage &amp; Distribution</td>
<td>9/14/2017</td>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>12/21/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>OMC Expansion - Design/Build</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>5/1/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Agency Owned Vehicle Fleet Maintenance</td>
<td>5/30/2017</td>
<td>6/22/2017</td>
<td>9/21/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFB</td>
<td>Mobile Sand Filling Machine</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>CARE Evaluation</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>8/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Ride Choice</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>8/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Government Relations Consulting Services</td>
<td>8/24/2017</td>
<td>9/22/2017</td>
<td>11/16/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE
May 24, 2017

AGENDA ITEM 9

SUBJECT
Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events

PURPOSE
Chairs Zuercher and Methvin will request future agenda items from members, and members may provide a report on current events.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
None

COST AND BUDGET
None

COMMITTEE PROCESS
None

RECOMMENDATION
This item is presented for information only.

CONTACT
Scott Smith
Chief Executive Officer
602-262-7433
ssmith@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
Pending Items Request
Pending Items Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Requested</th>
<th>Date Requested</th>
<th>Planned Follow-up Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transit Management Committee
Wednesday, June 7, 2017
Lake Powell Conference Room
101 N. 1st Avenue, 10th Floor
11:00 a.m.

May 31, 2017

1. Public Comment on Agenda Action Items (blue card)

The public will be provided with an opportunity at this time to address the TMC on all action agenda items. Up to three minutes will be provided per speaker to address all agenda items unless the Chair allows more at his/her discretion. A total of 15 minutes for all speakers will be provided.

2. Minutes

Minutes from the May 3, 2017 TMC meeting are presented for approval.

CONSENT AGENDA

3A. Fiscal Year 2018 (FY18) Intergovernmental Agreements (IGA)

Staff recommends that the TMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute FY18 IGAs and IGA amendments for projects tied to the approved Valley Metro RPTA FY18 Operating and Capital Budget as listed in the attachment for the period of performance and in the amount indicated for each agreement.

3B. Major Amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Staff recommends that the TMC forward to the Board of Directors approval of Resolution 2017-01 regarding the major amendment to the RTP to add the:

- Interstate 11 (I-11) corridor from Interstate 10 to US-93 in the West Valley; and
- Arizona State Route 30 (SR-30) corridor as a freeway facility from SR-85 to Loop 303 and from Loop 202/South Mountain to I-17
3C. Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with the City of Phoenix for Federal Transit Administration Pass-Through Grants

Staff recommends that the TMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute an IGA with the City of Phoenix to allow Valley Metro to be reimbursed for eligible activities.

3D. Total Transit Enterprises Regional Paratransit (Dial-a-Ride) Services Contract Change Order

Staff requests that the TMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute a change order with Total Transit Enterprises for Contract 1040014-S in the amount of $961,400 to cover the increased cost for Regional Paratransit (Dial-a-Ride) services.

3E. Manufacture and Delivery of Heavy Duty Transit Buses Contract Award

Staff requests that the TMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute contracts with El Dorado National Inc. and New Flyer of America Inc. for the manufacture and delivery of heavy duty transit buses over a five-year period for an amount not to exceed $169,751,370 (base bus, optional components, tools) plus an additional $8,500,000 (5%) contingency for Producer Price Index (PPI) increases and other unanticipated expenses.

REGULAR AGENDA

4. Recommended October 2017 Transit Service Changes

Staff recommends that the TMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to amend member agency FY18 Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs) as necessary, and to execute a change order to the First Transit and Total Transit fixed route contracts in the amount of $4,402,000 for First Transit and $1,363,000 for Total Transit to accommodate the recommended October 2017 service changes through the existing contract term of June 30, 2019.
5. Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events

Chair Zuercher will request future agenda items from members, and members may provide a report on current events.

6. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for **Wednesday, August 2, 2017 at 11:00 a.m.**

Qualified sign language interpreters are available with 72 hours notice. Materials in alternative formats (large print, audiocassette, or computer diskette) are available upon request. For further information, please call Valley Metro at 602-262-7433 or TTY at 602-251-2039. To attend this meeting via teleconference, contact the receptionist at 602-262-7433 for the dial-in-information. The supporting information for this agenda can be found on our web site at [www.valleymetro.org](http://www.valleymetro.org)
DATE
May 24, 2017

AGENDA ITEM 1

SUBJECT
Public Comment on Agenda Action Items

PURPOSE
The public will be provided with an opportunity at this time to address the TMC on all action agenda items. Up to three minutes will be provided per speaker to address all agenda items unless the Chair allows more at his/her discretion. A total of 15 minutes for all speakers will be provided.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
None

COST AND BUDGET
None

COMMITTEE PROCESS
None

RECOMMENDATION
This item is presented for information only.

CONTACT
Scott Smith
Chief Executive Officer
602-262-7433
ssmith@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
None
Summary Minutes
Valley Metro RPTA Transit Management Committee
Wednesday, May 3, 2017
Lake Powell Conference Room
101 N. 1st Avenue, 10th Floor
Phoenix, AZ
11:00 a.m.

Members Present
Ed Zuercher, City of Phoenix, Chair
Gina Montes, City of Avondale
Roger Klingler, City of Buckeye
Ryan Peters for Marsha Reed, City of Chandler
James Shano, City of El Mirage
Kristen Myers for Marc Skocypec, Town of Gilbert (phone)
Kevin Link for Kevin Phelps, City of Glendale
Rob Bohr for Brian Dalke, City of Goodyear
Chris Brady, City of Mesa
Stuart Ken for Jeff Tyne, City of Peoria
Mike Nevarez for Steven Methvin, City of Tempe
Martin Soto for Nicole Lance, City of Surprise
Sara Allred, ADOT

Members Not Present
Reed Kempton, Maricopa County
Paul Basha, City of Scottsdale
City of Tolleson

Chair Zuercher called the meeting to order at 11:13 a.m.

1. Public Comment on Agenda Action Items

Mr. Crowley said the Farebox Software Maintenance and Support Contract Award. We're getting that finally, the adjustment on the surcharge, at the end of this month, and part of the reason is that this company put us in the back of the line of getting things done on that, because in February the electeds said that surcharge is gone.

Now I also looked at some of the other stuff when they came up and you guys increased their contract and such because of this two years we're going to be changing stuff. And at that time in the minutes I noted that it was said by staff that the reason that we like these people so much, but we're working with them is because they don't treat us as second class when it comes to us, and Pittsburgh having so much more than us, they treat us the same in that.
Well, it turns out when push came to shove and it needed to get done and was done, we were put at the back of the line, as in it doesn't take from February to at the time you said July, and then we got one month taken off. It doesn't take that time to adjust the system and getting it working and going right.

On the Vehicle Maintenance and Hardware Support Service Contract, what can I say. But then when it comes to the Transit Life Cycle Program, as I pointed out last month in the joint meeting, there's a roadway that in '06 you guys put on the document saying this is going to be there. And that it would have extended past 67th Avenue the north/south and also the connectivity because the Bell Road, the Thunderbird, the Greenway, the Camelback, the Indian School, the Thomas, the McDowell all then had to go to that roadway which is Litchfield. I don't see that in the short range plan.

Avondale, is there a reason you don't need it there? Litchfield, is there a reason you don't need it there? Peoria, Glendale, is there a reason you don't need it there? Phoenix, is there a reason you don't need it there, because it's not in the short range as it was expected to be.

And as to the grand agreement that Mr. Smith talked about as a reason why things are the way they are, that was done by population, and I believe that needs to be looked at it again, because the population of the east and west side is more balanced and the west side needs to get more of its share. Thank you.

2. Minutes

The minutes from the April 5, 2017 TMC meeting were presented for approval.

IT WAS MOVED BY CHRIS BRADY, SECONDED BY STUART KENT AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE APRIL 5, 2017 TMC MEETING MINUTES.

3. Consent Agenda

The following items were presented on the consent agenda:

A. Farebox Software Maintenance and Support Contract
B. Vehicle Management System (VMS) Hardware Support Services Contract Award
C. 2017 Transit Life Cycle Program – Bus Update

IT WAS MOVED BY STUART KENT, SECONDED BY KEVIN PHELPS AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA.

4. Valley Metro Fiscal Year 2018 (FY18) Preliminary Operating and Capital Budget and Five-Year Operating Forecast and Capital Program (FY18 thru FY22)

Mr. Smith said last month you received an overview from Paul Hodgins, our CFO.
We’ve had many discussions and meetings with your staff on some of those items. And Paul's here to give an update and to present for your recommendation the final budget. Paul.

Mr. Hodgins said thank you, Mr. Smith. Mr. Chair, members of the TMC, there are very few changes in the overall numbers in the budget. Based on the discussion at the last management committee I did provide -- I do have some additional detail and some slides that I’d like to touch on.

So, really, this budget is based on growth. There's growth in the services over the next five years. There's an increase in the number of capital projects. And we really want to address that with additional personnel. And I want to highlight that RPTA is really the employer for both agencies.

So we look at the effort of the staff, whether they're working on RPTA projects or VMR projects, so even though much of the growth we’re talking about is on the Valley Metro Rail side it does impact the RPTA budget. And we track that work effort for staff between the two agencies.

So overall, we have about a $311 million in revenue, much the same mix as I discussed. This is one of the slides I wanted to highlight in looking at -- rather than looking at the overall capital and operating together, I'm breaking out the operating and the capital. I'm further breaking out, really, the RPTA activities versus what I'm calling pass-through activities, so these would be the personnel or any revenues to offset personnel costs, and the Arizona Lottery fund.

So for the RPTA operating revenues we’re looking at an increase from about $143 million to $152 million, so it's about a 6 and 1/2 percent increase in the RPTA revenues. The Metro reimbursements, those are, as I mentioned, reimbursements from Valley Metro Rail to offset personnel costs. There's about a 24 percent increase in those. And then the lottery funds are about the same. So overall, $185 million in operating revenues roughly.

Capital revenues, I separated it the same way, so the RPTA capital we're looking at an increase of about $18 million for RPTA capital projects. Most of those revenues are from the public transportation funds, Prop 400, and federal grants.

And then we also have Prop 400 revenues that are dedicated to the rail program that's about 43 percent of the revenues that come in we allocate for VMR, so about $43 million in those. There are no additional bond proceeds or use of fund balance. So just about $127 million in capital revenues.

Expenses, $311 million. Again, a little breakout in the operating expenses, when we look at the RPTA specific projects, operations are the three main areas: fixed route operations, paratransit, some vanpool operations, and some smaller expenses for planning, commute solutions which is our rideshare programs, administration and
finance, and then regional services which includes marketing, the call center, ADA certification office and the mobility center.

So it's about a 6 and 1/2 percent increase in the RPTA operating. And then those pass-through costs, again, about $21.4 million that we expend on behalf of Valley Metro Rail for personnel, about a half million in regional area road fund disbursements for planning support, and then the lottery funds. So about $185 million in operating expenditures.

Then again, on the capital expense is split out, regional fleet being the single largest. We have about a 28 percent increase in our capital expenses for RPTA projects, $33 million in lead agency disbursements to Valley Metro Rail, and about $10 million is being added to the fund balance for Valley Metro Rail for future projects. So $127 million in capital expenditures.

And I have a couple of slides that just highlight that growth. So as a proxy for the service, I'm using revenue miles for the four categories of services that we provide.

The top purple line is fixed route service. So we have some increases planned in 2018. And then ‘19 through ‘22 as part of the short range transit program, we also have some significant increases planned and then just kind of leveling off after that. So you can see some growth in the fixed route service operated. Vanpool has some continued steady growth, paratransit as well.

And then the light rail, the green line at the bottom, you can see some spikes as we open new extensions when those capital projects are completed. Overall between 2014 and 2026, it's about a 57 percent increase in the services that we're operating.

And then again with the LRT capital project schedule, this is on a calendar year basis, so if you look at the '17 and '18 columns, we have eight different projects that are at various levels of either project development, design or construction, so significant work going forward, which is reflected in that personnel item or line item for VMR.

So we do have some significant changes in staffing. We're looking at bringing consultants in-house to use as staff. We talked about this a little bit at the last meeting. There are twenty-two positions that we're looking at in lieu of consultant or contract. We looked at a minimum need of three years for these positions with an estimated savings of about $1.3 million.

And we've committed to hiring positions that are for capital projects that are project based as term positions for either the term of the project or a specific time. We also have some that are based on strategic initiatives, the strategic plan, the IT strategic plan, and then just some general growth in anticipation of the growth in services and projects that we discussed.
So overall, I think this is generally the same chart we looked at last time. We have positions totaling 360 for the FY18 budget. It's 35 new positions for FY18 split between RPTA and VMR, the bulk being for VMR.

And then for those new staff, we looked at kind of where the fully burdened costs are being charged. So for RPTA it's about $800,000 in total from these additional 35 positions. Most of that being covered with regional funds and a very small amount through operations and some of it through the member city contributions. Valley Metro Rail being the largest part of the increase in personnel of just over three million in fully burden costs. And planning and project development, specific projects, capital projects being the largest part and about $650,000 through rail operations and agency operating that are funded through member city contributions.

So that's really a high-level overview of the annual budget. There's not a big change in the five year. I can touch on some of the items, or if there are any questions about the annual budget, I'd be happy to answer those before touching on the five year.

Mr. Phelps said two questions, and I apologize. Help me to understand slide 2 talks about increasing capital projects and the increase in employees, FTEs, due to growth. And, yet, we've gone from a $340 million combined operating capital budget down to $311 million, so I'm missing something here.

It seems to contradict the first slide, which is in reality, we have a smaller capital budget and an overall total budget slightly less than in '17.

Mr. Hodgins said Mr. Chair, Mr. Phelps, the capital projects, the increases there are really on the Valley Metro Rail side. And this goes back to how the budgets are really intertwined. So even though RPTA's capital budget is decreasing, we expend the salary cost, I guess, the personnel cost on behalf of Valley Metro Rail. So when we get to the Rail Management Committee, you'll see that the rail, the VMR capital budget, is more than doubling. It will be over $200 million.

So a lot of the staff that we're hiring will concentrate their effort on the Valley Metro Rail capital projects and so then that is really reflected -- if I can go back for just a moment, right here -- in the Metro personnel cost. So we see they're increasing from $17 million to $21 million, so it's almost a 25 percent increase in what RPTA is expending for personnel on behalf of Valley Metro Rail.

Mr. Phelps said and then the second question is maybe more for Mr. Smith, just more from a philosophical perspective.

With the unknowns that we have currently with our federal situation, I get that the business case for converting consultants into full-time FTEs, and I think that's part of the business case that's been laid out here, but in light of the unknown as we're going forward, the one advantage to consultants is also the ability to make quicker changes without affecting staffing.
So maybe walk me through the thought about why we would choose now to add permanent FTEs, even though it was good justification from a business case, while we still have this unknown back in the federal situation.

Mr. Smith said thank you. Mr. Chair, Mr. Phelps, you bring up a good point. This is a fluid process. When we started this budget process many months ago, this was not an issue that we were anticipating because we anticipated that the federal grant program would continue as is and it made sense to plan for a five- or six-year period.

Obviously, that's changed, and our thought process has changed. Although we are anticipating, we're planning for things to continue, but we also are operating as if they're in a state of flux. So we have not moved forward and nor will we move forward with committing, even to some of these positions even on the consultant side, certainly not on the FTE’s side until we get a little bit more clarity.

So we'll work with your staff to make sure that before we move forward -- and the Tempe Streetcar, for example, is a very good example.

We were coming up against a very firm construction commencement, which under normal circumstances we would have just continued on and been at risk, assuming that the federal process would catch up with us. We didn't take that approach this time. We sat down with Tempe and said, listen, we don't know where we are in this funding, shall we go forward, shall we not go forward.

In working with Tempe staff, we changed our plan a little bit and modified the risk we were willing to take and the people we were willing to put involved. We'll do that overall. And it's a little tough to be sitting here throwing out a budget as if things are normal, but recognizing that we'll be operating in a very, very fluid environment.

And your staff will be involved in every step of the way as to when we make a move, what personnel we are putting on certain projects, and what activities we'll undertake.

So we may never fill these positions. And, as a matter of fact, there's several positions that we have that we're looking at right now and saying, you know, because of the uncertainty, we'll go a different route and next year when we come back you'll see these positions perhaps disappear.

Chair Zuercher said thank you. Any other comments, questions on the current year operating budget?

I think the unease you sense from us is based probably on all of our experiences which is, and you know this, but hiring people into government implies a different commitment than hiring people in the private sector, particularly as it relates to pension obligations.

And so I think that's sort of our unease of committing long-term to something when we're not sure what's going on, but we do have to move the business forward. And, I
guess, the other issue is, you know, we want to reserve as much money possible for the provision of service, and so it's always hard to know the right balance of back office and service provision, but again, that's where we trust that you and your staff are looking at that.

I think it would be useful as we think about next year's budget, which you brought up, to think about starting this conversation a little earlier so that we can have those more philosophical discussions maybe in November, December, January and not get twisted around when you got to have a budget put to bed, which we all understand that, too. So that would be my suggestion.

Mr. Smith said Mr. Zuercher, just so you know, because of the situation that Mr. Phelps brought up, we are having ongoing discussions with your staff. And your staff have been really good about challenging us, pressing us on how we're going to manage this on a daily basis.

And we have committed to them and will continue to commit to them, this will not be a periodic discussion. This will be an ongoing discussion. And before we move on any specific area that will impact this, we'll have a discussion with your staff before we move on that. That's a commitment we've made to them. And they've been very good about understanding which direction we're going and where our needs are.

So I think we'll start those discussions long before November. And when we arrive at that point, we'll ease into the discussion as opposed to just jump into it without setting it up. So we're grateful for that.

Chair Zuercher said thanks. And we also acknowledge that you haven't even had a full cycle of this yet, so we'll see your imprint more on next year's budget as you've had a full cycle.

Mr. Smith said and we get it. We, you know, this is sort of a shock to the system. We understand that. But we really arrived at a, as I mentioned, a perfect storm, where we have these increases, but we also have all these projects coming on. And then, frankly, you know, I have some organizational issues that I'm trying to take care of for the changes we need to make to make sure that we're moving toward the future as opposed to operating in the past, add to that the uncertainties in the financial situation of the federal level, we get it. This is a complicated issue and we're not -- we're certainly not overlooking that and we want to engage you as much as we can to make sure that we're on the same page with each step we take.

Chair Zuercher said yes. We're all partners in this. That's the approach we're coming at it from, so good, thank you. Anything else on this part five-year plan overview?

Mr. Hodgins said yes, thank you. We didn't change our assumptions. We went through this last time, so I won't linger on this slide.
One of the concerns is that the overall revenues there's an overall deficit in the five year and we've adjusted that, so we're showing revenues of just about $815 million over the five years with expenses of just under that, so it's balanced barely, but it's balanced. We're not showing a deficit, so it's about $270,000 surplus over the five years.

And no change to the five-year capital program assumptions. It's a $225 million program mainly federal and Prop 400 funded, and the expenditures, again primarily fleet, are $225 million.

So with that, Mr. Chair, we're looking for a recommendation from TMC to forward to the Board of Directors approval of the '18 budget and the five-year operating and capital program. Thank you.

IT WAS MOVED KEVIN PHELPS, SECONDED BY STUART KENT AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO FORWARD TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS APPROVAL OF THE '18 BUDGET AND THE FIVE-YEAR OPERATING AND CAPITAL PROGRAM.

5. Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events

None.

With no further discussion the meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.
DATE
May 31, 2017

SUBJECT
Fiscal Year 2018 (FY18) Intergovernmental Agreements (IGA)

PURPOSE
To authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute FY18 IGAs and IGA amendments for projects tied to the approved Valley Metro RPTA FY18 Operating and Capital Budget.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
There are a number of IGAs and IGA amendments that require Board approval prior to the start of FY18. This memo and its attachment summarize the FY18 RPTA required IGAs and renewals.

The IGAs are based on the latest estimates of costs and services funded by each member. IGA changes that are required as a result of service changes in October 2017 or April 2018 will be brought to the Board for approval after the final list of service changes is determined.

COST AND BUDGET
Please see the attached spreadsheet.

COMMITTEE ACTION
RTAG: May 16, 2017 for information
TMC: June 1, 2017 for action
Board of Directors: June 22, 2017 for action

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the TMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute FY18 IGAs and IGA amendments for projects tied to the approved Valley Metro RPTA FY18 Operating and Capital Budget as listed in the attachment for the period of performance and in the amount indicated for each agreement.

CONTACT
Michael Minnaugh
General Counsel
602-744-5599
mminnaugh@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
Attachment 1 - List of FY18 IGAs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense/Revenue</th>
<th>Member Agency/Jurisdiction Intergovernmental Agreement No.</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>FY 2017 Amount</th>
<th>* FY 2018 Amount</th>
<th>Change from FY 2017 to FY 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Avondale 106-75-2018</td>
<td>ADA Allocations</td>
<td>$207,727</td>
<td>$139,700</td>
<td>($68,027)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Avondale 106-75-2018</td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$735,414</td>
<td>$754,123</td>
<td>$18,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Avondale 106-75-2018</td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$9,873</td>
<td>$45,894</td>
<td>$36,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Avondale 106-75-2018</td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$594,157</td>
<td>$909,151</td>
<td>$314,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Buckeye 166-75-2018</td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$32,340</td>
<td>$35,010</td>
<td>$2,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Chandler 118-75-2018</td>
<td>ADA Allocations</td>
<td>$1,251,860</td>
<td>$1,665,000</td>
<td>$413,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Chandler 118-75-2018</td>
<td>East Valley DAR</td>
<td>$1,210,828</td>
<td>$1,146,790</td>
<td>($64,038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Chandler 118-75-2018</td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$4,487,535</td>
<td>$5,077,951</td>
<td>$590,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Chandler 118-75-2018</td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$199,172</td>
<td>$333,710</td>
<td>$134,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Chandler 118-75-2018</td>
<td>East Valley DAR</td>
<td>$353,602</td>
<td>$649,607</td>
<td>$296,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Chandler 118-75-2018</td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$375,689</td>
<td>$1,130,571</td>
<td>$754,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Chandler 118-75-2018</td>
<td>RideChoice</td>
<td>$73,979</td>
<td>$65,377</td>
<td>($8,602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of El Mirage 121-48-2018</td>
<td>ADA Allocations</td>
<td>$24,100</td>
<td>$25,500</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of El Mirage 121-48-2018</td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$24,800</td>
<td>$25,500</td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of El Mirage 121-48-2018</td>
<td>Northwest Valley DAR</td>
<td>$42,196</td>
<td>$149,794</td>
<td>$107,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of El Mirage 121-48-2018</td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$8,634</td>
<td>$24,462</td>
<td>$15,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Glendale 133-75-2018</td>
<td>ADA Allocations</td>
<td>$729,059</td>
<td>$1,070,005</td>
<td>$340,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Glendale 133-75-2018</td>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>$2,557,571</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($2,557,571)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Glendale 133-75-2018</td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$3,375,884</td>
<td>$3,508,624</td>
<td>$132,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense/Revenue</td>
<td>Member Agency/Jurisdiction Intergovernmental Agreement No.</td>
<td>Brief Description</td>
<td>FY 2017 Amount</td>
<td>* FY 2018 Amount</td>
<td>Change from FY 2017 to FY 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Glendale 133-75-2018</td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$213,000</td>
<td>$213,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Goodyear 136-75-2018</td>
<td>ADA Allocations</td>
<td>$19,067</td>
<td>$13,600</td>
<td>($5,467)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Goodyear 136-75-2018</td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$4,889</td>
<td>$7,327</td>
<td>$2,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Goodyear 136-75-2018</td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$144,857</td>
<td>$150,651</td>
<td>$5,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Goodyear 136-75-2018</td>
<td>ADA Allocations</td>
<td>$3,028,200</td>
<td>$3,620,851</td>
<td>$592,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Mesa 145-75-2018</td>
<td>East Valley DAR</td>
<td>$2,806,047</td>
<td>$2,760,295</td>
<td>($45,752)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Mesa 145-75-2018</td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$8,297,319</td>
<td>$9,218,513</td>
<td>$921,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Mesa 145-75-2018</td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$408,253</td>
<td>$560,556</td>
<td>$152,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Mesa 145-75-2018</td>
<td>East Valley DAR</td>
<td>$875,862</td>
<td>$1,112,202</td>
<td>$236,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Mesa 145-75-2018</td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$3,779,881</td>
<td>$4,326,448</td>
<td>$546,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Mesa 145-75-2018</td>
<td>RideChoice</td>
<td>$517,109</td>
<td>$677,301</td>
<td>$160,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Peoria 151-75-2018</td>
<td>ADA Allocations</td>
<td>$228,100</td>
<td>$234,300</td>
<td>$6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Peoria 151-75-2018</td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$244,017</td>
<td>$1,613,935</td>
<td>$1,369,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Peoria 151-75-2018</td>
<td>Northwest Valley DAR</td>
<td>$226,374</td>
<td>$108,223</td>
<td>($118,151)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Peoria 151-75-2018</td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$49,947</td>
<td>$223,918</td>
<td>$173,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>City of Phoenix 127858</td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services - RPTA Buys</td>
<td>$8,415,024</td>
<td>$8,693,733</td>
<td>$278,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Phoenix 127858</td>
<td>ADA Allocations</td>
<td>$17,448,559</td>
<td>$18,476,000</td>
<td>$1,027,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Phoenix 131568</td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$867,526</td>
<td>$1,346,369</td>
<td>$478,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Phoenix 131568</td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$489,341</td>
<td>$1,727,472</td>
<td>$1,238,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense/Revenue</td>
<td>Member Agency/Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Agreement No.</td>
<td>Brief Description</td>
<td>FY 2017 Amount</td>
<td>* FY 2018 Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Phoenix 131568</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services - Phx Buys</td>
<td>$4,444,109</td>
<td>$6,854,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Scottsdale 160-75-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADA Allocations</td>
<td>$364,317</td>
<td>$1,519,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Scottsdale 160-75-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>$809,346</td>
<td>$303,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Scottsdale 160-75-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>East Valley DAR</td>
<td>$879,759</td>
<td>$808,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Scottsdale 160-75-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$6,081,523</td>
<td>$7,238,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Scottsdale 160-75-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$235,524</td>
<td>$395,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Scottsdale 160-75-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>East Valley DAR</td>
<td>$72,409</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Scottsdale 160-75-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$265,296</td>
<td>$288,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Surprise 166-75-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADA Allocations</td>
<td>$48,300</td>
<td>$49,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Surprise 166-75-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$24,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Surprise 166-75-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Northwest Valley DAR</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$49,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Surprise 166-75-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$109,959</td>
<td>$110,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Surprise 166-75-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Northwest Valley DAR</td>
<td>$504,013</td>
<td>$411,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Surprise 166-75-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>RideChoice</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$419,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Surprise 166-75-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$39,684</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Tempe 169-31-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$3,983,669</td>
<td>$4,750,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Tempe 169-31-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$14,612,568</td>
<td>$17,024,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Tempe 169-75-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>East Valley DAR</td>
<td>$1,041,370</td>
<td>$736,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Tempe 169-75-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$12,120</td>
<td>$345,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense/Revenue</td>
<td>Member Agency/Jurisdiction Intergovernmental Agreement No.</td>
<td>Brief Description</td>
<td>FY 2017 Amount</td>
<td>*FY 2018 Amount</td>
<td>Change from FY 2017 to FY 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Tempe 169-75-2017</td>
<td>East Valley DAR</td>
<td>$35,774</td>
<td>$586,089</td>
<td>$550,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Tempe 169-75-2017</td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$102,509</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($102,509)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Tempe 169-75-2017</td>
<td>RideChoice</td>
<td>$103,315</td>
<td>$156,595</td>
<td>$53,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Tempe 169-53-2018</td>
<td>Reduced Fare</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Tempe 169-75-2018-EVBOM</td>
<td>EVBOM</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,460,489</td>
<td>$5,460,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Tolleson 172-75-2017</td>
<td>ADA Allocations</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$10,700</td>
<td>($12,300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Tolleson 172-75-2017</td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$200,616</td>
<td>$329,694</td>
<td>$129,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>City of Tolleson 172-75-2017</td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$12,120</td>
<td>$10,700</td>
<td>($1,420)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>City of Tolleson 172-75-2017</td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$322,409</td>
<td>$325,401</td>
<td>$2,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community 128-75-2017</td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$932,847</td>
<td>$1,018,323</td>
<td>$85,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) #1</td>
<td>Transit Planning Services</td>
<td>$224,720</td>
<td>$724,720</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) #2</td>
<td>Regional Rideshare/Telework</td>
<td>$594,000</td>
<td>$594,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>Maricopa County</td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$17,543</td>
<td>$135,800</td>
<td>$118,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Maricopa County 1</td>
<td>Northwest Valley DAR</td>
<td>$835,186</td>
<td>$2,303,346</td>
<td>$1,468,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Maricopa County 2</td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$231,028</td>
<td>$39,498</td>
<td>($191,530)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>Maricopa County 3</td>
<td>ADA Allocations</td>
<td>$132,200</td>
<td>$135,800</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Maricopa County 4</td>
<td>Trip Reduction Expansion</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Maricopa County 5</td>
<td>Trip Reduction</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>Salt River Pima Indian Community 162-75-2017</td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$58,453</td>
<td>$87,712</td>
<td>$29,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense/Revenue</td>
<td>Member Agency/Jurisdiction Intergovernmental Agreement No.</td>
<td>Brief Description</td>
<td>FY 2017 Amount</td>
<td>*FY 2018 Amount</td>
<td>Change from FY 2017 to FY 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>Town of Fountain Hills 124-75-2017</td>
<td>ADA Allocations</td>
<td>$38,400</td>
<td>$13,475</td>
<td>($24,925)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>Town of Fountain Hills 124-75-2017</td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$27,042</td>
<td>$28,905</td>
<td>$1,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>Town of Fountain Hills 124-75-2017</td>
<td>RideChoice</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$13,475</td>
<td>$13,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Town of Fountain Hills 124-75-2017</td>
<td>RideChoice</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,220</td>
<td>$2,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>Town of Gilbert 130-75-2017</td>
<td>East Valley DAR</td>
<td>$1,006,202</td>
<td>$1,070,037</td>
<td>$63,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>Town of Gilbert 130-75-2017</td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$3,220,506</td>
<td>$3,575,522</td>
<td>$355,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>Town of Gilbert 130-75-2017</td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$200,298</td>
<td>$172,663</td>
<td>($27,635)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Town of Gilbert 130-75-2017</td>
<td>East Valley DAR</td>
<td>$506,643</td>
<td>$614,169</td>
<td>$107,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Town of Gilbert 130-75-2017</td>
<td>RideChoice</td>
<td>$71,973</td>
<td>$82,083</td>
<td>$10,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>Town of Guadalupe 139-75-2017</td>
<td>ADA Allocations</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($5,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>Town of Guadalupe 139-75-2017</td>
<td>Fixed Route Transit Services</td>
<td>$172,036</td>
<td>$196,697</td>
<td>$24,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>Town of Youngtown 172-75-2017</td>
<td>Northwest Valley DAR</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($1,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF Reimbursement</td>
<td>Town of Youngtown 172-75-2017</td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$4,889</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>($3,289)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Town of Youngtown 172-75-2017</td>
<td>Northwest Valley DAR</td>
<td>$29,323</td>
<td>$43,901</td>
<td>$14,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Town of Youngtown 172-75-2017</td>
<td>Regional DAR</td>
<td>$10,681</td>
<td>$25,010</td>
<td>$14,329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE                  AGENDA ITEM 3B
May 24, 2017

SUBJECT
Major Amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

PURPOSE
To request approval of Resolution 2017-01 regarding major amendments to the RTP to add the:

- Interstate 11 (I-11) corridor from Interstate 10 to US-93 in the West Valley;
- Arizona State Route 30 (SR-30) corridor as a freeway facility from SR-85 to Loop 303 and from Loop 202/South Mountain to I-17

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
On April 26, 2017, the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) approved a proposed action to make major amendments to the Draft 2040 MAG RTP by adding the sections of I-11 and SR-30 as described above. When voters approved Proposition 400, a provision was added to state law (A.R.S. 28-6353.E.2) that requires the RPTA Board of Directors, by a majority vote of the members, to submit a written recommendation to the Transportation Policy Committee that the proposed amendment be approved, modified or disapproved. The State Transportation Board and the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors are also required to make a recommendation.

I-11 Background
The I-11 corridor dates back to 2008 with findings from the MAG I-10/Hassayampa Valley Framework Study identifying the Hassayampa Freeway corridor for inclusion in the RTP. The U.S. Congress designated I-11 initially in the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) in 2012. Congress subsequently extended I-11 in 2015 in the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act to run from Nogales, AZ through Phoenix and Las Vegas to Reno, NV to identify an emerging north-south corridor important to the Intermountain West.

Portions of the I-11 corridor are currently undergoing environmental analysis that will result in a 2,000 foot wide corridor. The next level of environmental analysis will identify a centerline, which will provide greater regional and private-sector planning associated with the freeway. A major amendment to the MAG RTP is needed to proceed to the next level of study.

SR-30 Background
SR-30 was initially identified in the November 2003 RTP to be built in two stages. Stage one was a full six-lane freeway between Loop 303 and Loop 202/South Mountain. Stage two was to be an interim roadway recommended between SR-85 and Loop 303. This concept was approved by voters as part of Proposition 400. Both stages were deferred in 2009 as a result of the economic downturn.
Environmental studies have continued on the SR-30 corridor since 2009. In March 2017, the segment from Loop 303 to Loop 202/South Mountain was returned to the MAG freeway program as part of a rebalancing process. Additionally, MAG’s framework studies identify the need for SR-30 to be completed as a freeway facility from SR-85 to the vicinity of the southwest corner of I-17 and a major amendment to the 2040 RTP is needed to begin environmental studies that identify a centerline to provide greater regional and private-sector planning in this portion of Maricopa County.

COST AND BUDGET
None

COMMITTEE ACTION
RTAG – May 16 for information
TMC – June 7, 2017 for action
RPTA Board of Directors – June 22, 2017 for action

RECOMMENDATION
Staff is recommends that the TMC forward to the Board of Directors approval of Resolution 2017-01 regarding the major amendment to the RTP to add the:

- Interstate 11 (I-11) corridor from Interstate 10 to US-93 in the West Valley;
  and
- Arizona State Route 30 (SR-30) corridor as a freeway facility from SR-85 to Loop 303 and from Loop 202/South Mountain to I-17

CONTACT
John Farry
Government Relations Officer
602-744-5550
jfarry@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
Resolution 2017-01
RESOLUTION 2017-01
A RESOLUTION OF THE
VALLEY METRO REGIONAL PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
REGARDING MAJOR AMENDMENTS TO THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
ADDING INTERSTATE 11 AND STATE ROUTE 30

WHEREAS, On April 26, 2017, the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) approved consultation on major amendments to the MAG 2040 Draft Regional Transportation Plan (2040 RTP) to add the:

- Interstate 11 corridor from Interstate 10 to US-93 in the West Valley; and
- Arizona State Route 30 (SR-30) corridor as a freeway facility from SR-85 to Loop 303 and from Loop 202/South Mountain to I-17; and

WHEREAS, The addition of these corridors into the 2040 RTP is contingent upon a finding of air quality conformity; and

WHEREAS, The U.S. Congress initially designated I-11 in 2012 through the MAP-21 Act and extended the corridor in the 2015 FAST Act to establish the corridor from Nogales, AZ through Phoenix and Las Vegas to Reno, NV to identify an emerging north-south corridor important to the Intermountain West; and

WHEREAS, A major amendment to the 2040 RTP is needed to perform a Tier II Environmental Impact Study that will identify a centerline for I-11 between I-10 and US-93 to provide greater regional and private-sector planning in this portion of Maricopa County; and

WHEREAS, SR-30 was initially identified the 2003 MAG RTP with construction in two stages as follows:

- Stage one was a full six-lane freeway between Loop 303 and Loop 202/South Mountain; and
- Stage two as an interim roadway recommended between SR-85 and Loop 303; and

WHEREAS, Recommendations from MAG’s Framework Studies identify the need for SR-30 to be completed as a freeway facility from SR-85 to the vicinity of the southwest corner of I-17 and a major amendment to the 2040 RTP is needed to begin environmental studies that identify a centerline to provide greater regional and private-sector planning in this portion of Maricopa County; and

WHEREAS, State law (A.R.S. 28-6353.E.2) requires the Board of Directors of the Regional Public Transportation Authority, by a majority vote of the members, to submit a written recommendation to the Transportation Policy Committee that the proposed amendment be approved, modified or disapproved by July 17, 2017; and
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Regional Public Transportation Authority’s Board of Directors recommends that the MAG Transportation Policy Committee approve the major amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan to add:

- Interstate 11 corridor from Interstate 10 to US-93 in the West Valley; and
- Arizona State Route 30 (SR-30) corridor as a freeway facility from SR-83 to Loop 303 and from Loop 202/South Mountain to I-17

Passed and Adopted by the Valley Metro Regional Public Transportation Authority Board of Directors this 22nd day of June, 2017.

Thelda Williams, Chairwoman
Board of Directors
Regional Public Transportation Authority
DATE
May 31, 2017

AGENDA ITEM 3C

SUBJECT
Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with the City of Phoenix for Federal Transit Administration Pass-Through Grants

PURPOSE
To request authorization for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute an IGA with the City of Phoenix to allow Valley Metro to be reimbursed for eligible activities.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
Valley Metro is being provided federal funds through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) from two grant sources. The table below summarizes the funding available:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Federal Share</th>
<th>Local Share</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZ-04-0004</td>
<td>5309 - Discretionary</td>
<td>$190,357</td>
<td>$47,589</td>
<td>$237,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-04-0005</td>
<td>5309 - Discretionary</td>
<td>$200,640</td>
<td>$50,160</td>
<td>$250,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$390,997</td>
<td>$97,749</td>
<td>$488,746</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Funds are from Section 5309, Discretionary, and were earmarked for dial-a-ride facility development for the City of Phoenix.

The City of Phoenix is the designated recipient for all FTA grant funds for the region. Valley Metro undertakes projects approved for FTA grant funding, then submits requests to Phoenix for reimbursement of actual expenses incurred. Phoenix then executes a drawdown of funds from FTA to pass-through the reimbursement to Valley Metro.

The pass-through IGAs are required in order for Phoenix to reimburse Valley Metro for eligible expenses.

COST AND BUDGET
All expenses are in the approved FY 2018 Adopted Operating and Capital Budget and 5-Year Capital Program. The grant funds will offset expenses, reducing the net cost to the Public Transportation Fund and member agency budgets.

STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT
This item relates to the following goals and strategies in the Five-Year Strategic Plan, FY 2016 – 2020:
- Goal 2: Advance Performance Based Operation
  - Tactic C: Deliver projects and services on-time/on-budget
COMMITTEE PROCESS
RTAG: May 16, 2017 for information
TMC: June 7, 2017 for action
Board of Directors: June 22, 2017 for action

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the TMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute the IGAs and change order with the City of Phoenix for the listed grants.

CONTACT
Paul Hodgins
Chief Financial Officer
602-523-6043
phodgins@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
None
DATE
May 31, 2017

AGENDA ITEM 3D

SUBJECT
Total Transit Enterprises Regional Paratransit (Dial-a-Ride) Services Contract Change Order

PURPOSE
To request authorization for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute a contract change order with Total Transit Enterprises for Contract 1040014-S in the amount of $961,400 to provide additional contract authority to cover the increased cost for Regional Paratransit (Dial-a-Ride) services.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
Valley Metro has two contracts with Total Transit Enterprises for the operation of Dial-a-Ride services. Contract 1240003-S is for operation of Dial-a-Ride services in the East Valley, and Contract 1040014-S is for operation of Regional Paratransit (Dial-a-Ride) services operated in the Northwest Valley and for trips to and from the Valley Metro Mobility Center in Phoenix.

In February, 2017, the Board authorized a change order for Contract 1040014-S in the amount of $4,681,585 to cover increasing demand and cost for Northwest Valley Dial-a-Ride and Regional Paratransit services. With this change order, the total value of Contract 1040014-S was increased to $18,271,805. After payment of the contractor’s invoice for February, available authorized funding for this contract stood at $3,012,217. However, demand for Regional Paratransit has continued to increase, and based on analysis of trip and cost data, staff projects that by the end of June (when the Total Transit Enterprises contract expires), the combined cost of Northwest Valley, Regional and Mobility Center trips will exceed authorized funding by $874,000.

COST AND BUDGET
This request is for additional contract authority only. There is no overall budget impact in FY17. Given the increase in trip demand, staff is requesting additional contract authority in the amount of $961,400, which includes the forecasted cost increase of $874,000 and a 10 percent contingency of $87,400. Since many trips now taken on Regional Paratransit were previously made on local Dial-a-Ride services, these programs have experienced demand that in many cases is lower than budgeted. Because the budget savings are occurring under contracts other than Total Transit Enterprises Contract 1040014-S, additional contract authority for this contract is needed. The additional increase in regional services costs are anticipated to be offset by projected savings for local Dial-a-Ride services across the region as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>FY17 Budget (000)</th>
<th>FY17 Projected Cost (000)</th>
<th>Difference (000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Valley</td>
<td>$8,601</td>
<td>$7,590</td>
<td>$1,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>$2,269</td>
<td>$2,269</td>
<td>$0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Valley</td>
<td>$2,697</td>
<td>$2,635</td>
<td>$62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria</td>
<td>$911</td>
<td>$911</td>
<td>$0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix/SW Valley</td>
<td>$15,499</td>
<td>$15,143</td>
<td>$356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$29,977</td>
<td>$28,548</td>
<td>$1,429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: In addition to ADA service, both Glendale and Peoria operate non-ADA service, and in both cities, the amount of non-ADA service has risen to supplant ADA trips which have shifted to the regional paratransit service.

Staff will use the year-end reconciliation process to work with each member agency to reallocate budget authority from local Dial-a-Ride and other transportation programs where funds may be underspent. Reallocation of budget between programs will help ensure that all programs are funded within the current FY 17 budget.

**STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT**
This item relates to the following goals and strategies in the Five-Year Strategic Plan, FY 2016 – 2020:

- Goal 1: Increase Customer Focus
  - Tactic A: Improve Customer Satisfaction
  - Tactic E: Enhance services and facilities for seniors and people with disabilities.
- Goal 2: Advance performance based operation
  - Tactic A: Operate an effective, reliable, high performing transit system

**COMMITTEE PROCESS**
RTAG: May 18, 2017 for information
TMC: June 7, 2017 for action
Board of Directors: June 22, 2017 for action

**RECOMMENDATION**
Staff recommends that the TMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute a change order with Total Transit Enterprises for Contract 1040014-S in the amount of $961,400 to provide additional contract authority to cover the increased cost for Regional Paratransit (Dial-a-Ride) services.

**CONTACT**
Wulf Grote
Director of Capital and Service Development
602.322.4420
wgrote@valleymetro.org

**ATTACHMENT**
None
DATE
May 31, 2017

AGENDA ITEM 3E

SUBJECT
Manufacture and Delivery of Heavy Duty Transit Buses Contract Award

PURPOSE
To request authorization for the CEO to execute contracts with El Dorado National Inc. and New Flyer of America Inc. for the manufacture and delivery of heavy duty transit buses over a five-year period for an amount not to exceed $169,751,370 (base bus, optional components, tools) plus an additional $8,500,000 (5%) contingency for Producer Price Index (PPI) increases and other unanticipated expenses.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
In November 2015, the Board of Directors authorized the CEO to issue a federally compliant Request for Proposals (RFP) for the purchase of heavy duty transit buses. The City of Phoenix and Valley Metro combined their bus requirements for the purchase of 30’, 40’, 60’ and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)’ buses and spare parts under a five-year contract for the Greater Phoenix region. The joint regional RFP was issued September 2016.

The joint regional procurement affords both transit agencies a strategic five-year regional acquisition and provides for multiple contract awards for each agency to negotiate and execute their own contracts with the selected bus manufacturers. The buses will be powered with either ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) or compressed natural gas (CNG).

Due to the unique nature of the equipment specifications, Valley Metro elected to utilize the “Best Value” selection process pursuant to Federal Transit Administration (FTA) procurement guidelines, and notified all proposers of such in the RFP.

The Best Value process was conducted as follows:
- Technical Review, scoring and ranking including best and final offers
- Best Value Trade Off Analysis (determine cost and risks associated with each of the proposals)
- Price fair and reasonableness determination including price analysis with the independent cost estimate.

The RFP included the following technical and price evaluation criteria:
- Product support (200 points),
- Schedule and schedule credibility (200 points),
- Technical specifications (200 points),
- Price Offer (400 points).
In January, 2017, four proposals were received from the following bus manufacturers: El Dorado National Inc., Gillig LLC, New Flyer of America Inc., and Nova Bus.

An evaluation committee consisting of Valley Metro, City of Phoenix Public Transit Department and the City of Tempe Transportation Division and qualified technical staff from these respective agencies was appointed to conduct evaluations of the proposals, establish a competitive range, and select the proposer(s) to receive the contract award. The committee developed questions and requests for clarifications specific to each firm’s proposal and to assumptions made in each firm’s pricing structure. Based on these responses, the evaluation committee determined that three proposers were within the competitive range. Each remaining firm was allowed an opportunity to submit best and final offers (BAFO) before completing the evaluation and reaching a final award recommendation.

The BAFO Phase allowed the firms to clarify the selection committees’ technical concerns, and submit revised proposals, including a final pricing of the vehicles. Upon receipt of the BAFO submittals, the committees collectively concluded their technical scoring and ranking and proceeded to the Best Value Trade-off Analysis. The selection committee’s technical scoring and ranking for the 30ft and 40ft buses placed two manufacturers in almost a statistical tie.

The Best Value Trade-off Analysis considered both the technical/commercial factors and the quoted manufacturer’s price to determine the offer that offers the greatest value to the project. The trade-off analysis identified the strengths, weakness, and risks associated with each proposal.

Once the trade-off analysis was completed, the selection committee conducted its price reasonableness review of the price proposals. FTA’s Best Practices states, “Prices should be evaluated and brought alongside the technical proposal scores in order to make the necessary trade-off decisions as to which proposal represents the best overall value to the agency.” The selection committee compared each of the proposers prices to the independent cost estimate and based on their analysis determined that price from El Dorado and New Flyer were fair and reasonable and the best value to both agencies. The Selection Committee recommended that the bus program award contracts to El Dorado National for the 30’ bus, and New Flyer of America, Inc. for the 40’ and 60’ buses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30’ Bus</th>
<th>40’ Bus</th>
<th>60’ Bus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposers by Points and Rank Order</strong></td>
<td><strong>Technical Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Price Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado National</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillig</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Flyer</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillig</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado National</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Flyer*</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only Proposer
Below are the quantities of buses by year required during the 5-year contract term. This chart is based on the current schedule and may change based on future requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus Type</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30' CNG</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40' CNG</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40' Diesel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60' CNG</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus Type</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30' CNG</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30' Diesel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40' CNG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40' Diesel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60' CNG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COST AND BUDGET**

Based on planned quantities of each bus type to be purchased, the estimated five-year cost for Valley Metro is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mfg.</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Fuel Type</th>
<th>Qty.</th>
<th>Base Bus Cost + Optional Components</th>
<th>One Time Costs- Tools &amp; Equip.</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>CNG</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$530,280</td>
<td>$31,332</td>
<td>$20,712,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$477,380</td>
<td>$16,070,700</td>
<td>$7,160,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Flyer</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>CNG</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>$554,866</td>
<td>$155,138</td>
<td>$104,469,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Flyer</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$517,829</td>
<td>$15,017,041</td>
<td>$15,017,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Flyer</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>CNG</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$889,159</td>
<td>$162,456</td>
<td>$22,391,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$169,751,370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total value of the bus contracts for approval is for an amount not to exceed $169,751,370. The total contract costs includes both the base and optional quantities. In addition, a contract contingency of $8,500,000, (5 percent) is established for the Producer Price Index (PPI) increases and other unanticipated expenses. Any cost increases for each year of the contract, from the base prices quoted, will be determined
by increases in the Producer Price Index (PPI) and optional equipment including any on-board equipment required to place the vehicle into service.

All vehicles are programmed to be funded with 85% Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds and 15% Regional Proposition 400 funds. All costs in FY18 are included in the RPTA Adopted FY 2018 Operating and Capital Budget. Contract Obligations beyond FY 2018 are incorporated into the Adopted RPTA Five-Year Operating Forecast and Capital Program (FY2018 thru FY2022).

**STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT**
This item relates to the following goals and strategies in the Five-Year Strategic Plan, FY 2016 – 2020:

- Goal 2: Advance performance based operation
  - Tactic A: Operate an effective, reliable, high performing transit system

**COMMITTEE PROCESS**
RTAG: May 16, 2017 for information  
TMC: June 7, 2017 for action  
Board of Directors: June 22, 2017 for action

**RECOMMENDATION**
Staff recommends that the TMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute contracts with El Dorado National Inc. and New Flyer of America Inc. for the manufacture and delivery of heavy duty transit buses over a five-year period for an amount not to exceed $169,751,370 (base bus, optional components, tools) plus an additional $8,500,000 (5%) contingency for Producer Price Index (PPI) increases and other unanticipated expenses.

**CONTACT**
Ray Abraham  
Chief Operating Officer  
602-652-5054  
rabraham@valleymetro.org

**ATTACHMENT**
Presentation
Background

- In September 2016, City of Phoenix and Valley Metro issued a joint regional RFP.

- The City of Phoenix and Valley Metro combined resources for this joint procurement to award a five-year contract for the purchase of 30’, 40’, 60’ and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) buses, and spare parts.

- Procurement based on specific technical specifications and “Best Value” selection process
Selection Process

• An evaluation committee consisting of Valley Metro, City of Phoenix Public Transit Department and the City of Tempe Transportation Division and qualified technical staff from these respective agencies was appointed to conduct evaluations.

• The Best Value process was conducted as follows:
  ➢ Technical Review, scoring and ranking including best and final offers
  ➢ Best Value Trade Off Analysis (determine cost and risks associated with each of the proposals)
  ➢ Price fair and reasonableness determination including price analysis with the independent cost estimate.

Selection Process (cont.)

• RFP included the following evaluation criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product Support</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule and Schedule Credibility</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Specifications</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL POINTS AVAILABLE</strong></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• In January, 2017, four proposals were received from the following bus manufacturers:
Evaluation Scoring

• The committee developed questions and requests for clarifications specific to each firm’s proposal and to assumptions made in each firm’s pricing structure.

• Based on these responses, the evaluation committee determined that three proposers were within the competitive range.

• The selection committee reviewed, scored and ranked the BAFO utilizing the published evaluation criteria and “Best Value” Trade-Off methodology.

Evaluation Scoring (cont.)

• The Best Value Trade-off Analysis considered both the technical/commercial factors and the quoted manufacturer’s price to determine the offer that offers the greatest value to the project.

• The trade-off analysis identified the strengths, weakness, and risks associated with each proposal.

• Once the trade-off analysis was completed, the selection committee conducted its price reasonableness review of the price proposals.
The Selection Committee recommended that the bus program award contracts to El Dorado National for the 30’ bus, and New Flyer of America, Inc. for the 40’ and 60’ buses.

**Evaluation Scoring (cont.)**

| Proposers by Points and Rank Order
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>30’ Bus</strong></td>
<td>Technical Points</td>
<td>Price Points</td>
<td>Total Points</td>
<td>Rankings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado National</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillig</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40’ Bus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Flyer</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillig</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado National</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>60’ Bus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Flyer*</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Only Proposer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Five-Year Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mfg.</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Fuel Type</th>
<th>Qty.</th>
<th>Base Bus Cost + Optional Components</th>
<th>One Time Costs - Tools &amp; Equip.</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>CNG</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$530,280</td>
<td>$31,332</td>
<td>$20,712,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$477,380</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,160,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Flyer</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>CNG</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>$554,866</td>
<td>$155,138</td>
<td>$104,469,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Flyer</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$517,829</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,017,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Flyer</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>CNG</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$889,159</td>
<td>$162,456</td>
<td>$22,391,431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cost** $169,751,370

### Recommendation

Staff recommends that the TMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute contracts with El Dorado National Inc. and New Flyer of America Inc. for the manufacture and delivery of heavy duty transit buses over a five-year period for an amount not to exceed $169,751,370 (base bus, optional components, tools) plus an additional $8,500,000 (5%) contingency for Producer Price Index (PPI) increases and other unanticipated expenses.
DATE
May 31, 2017

SUBJECT
Recommended October 2017 Transit Service Changes

PURPOSE
To request authorization for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to amend member agency FY18 Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs) as necessary, and to execute a change order to the First Transit and Total Transit fixed route contracts in the amount of $4,402,000 for First Transit and $1,363,000 for Total Transit to accommodate the recommended October 2017 service changes through the existing contract term of June 30, 2019.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
Effective October 23, 2017 a few Valley Metro transit service changes are recommended throughout the region. Changes were coordinated and analyzed through the five-year Short Range Transit Program as well as the Board adopted Transit Standards and Performance Measures. In addition, the service changes were proposed and reviewed in coordination with the Valley Metro Service Planning Working Group, comprising representatives from Valley Metro member agencies. Valley Metro also worked with each affected member agency regarding the proposed changes and funding impacts. An extensive public outreach was conducted from April through May, via online comment, email, in-person information sessions, webinar, social media and a public hearing. The outreach covered all proposed service changes regardless of funding source; see Appendix A for all proposed regional service changes.

This summary includes bus service changes for Valley Metro-operated routes and routes funded through the regional Public Transportation Fund (PTF). Changes that would specifically affect other locally funded service from different operating agencies (e.g. Phoenix) are not addressed herein. The recommended changes include service enhancements and modifications.

Proposed Route and Schedule Changes:
The recommended service changes include new routes and route modifications. The following list outlines all Valley Metro operated or funded recommended service changes. Changes resulting in schedule adjustments are not included in the appendix. Valley Metro has prepared a Title VI Evaluation Report, which is available upon request.

- **Route 140 – Ray Rd.**: In Phoenix, Chandler and Gilbert, new route to serve Ray Road from 48th Street to Gilbert Road Monday-Saturday at 30-minute frequency.
- **Orbit Saturn Neighborhood Circulator**: In Tempe, new circulator to operate Monday to Sunday at 30-minute frequency.
• **ZOOM North Neighborhood Circulator**: In Avondale, new circulator to operate Monday to Saturday at 30-minute frequency.

• **Route 67 – 67th Ave.**: In Glendale, modify route to no longer travel into Arrowhead Mall but instead continue along 67th Avenue to Union Hills Drive.

• **Route 72 – Scottsdale/Rural**: In Scottsdale, improve Sunday service to 30-minute frequency.

• **Route 104 Alma School**: In Chandler, modify route to serve the area currently served by the Route 112 (Morelos St. and Hamilton St.) short trip end-of-line deviation while maintaining.

• **Route 112 – Country Club/Arizona Ave.**: Improve weekday frequency to 15 minutes from 9:00AM to 2:00PM from Main Street to Pecos Road. In Chandler, eliminate the Morelos St. and Hamilton St. end-of-line deviation, all trips will serve the Chandler Park-and-Ride.

• **Route 136 – Gilbert Rd.**: In Chandler, modify the end of line.

**Public Outreach**
As noted above, Valley Metro conducted extensive community outreach beginning in April through May to notify the public and solicit input on the recommended service changes. Transit users have submitted feedback through a variety of methods.

• **Input Opportunities**:
  - Public hearing conducted on May 15, 2017
  - Webinar conducted on May 9, 2017
  - In-person information sessions
  - Online comment card
  - Via email at input@valleymetro.org
  - Social media

• **Communication Channels**:
  - Six advertisements were placed in the *Arizona Republic* (2), *East Valley Tribune*, *La Prensa Hispana*, *La Voz* and *Arizona Informant*. They included information regarding the proposed route changes, public comment period and public hearing.
  - Transit vehicle announcements (Route Scout)
  - A-frame signage at key transit locations
  - Email notices to riders and Trip Reduction Program employers
  - Press release resulting in news coverage
  - Social media posts
  - Website (valleymetro.org/service changes)
  - Internal communication to staff and contractors

• **Results**
The outreach process yielded 859 total comments. There were 371 specific
comments on the proposed Valley Metro operated and/or funded service changes; 45% are in favor of the change, 8% not in favor and 47% are not sure.

COST AND BUDGET
The table in Appendix B provides a summary of the estimated annual costs or savings of the recommended service changes and adjustments necessary to Valley Metro’s operating contracts and member agency IGAs. The category of “Other Costs” includes primarily fuel and insurance. Costs for changes that do not impact Valley Metro-operated routes and routes not funded through PTF are also excluded from this table. Contract adjustments for minor bus service changes that do not require an amendment to the IGAs will be made through the year-end reconciliation process. First Transit and Total Transit operated recommended service changes are included in the RPTA Adopted FY18 Operating and Capital Budget and the Adopted RPTA Five-Year Operating Forecast and Capital Program (FY2018 thru FY2022).

Because of the significance of the changes for the operator, we have estimated the overall impact of the increases to the service contract through the term of the contract (October 2017 through June 2019) to ensure that we have sufficient contract authority to pay for the increases. The additional contract authority requested and estimated cost for First Transit will be $4,402,000 and for Total Transit will be $1,363,000 for necessary service changes between October 23, 2017 and June 30, 2019.

STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT
This item addresses three goals in the Board-adopted FY16-20 Strategic Plan:
- Goal 1: Increase customer focus
  - Tactic A: Improve customer satisfaction
- Goal 2: Advance performance based operations
  - Tactic A: Operate an effective, reliable, high-performing transit system
- Goal 3: Grow transit ridership
  - Tactic A: Expand and improve transit services to reach new markets
  - Tactic B: Improve connectivity of transit services for greater effectiveness

COMMITTEE PROCESS
RTAG: May 16, 2017 for information
TMC: June 7, 2017 for action
Board of Directors: June 22, 2017 for action

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the TMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to amend member agency FY18 Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs) as necessary, and to execute a change order to the First Transit and Total Transit fixed route contracts in the amount of $4,402,000 for First Transit and $1,363,000 for Total Transit to accommodate the recommended October 2017 service changes through the existing contract term of June 30, 2019.
CONTACT
Wulf Grote, P.E.
Director, Capital and Service Development
602-322-4420
wgrote@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
Appendix A – Proposed Regional Services Regardless of Funding Source
Appendix B – Estimated Annualized Costs or Savings of Service Changes
Appendix A – Proposed Regional Services Regardless of Funding Source

October 2017 Proposed Transit Service Changes
## Appendix B – Estimated Annualized Costs or Savings of Service Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Contractor (base cost)</th>
<th>Other Costs</th>
<th>Gross Costs</th>
<th>Credits*</th>
<th>Funding Agency (estimated net)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Transit (VM)</td>
<td>Total Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>$1,043,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$385,000</td>
<td>$1,428,000</td>
<td>($274,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbit Saturn</td>
<td>$1,012,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$347,000</td>
<td>$1,359,000</td>
<td>($129,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOOM North</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$781,000</td>
<td>$964,000</td>
<td>$964,000</td>
<td>($48,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$259,000</td>
<td>($62,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$77,000</td>
<td>($18,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>$298,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$408,000</td>
<td>($97,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>($44,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($14,000)</td>
<td>($58,000)</td>
<td>($14,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,554,000</td>
<td>$781,000</td>
<td>$1,883,000</td>
<td>$4,437,000</td>
<td>($614,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes federal preventive maintenance credits and fare recovery where applicable. Annual estimate based on FY19. Note: amounts are based on estimated contractor rates.
Proposed October 2017 Transit Service Changes

June 2017

Overview

• Changes to be implemented October 23, 2017
• Valley Metro funded and/or operated changes
• Coordinated through:
  – Service Planning Working Group
  – Short Range Transit Program
• June 2017 Board action for
  – Service contract changes
  – IGA amendments
Proposed Service Changes

- **New Routes**
  - Route 140 – Ray Road
  - Orbit Saturn Neighborhood Circulator – Tempe
  - ZOOM North Neighborhood Circulator – Avondale

- **Frequency Adjustment**
  - Route 72 – Scottsdale/Rural
  - Route 112 – Country Club/Arizona Ave

- **Route Modifications**
  - Route 67 – 67th Ave
  - Route 104 – Alma School
  - Route 112 – Country Club/Arizona Ave

- **End-of-line adjustments**
  - Route 136 – Gilbert Road

- **Schedule Adjustments**
New Route: Route 140 – Ray

New Route: Route Orbit – Saturn
New Route: Route ZOOM – North

Proposed Route

Frequency Improvement

- Route 72 – Scottsdale/Rural
  - In Scottsdale: Increase Sunday frequency to 30 minutes between Tempe Transportation Center and Honor Health Scottsdale Thompson Peak

- Route 112 – Country Club/Arizona Ave
  - Increase weekday frequency to 15 minutes from 9 AM to 2 PM between Chandler Park-and-Ride and Main St.
Route Change: Route 67 – 67th Avenue

Route Change:
Route 112 – Country Club / Arizona Avenue
Route Change: Route 104 – Alma School

Route Change: Route 136 – Gilbert
Proposed Service Changes

- Public comment period: April – May 2017
- Feedback opportunities:
  - Online comment card
  - Email comments
  - Events
    - Webinar: May 9
    - Public hearing: May 15
  - Social media

- Webinar: May 9
- Public hearing: May 15

- 859 total comments regarding the October Service Changes and the overall system
- Of the 859, 371 comments were specific to the October Service Change Proposals before the Board
  - 167 in favor
  - 29 not in favor
  - 175 unsure
Recommendation

Staff recommends that the TMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to amend service operator contracts and member agency intergovernmental agreements (IGAs), as necessary, to accommodate the recommended October 2017 service changes.
DATE
May 24, 2017

AGENDA ITEM 5

SUBJECT
Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events

PURPOSE
Chair Zuercher will request future agenda items from members, and members may provide a report on current events.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
None

COST AND BUDGET
None

COMMITTEE PROCESS
None

RECOMMENDATION
This item is presented for information only.

CONTACT
Scott Smith
Chief Executive Officer
602-262-7433
ssmith@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
Pending Items Request
## Pending Items Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Requested</th>
<th>Date Requested</th>
<th>Planned Follow-up Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda

May 24, 2017

Rail Management Committee
Wednesday, June 7, 2017
Lake Powell Conference Room
101 N. 1st Avenue, 10th Floor
11:00 a.m.

Action Recommended

1.  **Public Comment on Agenda Action Items (blue card)**

   The public will be provided with an opportunity at this time to address the Board on all **action agenda** items. Up to three minutes will be provided per speaker to address all agenda items unless the Chair allows more at his/her discretion. A total of 15 minutes for all speakers will be provided.

2.  **Minutes**

   Minutes from the May 3, 2017 RMC meeting are presented for approval.

### CONSENT AGENDA

3A.  **Aconex Project Controls Software – Contract Amendment**

   Staff recommends that the RMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute a contract amendment with Aconex Ltd. to provide project controls software capabilities for additional capital projects for an amount to exceed $1,208,220 plus an additional $120,822 (10%) for use as a contingency for unforeseen circumstances.

3B.  **City of Mesa Fiesta-Downtown Chandler Corridor Study Intergovernmental Agreement**

   Staff recommends that the RMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with the City of Mesa for them to provide up to $900,000 to Valley Metro for an Alternatives Analysis for the Fiesta-Downtown Chandler Corridor.
3C. **Northwest Phase II Light Rail Extension Third Party Utility Agreements for Design**

Staff recommends that the RMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to sign Letters of Authorization with third party utility companies for their design activities on the Northwest Phase II Light Rail Extension for an amount not to exceed $964,091 plus an additional $96,409 (10%) contingency for unforeseen circumstances.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

4. **South Central Light Rail Extension Construction Manager at Risk (CM@R) Contract Award**

Staff recommends that the RMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute a contract for the South Central Light Rail Extension CM@Risk contractor for pre-construction services, with Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. for an amount not to exceed $2,400,000 plus an additional $240,000 (10%) contingency for unforeseen circumstances.

5. **Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events**

Chair Methvin will request future RMC agenda items from members and members may provide a report on current events.

6. **Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the RMC is scheduled for **Wednesday, August 2, 2017 at 11:00 a.m.**

Qualified sign language interpreters are available with 72 hours notice. Materials in alternative formats (large print, audiocassette, or computer diskette) are available upon request. For further information, please call Valley Metro at 602-262-7433 or TTY at 602-251-2039. To attend this meeting via teleconference, contact the receptionist at 602-262-7433 for the dial-in-information. The supporting information for this agenda can be found on our web site at [www.valleymetro.org](http://www.valleymetro.org)
DATE
May 24, 2017

AGENDA ITEM 1

SUBJECT
Public Comment on Agenda Action Items

PURPOSE
The public will be provided with an opportunity at this time to address the RMC on all action agenda items. Up to three minutes will be provided per speaker to address all agenda items unless the Chair allows more at his/her discretion. A total of 15 minutes for all speakers will be provided.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
None

COST AND BUDGET
None

COMMITTEE PROCESS
None

RECOMMENDATION
This item is presented for information only.

CONTACT
Scott Smith
Chief Executive Officer
602-262-7433
ssmith@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
None
Minutes

DATE
May 31, 2017

AGENDA ITEM 2

Minutes from the
Rail Management Committee
Wednesday, May 3, 2017
Lake Powell Conference Room
101 N. 1st Avenue, Suite 1000
Phoenix, AZ
11:00 a.m.

Members Present
Steven Methvin, City of Tempe, Chair
Scott Butler for Chris Brady, City of Mesa, Vice Chair
Ryan Peters for Marsha Reed, City of Chandler
Kevin Phelps, City of Glendale
Ed Zuercher, City of Phoenix

Chair Methvin called the meeting to order at 11:35 a.m.

1. Public Comment on Agenda Action Items

MR. CROWLEY: I'll try to be quick on each of these. The first one would be 3A with the design contract award. Please, in that design will you make sure that you show the bike lane being that when it was shown to us a while back -- it wasn't on there.

As on to the light rail vehicle contract award, now our current contractor is the one that we're going to be going with, or is it we're going with the other one? And if so, I don't want to butcher their name -- the Kinki Sharyo, whatever it is, weren't they one of the original ones that offered to construct our light rail? In fact, they were going to build the facility here in Arizona, so when I look back on last month's communications that y'all did -- is there a reason that thing never started -- I love that -- my timer.

So not to just ramble, I appreciate what y'all did on the questions on that contract, and, as I said, is the non-Siemens builder the one that offered to construct a facility here in Arizona back when this thing was not even having a shovel full of dirt moved.

And for the operating and capital budget, you've gone over that twice, but I keep on looking at it and saying, well, if it would have been bifurcated, would they be rating all those moneys from the bus and saying well, we're doing it to rail, because as it stated back in the day, bus was to get 60 percent, rail was to get 40.

And when I look at the rail spending two and a half billion dollars, I'm going, okay, well, wouldn't that be three and a half billion we're going to be doing on the bus. And it's far less. That is inequity. And it isn't multimodal as it should be. Have a pleasant.
2. Minutes

Minutes from the April 5, 2017 RMC meeting were presented for approval.

IT WAS MOVED BY ED ZUERCHER, SECONDED BY KEVIN PHELPS AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE APRIL 5, 2017 RMC MEETING.

3. Consent Agenda

The following items were presented on the consent agenda:

A. South Central Light Rail Extension Design Contract Award
B. Tempe Streetcar Construction Manager at Risk Contract Award
C. Transit Life Cycle Program – Light Rail Update
D. Contact with Routes Match to develop an application association with FTA Mobility on Demand Sandbox Grant
E. 50th Street Light Rail Station Construction Contract Amendment

Mr. Zuercher said Mr. Chair, I'd note that 3D was revised and that's at our place as revised. I just wonder if they could tell us for a second what got revised there. And then there is a new 3E at our place and on the agenda about a 50th Street light rail station, so I wonder if we can just get a thirty-second of what that one is as well.

Mr. Smith said thank you, Mr. Chair. 3D was revised simply to change the numbers on it. 3D is a pass through. It's an administrative -- we get the million-dollar grant from the federal government for the sandbox and RouteMatch is our co-applicant. And so in order for us to pass through the funds that are paid to them under that we have 3D and the numbers weren't right on that. It's $800,000 plus they are giving an in-kind for $200,000 which matches our -- which qualifies as the local match they're doing on our behalf.

Consent Agenda Item 3E was added simply because we reached agreement with Stacy Witbeck just literally yesterday morning right before the twenty-four hours and rather than hold it off a month, we thought we would put it through because we have agreement with the construction manager at risk on an amount on the guaranteed maximum price.

Your staff has reviewed that. City of Phoenix has approved that. And so we put it on the agenda so we could get them going and start the work with a notice to proceed.

Mr. Zuercher said thank you. Yes, we are good with that. Just a friendly suggestion, when we revise if we can note where the revision is on the report in the future.

Mr. Smith said yes.
IT WAS MOVED BY ED ZUERCHER, SECONDED BY KEVIN PHELPS AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA.

4. Light Rail Vehicle Contract Award

Mr. Smith said I hope that you've read the memo and I think we did a much better job of explaining to you this process. This was the one where, and frankly, we dropped the ball on being able to adequately communicate to you what the best value process was.

And if you look into that, we had the opportunity to have two good proposers on these cars. The best value was a combination of technical and pricing. Although it's not a low bid, so to speak, it's scored as the combination of those two that provides the best value.

And in this case, we made -- the panel made a very, very significant decision to move away from our existing provider Kinkisharyo to go to Siemens Industry.

They found that their cars do meet our specifications. They will run on our system. There are some costs involved, though, and this is one of the questions that came up last time. And we have included it as an addendum, as you can see, an analysis of two scenarios of those costs. The first scenario is what it would be the one-time cost if we just bought 11 vehicles and stopped there. This procurement is for a total of seventy-eight: eleven purchased now, 67 on option.

So on that schedule, we went through and looked and said if we purchase just eleven vehicles, what are the costs that we would incur. Because you have to say, you know, if the price differential is great enough, it's got to work for both short-term and the long-term. And as you can see, we estimate that there will be just under $2.2 million in one-time cost that will be incurred by having the Siemens car in addition to the Kinkisharyo.

Down below, we have a price differential table which shows you the difference between the bids on both the eleven vehicles and sixty-seven. And as you can see, there's an $18.2-million-dollar-price differential, which far exceeds the $2.2 million dollars in what we anticipate will be our one-time cost. That sort of sealed the deal, you might say, the cost differential.

The price differential was so great that it more than covered. If you take that ongoing and we look at some of the ongoing 20-year life cycle, of course we'll have to continually hire and train our maintenance people on two systems that we anticipate will be $3.2 million, and we'll consistently have to train new operators on operating both systems, and we believe that will incur a $1.4 million incremental or additional cost, because we're training them on both the Kinkisharyo and the Siemens.
You can see that that, once again, over the life of the contract almost a $100 million price differential. We believe that operationally we can make it work and the costs are minimal as far as not being able to hook the cars together. That's an irritation. It doesn't really increase the cost, but that the incremental cost we will incur are far less than the price savings, and it's so significant that we are recommending that we go with the Siemens car.

Mr. Zuercher said can I just clarify then, so these are three separate pieces? It's $2.2 million dollars for the 11 vehicles on one-time cost. For the extra 67 it's another $250,000.

Mr. Smith said well, if we go that way, we'll have to expand our parts inventory. And this would be the cost to expand -- we'll basically build a mezzanine in our parts area. That will enable us to store the parts in our existing facility but create a second floor. So that would be at $250,000 that we could do upfront or we could do as part of the twenty year. It's something we're going to have to think about.

Mr. Zuercher said it's fine. I'm just trying to clarify what you have. So it's for 11 vehicles it's the biggest chunk. If you do the extra 67, you're going to have to build that one thing. And then no matter whether 11 or 67, it's an additive there of $4.6 million dollars.

Mr. Smith said that's if we go the whole 67 and we basically make -- Siemens -- over twenty years. Those are the cost of continually having to train staff on two systems.

Mr. Smith said so instead of four weeks training, we'll have five weeks training. That extra week of training is simply because we have the Siemens vehicle. What will be the cost of that one week of training.

Mr. Zuercher said it looks like it's about $7 million all together, that's the total extra cost for having these two separate cars -- types of cars. Which is a deduct from the $117 million of savings, meaning a net savings to the region of $110 million.

Mr. Smith said that's correct. And if we're off on that, we believe there's enough of that cushion in there that, let's say, we're only half of our actual cost, we'd have so much cushion there that it really made the decision fairly straight forward because of the price differential.

Mr. Zuercher said another couple questions. Are there other systems that have two separate manufactured vehicles running and operating, do we know?

Mr. Smith said yes. Almost every system uses multiple. It's rare that you have a system -- unless it's a very small system. But anytime a system grows, and especially ones that go to two lines, it's very common to have two cars. And many times what they'll do is when they grow they'll put one type of car on one line another type of car on another line, but it's not uncommon for systems to have more than one brand of car.
working on their system at the same time.

Mr. Zuercher said and that was my second question, which is a little bit of a worry but it may be over blown, which would be a perception of one line having a better car than another line. Would we interline these cars or would we say like whatever the north-south line is going to have one and the east-west is going to have another? What's the vision of that.

Mr. Smith said with 11 cars, they'll be mixed. And we'll come to a point in time where we have fifty cars in our current inventory. If we get up to that fifty cars, we'll make operational decisions at that time as to whether we want to dedicate one car for one line and another car for another line. That's an operational decision that will be made on the fly. Ray, is that accurate?

Mr. Abraham said that is accurate.

Mr. Zuercher said but initially you're going to have to interline them. They have to stay in their own sets. Is that right? You can't mix the cars.

Mr. Smith said yes, that is correct. You can't couple the cars, but they will -- for example, if you're waiting at a platform, you may have a two-car Kinkisharyo come through and the next time you'll have a Siemens car come through.

Now one thing we are doing, and you'll hear from Hillary maybe next month, is on how we update and we consolidate our branding, so that really when those cars come through, unless you're looking very, very carefully to the average person they won't notice a difference.

I can tell you in San Diego right now, they're going through a shift, a major shift, between their providers. And, you know, even me, I got to look at it, because they're painted the same, they're branded, and you really don't notice it when they come up which car it is, whether it's the car that they're transitioning out of or the car they've transitioned into. And that's common, which is one reason why we're working on a consolidated branding program so you don't say, oh, that's the old car, that's the new car.

Over the next few years we'll move to a consistent paint scheme, a consistent branding so the difference will be very -- once you get in the car, you'll hardly notice the difference between the two.

Mr. Zuercher said are we anticipating that they're going to be delivered with a different paint scheme?

Mr. Smith said that could be the case. If we decide before that, we can do that upfront. That's why we're talking with your staff and we'll be bringing that issue to you as to
whether we're moving away from, you know, the paint scheme we have, which is a beautiful paint scheme, but it is nine years old.

And the question is whether -- how we move forward. Do we want to do the Siemens car and the same paint scheme that we have now, or do we want to use this as an opportunity to change and upgrade our branding and make it consistent with our buses and the Tempe Streetcar and go to something like that. That's going to be -- that's what we're working through right now. And we'll present that to you as a philosophical discussion as to do we want this consistent branding.

And one of the reasons we're doing it this time is we're going to have to make a decision soon as to whether we order these with a specific paint scheme. A lot of them you get it with just the base paint. And a lot of what you see are decals or they're put on. They're not actually paint. Some of it is actual paint.

We need to make this decision now so that when we order the cars we can define as part of our specs to the manufacturer how we want these things to be painted. So even though it seems a little premature, it's not. It's very timely that we have this discussion.

Chair Methvin said are there any other questions?

Mr. Zuercher said my bias on that is we shouldn't spend any more money trying to do something different. We spent a lot of time and energy getting this paint scheme. We need to focus on service, not on colors when we already got it, but that's another discussion for another day. I just wanted to lay my marker out there on that.

Mr. Smith said and, believe me, Hillary can attest that was the very question that we came up with yesterday, so it's a big decision. And one we're not going to take likely because there's really pros and cons both ways. It would take a sizable investment, but it's a twenty-thirty-year investment, too, so, you know, we're going to try and lay it out both sides and then let you as the governing bodies decide which way you want to go.

Chair Methvin said okay. Thank you very much. No other questions. Do I have a motion to approve?

IT WAS MOVED BY KEVIN PHELPS, SECONDED BY ED ZUERCHER AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO FORWARD TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CEO TO EXECUTE A SEVEN-YEAR CONTRACT WITH SIEMENS INDUSTRY INC. TO PURCHASE AN INITIAL QUANTITY OF 11 S70 LIGHT RAIL VEHICLES IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $57.9 MILLION WITH OPTIONS FOR UP TO AN ADDITIONAL 67 S70 LIGHT RAIL VEHICLES OVER THE SEVEN-YEAR TERM AND TO ESTABLISH A CONTRACT CHANGE CONTINGENCY OF $5,790,000 THAT IS INCLUDED IN THE OVERALL BUDGET ESTABLISHED FOR THE PROJECT.
Mr. Hodgins said thank you. Mr. Chair, members of the Rail Management Committee, again with this budget there are some minor changes, but largely unchanged from what we saw last month.

I did add some detailed slides to explain some of the changes, so I'll try to focus on those. No change to our baseline in what we estimate for operations. Really no change to the revenues, about $67 million overall for operating revenues.

I do want to address some of the assumed changes in the rail operations budget, and this slide highlights some of the keys.

We have increased staffing that we talked about a little bit at the TMC meeting that added just over a $.5 million. We are proposing systemwide implementation of Wi-Fi on the light rail. That's another half million of the increase in the rail operations.

We have additional security costs that were approved by the Board that was almost a million-dollar increase. The ACI contract is actually -- we reduced that a little bit based on the new contract, so it's about $700,000 less than the current year's budget. And then increased vehicle and facility maintenance as the system ages, that's about 1.6 million increase.

So that hopefully helps to explain some of the increases in the operations budget.

And I also wanted to identify some of the changes and why the project development is so much higher, because it's about a 50 percent increase for FY18 over '17. And it's just the number of projects we're working on.

We have three corridors where we're anticipating completion of preliminary engineering. Basically, what we call project development is all the work needed to identify the alignment, do the preliminary engineering up to 30 percent design. And at that point it becomes a capital project, moves over to capital budget.

So we have three corridors that are still -- that are completing preliminary engineering. We have other corridors that we continue to work on. And the one item I wanted to highlight is we have some a new activity, it's about $2 million for an I-10/I-17 ramp for design work.

And just to show what that is, really, it's part of the Capitol I-10 West project. It's a ramp designed to take the light rail vehicles from the Capitol area across I-17, up the frontage road, and then accessing I-10. So what we're proposing to do is to advance from the Capitol I-10 west project use it as a bus ramp in the interim. And this highlights what it
would do to the bus service.

So the thick orange line is what EXPRESS and RAPID routes do today. They come into downtown through the 5th and 3rd Avenue HOV ramps, and then circulate back out to the Capitol, so they're coming in farther to go back to the Capitol.

So this would really facilitate coming directly to the Capitol first and then hitting the rest of downtown. It's a decrease in mileage. It's a decrease in time for passengers. A decrease in the operating cost in the long run for those EXPRESS's. So we think that we want to get some design work to look at how we might implement that. So that's about a $2 million increase -- or explanation of why there's a $6 million increase. So that's something we're looking at.

Operating expenses, this is generally unchanged from last month, $67 million. Again, there's almost a $6 million increase in the project development. I highlighted some of the key changes there.

Baseline project schedule, we've seen that, multiple projects. A $203 million capital budget, and this helps to explain some of the changes we talked about in the RPTA budget with the staffing. This is really driving a lot of the new staff requests for Valley Metro Rail.

Then there was a question about the systemwide improvements. We have some increased cost there, so I wanted to highlight a few keys there. We have milestone progress payments for the expansion light rail vehicles that were just approved. That's about $16 million in the FY18 budget. That's a large part of the increase.

Major LRV component overhauls, the major capital component overhauls we charge to systemwide improvements, which are funded through Prop 400 rather than rail operations through the member cities, so that's about $3.7 million there.

The TVM door modifications are really for security. We need to upgrade our pin pads to accommodate cards with chips, so we can't just do a swap of the pin pad. It has to be a whole modification, a whole change to the door and the pin pads and everything. That's about just under a million dollars for that. And then station lighting retrofit, it's over a million dollars to retrofit the stations for LED lights.

In terms of some of the key changes for why the systemwide is increasing significantly, you can see it's an $11 million increase in that systemwide improvement line. Again overall, more than doubling of our capital budget.

Are there any questions on the annual before I touch on the five year?

Mr. Zuercher said I do have a question, if I could. The bus ramp, I-10/I-17, is the plan -- maybe somebody will know right now, is the plan that buses will be able to continue to
use it after light rail is implemented, or is it going to be bus first and then bus has to go off when rail comes?

Mr. Grote said Mr. Chair, members of the committee, the answer is we're looking at both options right now. We see some opportunity to continue the buses on the ramp. Other cities other metropolitan areas do share track and guideway for bus and rail, so it's something we're considering as part of this development.

Mr. Hodgins said thank you. There's no real change to the operating assumptions we discussed. I did want to point out on the five-year project development, you know, we do have this spike in FY18 because we have so many projects going on, but it does decrease in '19 and through the five years more, what I would say, normal levels as many of these projects move out of project development and into capital. So it's about just under $55 million for project development over the five years.

Five-year operating uses and sources, about $335 million you'll see in a couple of years when we have the Tempe Streetcar come in and the Gilbert Road extension as well.

Five-year capital, about a billion and a half over the five years. There's no real change from what we presented last month.

So with that, unless there are any additional questions I can answer, we would recommend that the RMC forward to the Board approval of the FY18 budget and five-year capital and operating forecast. Thank you.

Chair Methvin said thank you, Mr. Hodgins. Any questions for Mr. Hodgins? Do I have a motion to approve?


6. Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events

Chair Methvin said Item No. 6. Future Agenda Items.

I just have one for Mr. Smith. It's more of an observation. I ride the light rail quite regularly from my house in downtown Phoenix to the office in downtown Tempe. And especially on the train over today to this meeting, I noticed that the seats are getting quite worn out. And perhaps I don't think there needs to be a presentation, but this goes to what Mr. Zuercher was mentioning earlier about if we replace these seats now, which I'm sure you probably have on your radar to do, and then we think about changing to a new branding scheme in the near future, and I have no doubt that you've
already thought through all of this, I just hate to discard seats or fabric or what have you early just because we change a branding scheme.

Mr. Smith said thank you. We will not be discarding things like that. Although my guess is by the time we get to that stage, most of the seats will have gone through the cycle and either have been refurbished or replaced.

That is something that's in the schedule right now. We actually had a few meetings on this just recently as to how far we wanted to go, whether we could buy some more time through refurbishment and replacement.

But when we talk about branding, it's mostly the outward branding and making sure that it would be consistent with what's inside also. We're not changing our colors. We're not changing the basic theme of Valley Metro. It's still going to be the V, the M, the purple, the whatever color of green that is variation, and the swoosh. That's all staying. It's basically how -- consistency is what we're really looking for. And we want those components in any aspect of what we have, that would include the interior. So we don't want to put just a fresh coat of paint and leave the interior bad, because we recognize that people's perceptions of who we are and the service we have is both on the outside and on the inside.

Chair Methvin said yes. Thank you. I don't see any other questions.

Well -- our next meeting is June 7th. I'll end the meeting. Thank you.

With no further discussion the meeting adjourned at 12:01 p.m.
DATE
May 24, 2017

AGENDA ITEM 3A

SUBJECT
Aconex Project Controls Software – Contract Amendment

PURPOSE
To request authorization for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute a contract amendment with Aconex Ltd. to provide project controls software capabilities for additional capital projects for an amount not to exceed $1,208,220 plus an additional $120,822 (10%) for use as a contingency for unforeseen circumstances.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
In September 2015, the Valley Metro Board of Directors authorized a five-year contract with Aconex for project controls software in the amount not to exceed $350,000. The initial application of Aconex project controls software was for 50 user licenses for the Gilbert Road Light Rail Extension.

In March 2016, the Valley Metro Board of Directors authorized a contract amendment for $110,000 to add project controls capabilities for the 50th Street Light Rail Station, the Tempe Streetcar and the planning phase for future rail corridors. This contract amendment provided unlimited licenses for a 36 month duration for each project and included: full version control process management reporting, search capabilities with documentation configuration, real-time processing, and backup.

Aconex bases the cost of service on capital projects as they are advanced into the design phase. There are now four additional projects advancing into design, including the South Central Light Rail Extension, Northwest Light Rail Extension (Phase II), Capital/I-10 West Light Rail Extension and the Light Rail Operations and Maintenance Center expansion. Additionally the Tempe Streetcar and Light Rail Vehicle procurements will also utilize Aconex. Valley Metro and Aconex have negotiated a cost to add these projects, as well as the extension of unlimited licensing through the planning, design, construction and close out phases of all projects. The contract duration will be extended through the close-out date of all capital projects included in the Aconex contract.

COST AND BUDGET
The proposed contract amendment with Aconex is for an amount not to exceed $1,208,220, thus bringing the total contract amount to $1,668,220. The funding for this increase is included within the project cost forecasts for each of the included capital projects.
Expenses expected in FY17 are included within the adopted FY17 Valley Metro Rail Operating and Capital Budget. Contract obligations beyond FY17 are incorporated into the Five-Year Operating Forecast and Capital Program (FY17 through FY21).

STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT
This item relates to the following goals and strategies in the Five-Year Strategic Plan, FY 2016 – 2020:

- Goal 2: Advance performance based operation
  - Tactic C: Deliver projects and services on-time/on-budget.
  - Tactic E: Maintain strong fiscal controls to support Valley Metro’s long-term sustainability.

COMMITTEE PROCESS
RTAG: May 16, 2017 for information
RMC: June 7, 2017 for action
Board of Directors: June 22, 2017 for action

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the RMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute a contract amendment with Aconex Ltd. to provide project controls software capabilities for additional capital projects for an amount not to exceed $1,208,220 plus an additional $120,822 (10%) for use as a contingency for unforeseen circumstances.

CONTACT
Wulf Grote, P.E.
Director, Capital & Service Development
wgrote@valleymetro.org
602-322-4420

ATTACHMENT
None
DATE  
May 31, 2017

AGENDA ITEM 3B

SUBJECT  
City of Mesa Fiesta-Downtown Chandler Corridor Study Intergovernmental Agreement

PURPOSE  
To request authorization for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with the city of Mesa for them to provide up to $900,000 to Valley Metro for an Alternatives Analysis for the Fiesta-Downtown Chandler Corridor.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION  
In 2017 Valley Metro completed the Fiesta-Downtown Chandler Transit Corridor study to assess the feasibility of high capacity transit investments for the Arizona Avenue/Country Club Road corridor between Loop 202 in Chandler and Main Street in Mesa. The study recommended that a route generally heading south from Main Street along Dobson Road, east on Southern Avenue, and south on Country Club/Arizona Avenue to Loop 202 has future potential as a high capacity transit corridor. The study also identified that the corridor segment north from approximately Baseline Road has the highest potential for near term high capacity transit investment.

Staff from Mesa and Chandler have expressed interest to advance planning efforts to the next phase of study, called an Alternatives Analysis. This study will:

- Further refine the route
- Identify the appropriate transit mode (e.g. bus rapid transit, light rail, etc.)
- Identify station locations
- Determine the street configuration
- Determine federal funding feasibility
- Define possible phasing for implementation

For study purposes the corridor has been divided into two segments as follows:

- Segment I - extends from the existing light rail line on Main Street to Baseline Road in Mesa
- Segment II - extends from Baseline Road in Mesa to Pecos Road in Chandler

Mesa has identified funds to initiate the Alternatives Analysis within Segment I and would like to start work this summer. An IGA is proposed for Mesa to provide funds to Valley Metro to conduct this study, which would be completed over a two year period. Mesa commitment to the IGA is contingent upon approval by their City Council.

Chandler is still evaluating their participation in the Alternatives Analysis and expect to have better definition of their involvement by fall 2017.
COST AND BUDGET
The total cost for both segments of the Alternatives Analysis will depend upon Chandler’s commitment to participate, but is preliminarily forecasted to cost approximately $1.5 million. This includes Valley Metro agency and consultant costs. Mesa will contribute $900,000 for the Segment I study effort. No regional funds will be utilized for the Alternatives Analysis.

Funding for the Alternatives Analysis is included in the FY 2018 Valley Metro Budget and in the Five-Year Operating Forecast and Capital Program (FY2018 thru FY2022).

COMMITTEE PROCESS
RTAG: May 16, 2017 for information
RMC: June 7, 2017 for action
Board of Directors: June 22, 2017 for action

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the RMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with the City of Mesa for them to provide up to $900,000 to Valley Metro for an Alternatives Analysis for the Fiesta-Downtown Chandler Corridor. Approval of this IGA is contingent upon Mesa City Council approval.

CONTACT
Wulf Grote, P.E.
Director, Capital and Service Development
602-322-4420
wgrote@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
None

A copy of the intergovernmental agreement with Mesa is available upon request.
DATE
May 24, 2017

AGENDA ITEM 3C

SUBJECT
Northwest Phase II Light Rail Extension Third Party Utility Agreements for Design

PURPOSE
To request authorization for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to sign Letters of Authorization with third party utility companies for their design on the Northwest Phase II Light Rail Extension for an amount not to exceed $964,091 plus an additional $96,409 (10%) contingency for unforeseen circumstances.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
The Northwest Light Rail Extension includes 4.6 miles of additional light rail service, extending from the initial end-of-line at 19th Avenue and Montebello Avenue to 25th Avenue and Mountain View Road. In 2007, the route was divided into two phases. The 3.2-mile Phase I on 19th Avenue from Montebello to Dunlap Avenue opened on March 19, 2016.

Phase II of the project will extend west on Dunlap Avenue, north on 25th Avenue and across I-17 at Mountain View Road with a terminus on the west side of the freeway near Metrocenter Mall. This phase is scheduled to open in 2023.

Presently Valley Metro is developing the project’s preliminary engineering design. Competitive procurements for final design, construction and artists are currently underway. Final Design is anticipated through spring 2019, with construction work beginning in the summer 2019. The project team is evaluating various design and construction packages to best optimize the schedule.

An important next step in the project’s development is to design and construct required utility relocations. In order to commence this work, Letters of Authorization are needed with several third party utility companies. Initially, only authorizations for design work will be issued to the utilities. The ability to issue these Letters of Authorization require Board approval. Once design work is completed, relocation construction cost estimates will be developed and negotiated with the utility companies at which point additional authorizations will be presented to the Board for approval prior to issuance to the utilities at a later date.

COST AND BUDGET
The Northwest Phase II Light Rail Extension will be funded with Federal Transit Administration, regional Proposition 400, and City of Phoenix dollars. The cost for third party utility work is included in the overall budget established for the project.
Current estimated design costs for utility relocations by company are outlined in the following table. Design costs are estimated to be approximately 10% of the total utility relocation costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility Company</th>
<th>Estimated Design Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APS Electric</td>
<td>$259,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CenturyLink</td>
<td>$94,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox Communications</td>
<td>$50,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Light-Wave</td>
<td>$11,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL3</td>
<td>$36,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt River Project Electric</td>
<td>$320,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt River Project - Irrigation</td>
<td>$59,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWG</td>
<td>$45,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCG/AT&amp;T</td>
<td>$14,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunication Group</td>
<td>$36,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAYO Group</td>
<td>$36,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$964,091</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All costs identified herein are within the Northwest Phase II Light Rail Extension project cost forecast and are included in the Valley Metro Rail adopted FY18 Operating and Capital Budget. Contract obligations beyond FY18 are incorporated into the Five-Year Operating Forecast and Capital Program (FY18 thru FY22).

**STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT**
This item relates to the following goals and strategies in the Five-Year Strategic Plan, FY 2016 – 2020:

- **Goal 2: Advance performance based operation**
  - Tactic C: Deliver projects and services on-time/on-budget.
- **Goal 3: Grow transit ridership**
  - Tactic A: Expand and improve transit services to reach new markets.
  - Tactic B: Improve connectivity of transit services for greater effectiveness.

**COMMITTEE PROCESS**
RTAG: May 16, 2017 for information
RMC: June 7, 2017 for action
Board of Directors: June 22, 2017 for action
RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the RMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to sign Letters of Authorization with third party utility companies for their design activities on the Northwest Phase II Light Rail Extension for an amount not to exceed $964,091 plus an additional $96,409 (10%) contingency for unforeseen circumstances.

CONTACT
Wulf Grote, PE
Director, Capital & Service Development
602-322-4420
wgrote@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
None
DATE
May 31, 2017

SUBJECT
South Central Light Rail Extension Construction Manager at Risk (CM@R) Contract Award

PURPOSE
To request authorization for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute a contract for the South Central Light Rail Extension Construction Manager at Risk (CM@Risk) contractor for pre-construction services, with Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. for an amount not to exceed $2,400,000 plus an additional $240,000 (10%) contingency for unforeseen circumstances.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
The South Central Light Rail Extension will extend light rail service approximately five miles south along Central Avenue from downtown Phoenix to Baseline Road. Within the downtown area the line will operate northbound on Central Avenue and southbound on 1st Avenue. South of downtown, light rail will operate two-directional within the median of Central Avenue.

The project will include seven light rail stations with locations at Lincoln Street, Buckeye Road, Nina Mason Pulliam Rio Salado Audubon Center, Broadway Road, Roeser Road, Southern Avenue and Baseline Road. It will also include two park and ride lots, one at Broadway Road and the other at Baseline Road. The route crosses over the Salt River and Western Canal and under the Union Pacific Railroad and I-17.

The South Central Light Rail Extension includes five major contracts: Design Services, Systems Engineering (which will also be utilized for other light rail corridors), Construction Manager at Risk (CM@Risk) Services, Public Art Services and Light Rail Vehicles. In May, the Design Services and Light Rail Vehicles contracts were approved for award by the Board of Directors. The light rail vehicle contract award involved an initial purchase of 11 vehicles to add passenger capacity for the existing light rail system and for the Gilbert Road Light Rail Extension. The contract also includes fleet purchase options for future light rail corridors, including the South Central project.

The other three contracts needed for the project are still in progress. The action requested in this memo is only for the CM@Risk Contractor.

CM@Risk contracts involve two phases: the pre-construction phase, which occurs parallel to the project’s design process, and the construction phase. At this time, action is only needed to execute a contract for the pre-construction phase. As the project nears design completion, the CM@Risk contractor, working closely with the design team, will prepare a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) for the construction of the
Project. At that time staff will seek Board approval to award the construction phase for the GMP amount.

During the pre-construction services phase, the CM@Risk contractor will work closely with the design consultants, Valley Metro and Phoenix staff to participate in design development and reviews. In addition, the CM@Risk will perform constructability reviews of the project’s design and prepare construction cost estimates and schedules in conjunction with milestone design submittals.

A Request for Qualifications (RFQ) in accordance with A.R.S Title 34-603 for this contract was issued on February 9, 2017. The RFQ published evaluation criteria and corresponding point values were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introductory Letter</th>
<th>0 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience of the Offeror</td>
<td>200 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Project and Approach to Performing Required Services</td>
<td>250 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Performance for past 10 years</td>
<td>200 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Project Team</td>
<td>350 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statements of Qualifications (SOQ’s) were received on March 30, 2017. A total of four submittals were received and deemed responsive. SOQ’s were received from the following firms:
- Archer Western
- Kiewit
- Stacey & Witbeck, Ames
- Sundt/MRM

The selection committee, comprised of three Valley Metro employees, three City of Phoenix employees, and one contractor, evaluated the four responsive SOQs. Based on the selection committee’s initial scoring and ranking it was determined that a Request for Proposals (RFP) would be extended to all four firms. The RFP was issued in accordance with A.R.S. Title 34-603 on April 14, 2017. The RFP published evaluation criteria and corresponding point values were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introductory Letter</th>
<th>0 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction manager/general contractor project team</td>
<td>150 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project approach and management of the work</td>
<td>100 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public involvement and community relations plan</td>
<td>100 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimating and cost control measures for this project</td>
<td>100 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major subcontractor and major supplier selections</td>
<td>50 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design document reviews</td>
<td>100 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management plan</td>
<td>50 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed project schedule</td>
<td>100 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four proposals were received on May 2, 2017 and all were deemed responsive. The selection committee, comprised of the same members during the Request for Qualification phase, evaluated the four responsive proposals. Based on the selection committee’s initial scoring and ranking it was determined that three of the four firms would be invited to participate in interviews, which occurred on May 15, 2017.

Upon completion of interviews, the selection committee prepared their final scoring and ranking results as reflected below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CM@Risk Contractor</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiewit Infrastructure West Co.</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundt / MRM</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ames / Stacy Witbeck</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The selection committee determined that Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. was the most qualified and highest ranked firm to perform the CM@Risk services and has entered into contract negotiations for preconstruction services.

COST AND BUDGET
The negotiated price for South Central Light Rail Extension preconstruction services is $2,400,000. An additional 10% contingency, to be held by staff, is also needed to address unforeseen changes and circumstances that may arise during the project’s design. Funding for the project will be a combination of federal, regional, and City of Phoenix funds.

Project funding is included in the Valley Metro Rail adopted FY18 Operating and Capital Budget. Contract obligations beyond FY18 are incorporated into the Five-Year Operating Forecast and Capital Program (FY18 thru FY22).

STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT
This item relates to the following goals and strategies in the Five-Year Strategic Plan, FY 2016 – 2020:

- **Goal 2: Advance performance based operation**
  - Tactic C: Deliver projects and services on-time/on-budget.
- **Goal 3: Grow transit ridership**
  - Tactic A: Expand and improve transit services to reach new markets.
  - Tactic B: Improve connectivity of transit services for greater effectiveness
COMMITTEE PROCESS
RTAG: May 16, 2017 for information
RMC: June 7, 2017 for action
Board of Directors: June 22, 2017 for action

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the RMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute a contract for the South Central Light Rail Extension CM@Risk contractor for pre-construction services, with Kiewit Infrastructure Co. for an amount not to exceed $2,400,000 plus an additional $240,000 (10%) contingency for unforeseen circumstances.

CONTACT
Wulf Grote, PE
Director, Capital and Service Development
602.322.4420
wgrote@valleymetro.org
DATE
May 24, 2017

AGENDA ITEM 5

SUBJECT
Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events

PURPOSE
Chair Methvin will request future agenda items from members, and members may
provide a report on current events.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSION/CONSIDERATION
None

COST AND BUDGET
None

COMMITTEE PROCESS
None

RECOMMENDATION
This item is presented for information only.

CONTACT
Scott Smith
Chief Executive Officer
602-262-7433
ssmith@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
Pending Items Request
## Pending Items Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Requested</th>
<th>Date Requested</th>
<th>Planned Follow-up Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>