MEETINGS OF THE
Transit Management Committees

TMC/RMC Joint Meeting  
Transit Management Committee (TMC)  
(RMC Members are encouraged to call into the meeting)  
Rail Management Committee (RMC)

Date
Wednesday, October 4, 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, October 4, 2017**
Lake Powell Conference Room
101 N. 1st Avenue, 10th Floor
11:00 a.m.

Action Recommended

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 September 6, 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 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.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

5A. **Ticket Vending Machine (TVM) Computer Upgrade Contract Award**
   Staff recommends that the TMC/RMC forward to the Boards of Directors authorization for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute a contract with Scheidt & Bachmann to perform computer upgrades to Valley Metro TVMs in an amount not to exceed
$670,584. VMR costs are $579,964 and RPTA costs are $90,620.

5B. **Commercial Property and Liability Insurance Coverage Purchase** 5B. For action

Staff recommends that the TMC/RMC forward to the Boards of Directors authorization for the CEO to purchase renewal coverage for Valley Metro’s insurance needs for an amount not to exceed $1,763,238.

5C. **Non-Revenue Fleet Maintenance Services Contract Award** 5C. For action

Staff recommends that the TMC/RMC forward to the Boards of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute a 3-year contract and two 1-year options with All Fleet Services, LLC for non-revenue vehicle fleet maintenance services in an amount not to exceed $698,000. VMR costs are $650,000 and RPTA costs are $48,000.

---

**REGULAR AGENDA**

6. **Travel, Expenditures and Solicitations** 6. For information

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

7. **Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events** 7. For information

Chairs Basha and Brady 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
September 27, 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
September 27, 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
Chair Basha called the meeting to order at 11:04 a.m.

1. Public Comment

Mr. Crowley said one of the things not on the agenda is infrastructure that is actual to the bus. Now, you're the Transit Committee; I know the Rail is also sitting there, but basically, this is the bus committee. And in some of your communities, bus means a Park-and-Ride lot and EXPRESS buses, not what it should be for the metroplex and from the people that wrote the Prop 400, and I happen to be one of them.
What it was supposed to be is your communities were to take the grid, put buses on it, make it intermodal. But what has happened has been, well, the Republican mindset that says we can't raise taxes for socialism as in the bus system is for everybody. That's a socialistic thing. It's not individual cars. It's working it for everyone.

And, in fact, wasn't it back in '86, Pat, that when one of your electeds, when we were first putting together Prop 400, said that he could never support raising taxes, so he would not be participating in the putting together the request to start moving us from the nineteen -- what would have been tens when it comes to transportation here, but it was in the nineteen seventies and eighties.

And with his wife being the head of the schools, I found it interesting that that was their attitude that no matter what one of the jobs government has that we can't raise taxes to get that accomplished.

Now, not one single one of your communities right now is approaching getting taxes for transit to expand your participation to where Phoenix and Tempe are. I'd like to say Mesa, but with two-thirds of Mesa not having any transit, what can you say. Especially when one of the routes that isn't there is the Rio Salado, wouldn't be nice if people from Scottsdale, Phoenix, and Tempe could get to that facility on the bus, but they can't. There's no bus there unless you're going to central Mesa and then back out. A waste of time. You got three seconds. Enjoy.

2. Chief Executive Officer’s Report

Mr. Smith provided an update on the following items:

- Paratransit Update
- Office Space Update
- VMAAG
- Accessible Transit
- MAG Framework Study Workshop
- Transit Police Officer Program
- OMC Fence
- Computer donation with Cox Communications
- Rideshare Month
- Upcoming Public Meetings

Chair Basha said thank you, Scott.

3. Minutes

Minutes from the August 2, 2017 Joint TMC/RMC meeting were presented for approval.

IT WAS MOVED BY ED ZUERCHER, SECONDED BY KEVIN PHELPS AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 2, 2017 JOINT TMC/RMC MINUTES.
4. **Public Comment on Agenda Action Items**

Mr. Crowley said for the Website and the related technologies, I look at each of your communities back in, what was it, '06, there was a document produced showing like the west side getting multiple routes, the amount it was going to cost and that.

You haven't been adhering too much to getting that done, so when I see this planning part again, I go, okay, that's more technology, infrastructure that is for yourselves and for staff, and you tell us that the public benefits from it, you know.

But then after the last electeds meeting after I complained about the lack of bus stops, one of y'all came up to me and said, you know a bus stop is $13,000. This is just after you had spent on lobbyists one million dollars and a half a million dollars on technology for planning. So when we're putting the moneys out there, I go what's happening and where.

Now on this construction I found it real fascinating. You know, you usually list things in order of priority when you're showing what they're going to be doing, you know what I'm saying, you know, the construction of the Peoria Park-and-Ride. It would be nice if every single one of those spaces in that Park-and-Ride were matched by a bus stop with a shelter, because they cost the same for each unit, and then the modernization.

But then when I get to the next page and I look all the way down at the bottom, I notice that emergency service for track repair, switch replacement, tracks and prior and communication and assistance to rail operations is right after install pullouts and bus stops, bus shelters. So that's, you know, I see that an emergency rail repair would need to be a little higher on that list of showing these are our priorities and especially when you're wanting the money for also bus shelters and pullouts. Could you move it up and put more out there. Thank you.

5. **Consent Agenda**

Chair Basha said items are being presented on the consent agenda for approval.

**IT WAS MOVED BY ROGER KLINGLER, SECONDED BY JEFF TYNE AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA.**

6. **Travel, Expenditures and Solicitations**

This item was presented for information.

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

None.

With no further discussion the meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.
DATE
September 27, 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
September 27, 2017

AGENDA ITEM 5A

SUBJECT
Ticket Vending Machine (TVM) Computer Upgrade Contract Award

PURPOSE
To request authorization for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute a contract with Scheidt & Bachmann to perform computer upgrades to Valley Metro TVMs in an amount not to exceed $670,584. VMR costs are $579,964 and RPTA costs are $90,620.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
Valley Metro Rail currently has 128 TVMs along the 26 mile rail alignment and RPTA has 20 TVMs along its Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) stations. The TVMs are in need of a computer upgrade as the current Microsoft XP operating system is no longer supported and the current motherboards are no longer available for replacement.

Contractor will perform the TVM computer upgrades that includes hardware engineering, software development, and software implementation. The computer upgrade installation will be done onsite in coordination with Valley Metro personnel and will include comprehensive testing. Contractor will work with Valley Metro to develop both a plan and a schedule for the work. The plan will include logistics and the support required at any given stage, and will be coordinated with Valley Metro’s operational needs.

The recommended contractor is Scheidt & Bachmann, the original equipment manufacturer (OEM). This is a sole source procurement because Scheidt & Bachmann is the only provider of these parts. An independent cost estimate and a sole source justification have been completed.

COST AND BUDGET
The VMR contract amount for contract is an amount not to exceed $579,964. The RPTA contract amount for the contract is an amount not to exceed $90,620.

The VMR contract obligation is fully funded within the VMR Adopted FY 2018 Operating and Capital Budget. Contract Obligations beyond FY 2018 are incorporated into the VMR Five-Year Operating Forecast and Capital Program (FY 2018 thru FY 2022).

The RPTA contract obligation is fully funded within the FY 2018 RPTA Adopted Operating Budget. Contract Obligations beyond FY 2018 are incorporated into the RPTA Five-Year Operating Forecast and Capital Program (FY 2018 – FY 2022).
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: September 19, 2017 for information
TMC/RMC: October 4, 2017 for action
Board of Directors: October 19, 2017 for action

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the TMC/RMC forward to the Boards of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute a contract with Scheidt & Bachmann to perform computer upgrades to Valley Metro TVMs in an amount not to exceed $670,584. VMR costs are $579,964 and RPTA costs are $90,620.

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

ATTACHMENT
None
DATE
September 27, 2017

AGENDA ITEM 5B

SUBJECT
Commercial Property and Liability Insurance Coverage Purchase

PURPOSE
To request authorization for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to purchase renewal coverage for Valley Metro’s insurance needs, for an amount not to exceed $1,763,238. RPTA’s obligation is $270,794. VMR’s obligation is $1,492,444.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
Valley Metro purchases commercial insurance to cover losses to Valley Metro property and to protect Valley Metro from third-party claims. RPTA and VMR jointly purchase the insurance.

Valley Metro’s insurance broker, Arthur J. Gallagher & Co., has obtained quotes from insurance carriers to meet the agency’s ongoing insurance needs. Staff met with member agency risk managers and our insurance broker to discuss our insurance renewal process and proposals.

Table 1 summarizes the current insurance proposal pricing for RPTA. These figures represent RPTA’s allocation of the combined RPTA and VMR insurance premium. Total excess liability limits are $60 million excess of a $250,000 self-insured retention.

Table 2 summarizes the current insurance proposal pricing for VMR. These figures represent VMR’s allocation of the combined RPTA and VMR insurance premium. Total excess liability limits are $100 million excess of a $250,000 self-insured retention.

Valley Metro’s insurance policies cover exposures of RPTA and VMR. The premium is split between RPTA and VMR based on risk exposure as determined by the market and evaluated by insurance underwriters. This combined approach provides the agency with greater coordination in coverage and in overall purchasing power.

COST AND BUDGET
The premium costs by type of insurance for RPTA and VMR are provided in the following table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coverage Type</th>
<th>RPTA Premium</th>
<th>VMR Premium</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renewal Coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>$7,758</td>
<td>$133,301</td>
<td>$141,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Marine Rolling Stock</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$181,758</td>
<td>$181,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Marine Town Lake Bridge</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$30,710</td>
<td>$30,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIC – Excess Flood/Quake Town Lake Bridge</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$34,936</td>
<td>$34,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>$2,998</td>
<td>$2,999</td>
<td>$5,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Liability &amp; Physical Damage</td>
<td>$21,038</td>
<td>$70,430</td>
<td>$91,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Liability – Buffer Layer</td>
<td>$37,023</td>
<td>$143,577</td>
<td>$180,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Excess Liability – 1st layer</td>
<td>105,010</td>
<td>407,234</td>
<td>$512,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Liability – 2nd layer</td>
<td>29,846</td>
<td>115,744</td>
<td>$145,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Liability – 3rd layer</td>
<td>19,488</td>
<td>75,575</td>
<td>$95,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Liability – 4th layer</td>
<td>29,725</td>
<td>115,275</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Liability – 5th layer</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>83,592</td>
<td>$83,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Liability – 6th layer</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>43,344</td>
<td>$43,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution Liability (Renewed in 2015 – 3 yrs.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand-Alone Terrorism (NCRB)</td>
<td>$2,093</td>
<td>$38,155</td>
<td>$40,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber/Privacy</td>
<td>$15,816</td>
<td>$15,815</td>
<td>$31,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$270,794</td>
<td>$1,492,444</td>
<td>$1,763,238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the term December 1, 2017 – November 30, 2018, the RPTA contract obligation is $270,794 which is fully funded within the FY 2018 RPTA Adopted Operating Budget. Contract Obligations beyond FY 2018 are incorporated into the RPTA Five-Year Operating Forecast and Capital Program (FY 2018 – FY 2022).

For the term December 1, 2017 – November 30, 2018 the VMR contract obligation is $1,492,444 which is fully funded within the VMR Adopted FY 2018 Operating and Capital Budget. Contract Obligations beyond FY 2018 are incorporated into the VMR Five-Year Operating Forecast and Capital Program (FY 2018 thru FY 2022).

**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.
  - Tactic E: Maintain strong fiscal controls to support Valley Metro’s long-term sustainability.

**COMMITTEE ACTION**

RTAG: September 19, 2017 for information
TMC/RMC: October 4, 2017 for action
Boards of Directors: October 19, 2017 for action
RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the TMC/RMC forward to the Boards of Directors authorization for the CEO to purchase renewal coverage for Valley Metro’s insurance needs for an amount not to exceed $1,763,238.

CONTACT
Michael J. Minnaugh
General Counsel
Legal Division
(602) 744-5599
mminnaugh@valleymetro.org

ATTACHMENT
Table 1 Insurance Proposal Pricing for RPTA
Table 2 Insurance Proposal Pricing for VMR
TABLE 1 - Insurance proposal pricing for RPTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line of Coverage</th>
<th>Policy Limit</th>
<th>Renewal Premium</th>
<th>Expiring Premium</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Blanket Limit</td>
<td>$7,758</td>
<td>$7,758</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,999</td>
<td>$2,997</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Liability &amp; Physical Damage</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$21,038</td>
<td>$13,080</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Liability SIR Buffer Layer</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$37,023</td>
<td>$37,023</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Excess Liability 1st layer in excess of $750,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$105,010</td>
<td>$104,796</td>
<td>.204%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Liability – 2nd layer</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$29,846</td>
<td>$30,135</td>
<td>-.968%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Liability – 3rd layer</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$19,488</td>
<td>$17,485</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Liability – 4th layer</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>$29,725</td>
<td>$27,470</td>
<td>8.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand-Alone Terrorism (NCBR)</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td>$2,093</td>
<td>$2,219</td>
<td>-6.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber/Privacy</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$15,816</td>
<td>$10,878</td>
<td>45.39%²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$270,794</td>
<td>$253,842</td>
<td>$253,842</td>
<td>6.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The auto liability and physical damage coverage applies to RPTA non-revenue vehicles. It does not apply to buses used in revenue service.
² This nominal increase was due to increasing the limits from 1M to 2M for Cyber coverage.
TABLE 2 - Insurance proposal pricing for VMR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line of Coverage</th>
<th>Policy Limit</th>
<th>Renewal Premium</th>
<th>Expiring Premium</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renewal Coverage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Blanket Limit</td>
<td>$133,301</td>
<td>$133,301</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Marine Rolling Stock</td>
<td>$150,660,000</td>
<td>$181,758</td>
<td>$181,452</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Marine Town Lake Bridge</td>
<td>$22,581,224</td>
<td>$30,710</td>
<td>$30,710</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIC – Excess Flood &amp; Quake</td>
<td>$15,000,000 x/o</td>
<td>$34,936</td>
<td>$34,936</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5mil u/l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,999</td>
<td>$2,997</td>
<td>0.066%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auto Liability &amp; Physical Damage</strong></td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$70,430</td>
<td>$66,347</td>
<td>6.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess Liability Buffer Layer (SIR)</strong></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$143,577</td>
<td>$143,577</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Excess Liability 1st layer in excess of $750,000</strong></td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$407,234</td>
<td>$406,405</td>
<td>0.204%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess Liability – 2nd layer</strong></td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$115,275</td>
<td>$116,865</td>
<td>-1.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess Liability – 3rd layer</strong></td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$75,575</td>
<td>$67,808</td>
<td>11.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess Liability – 4th layer</strong></td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>$115,275</td>
<td>$106,530</td>
<td>8.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess Liability – 5th layer</strong></td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>$83,592</td>
<td>$77,400</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess Liability – 6th layer</strong></td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$43,344</td>
<td>$40,145</td>
<td>7.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution Liability 2</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stand-Alone Terrorism (NCBR)</strong></td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td>$38,155</td>
<td>$40,459</td>
<td>-6.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber/Privacy(^3)</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$15,815</td>
<td>$10,878</td>
<td>45.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,492,444</td>
<td>$1,459,809</td>
<td>$1,459,809</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The auto liability and physical damage coverage applies to VMR non-revenue vehicles. It does not apply to rail cars used for service.

\(^2\) This was renewed in 2015 for a 3-year policy term at a premium of $23,673. It will renew next year.

\(^3\) This increase was due to increasing the limits from 1M to 2M for Cyber coverage.
DATE
September 27, 2017

SUBJECT
Non-Revenue Fleet Maintenance Services Contract Award

PURPOSE
To request authorization for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute a 3-year contract and two 1-year options with All Fleet Services, LLC for non-revenue vehicle fleet maintenance services in an amount not to exceed $698,000. Valley Metro Rail (VMR) costs are $650,000 and Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) costs are $48,000.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
Valley Metro currently has 82 non-revenue vehicles in its fleet, 66 VMR vehicles and trailers and 16 RPTA vehicles. The vehicles are used for the ongoing maintenance of the 26.2-mile light rail line, support of contracted light rail operations, and for integrated agency staff use. The average mileage on our existing fleet is over 72,000 miles with some vehicles having over 150,000 miles on them. The average age of the fleet is approximately 6 years old. Most of the maintenance vehicles travel between 100 miles to 150 miles per day. The amount paid on the current 3-year contract that expires October 31, 2017 will be approximately $310,000. Valley Metro is expecting an expansion of non-revenue vehicles in the next 5 years.

Contractor will perform preventative maintenance and general repair services on non-revenue vehicles to include, but not limited to, brakes, suspension, heat/air conditioning systems, electrical systems, engine, tires, accident repairs, etc. Valley Metro's preference is to have a primary contractor that has the ability to perform all required services. The contractor is to provide drop off and pick up services, tow trucks if applicable, and manage all vehicle maintenance and repairs.

In June 2017, Valley Metro issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) soliciting qualified contractors for the provision of Non-Revenue Fleet Maintenance Services. The RFP included both VMR and RPTA non-revenue vehicles to seek the economies of scale and competition that a joint procurement between the two agencies can provide. The RFP included the following evaluation criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications &amp; Experience of the Firm</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications &amp; Experience of Assigned Personnel</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding/Approach to the Scope of Work</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points Available</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposals were submitted prior to the proposal closing date of July 21, 2017. The following proposals were received:

1. All Fleet Services, LLC
2. Berge Ford
3. Camelback Ford
4. Sun Devil Auto

A five member evaluation committee was comprised of Valley Metro staff and a representative of Valley Metro's light rail transportation services contractor. Proposals were evaluated using the evaluation criteria listed in the RFP. After review and scoring of the proposals, the evaluation committee identified All Fleet Services, LLC as deemed the most advantageous and the best offer meeting Valley Metro's requirements. An independent cost estimate and price analysis has been completed. The proposed price has been deemed fair and reasonable based on the independent cost estimate and price analysis. The following table shows each firm’s ranking on the basis of total points:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposers by Points and Rank Order</th>
<th>Technical Points</th>
<th>Price Points</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Rankings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Fleet Services, LLC</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berge Ford</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camelback Ford</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Devil Auto</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COST AND BUDGET**

The VMR contract amount for the three-year fleet maintenance services contract is an amount not to exceed $390,000. Cost for the Option years is $260,000 for a total five year value of $650,000. The RPTA contract amount for the three year fleet maintenance services contract is an amount not to exceed $30,000. Cost for the Option years is $18,000, for a total five-year value of $48,000.

The VMR contract obligation is $650,000 which is fully funded within the VMR Adopted FY 2018 Operating and Capital Budget. Contract Obligations beyond FY 2018 are incorporated into the VMR Five-Year Operating Forecast and Capital Program (FY 2018 thru FY 2022).

The RPTA contract obligation is $48,000 which is fully funded within the FY 2018 RPTA Adopted Operating Budget. Contract Obligations beyond FY 2018 are incorporated into the RPTA Five-Year Operating Forecast and Capital Program (FY 2018 – FY 2022).

**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: September 19, 2017 for information
TMC/RMC: October 4, 2017 for action
Board of Directors: October 19, 2017 for action

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the TMC/RMC forward to the Boards of Directors authorization for the CEO to execute a 3-year contract and two 1-year options with All Fleet Services, LLC for non-revenue vehicle fleet maintenance services in an amount not to exceed $698,000. VMR costs are $650,000 and RPTA costs are $48,000.

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

ATTACHMENT
None
DATE
September 27, 2017

SUBJECT
Travel, Expenditures and Solicitations

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSSION/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
## Valley Metro

### Travel Reimbursement Report

*For Travel Completion Dates 8/26/17 through 9/25/17*

<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 Operations Officer</td>
<td>SCADA Testing</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>8/27/17-8/31/17</td>
<td>$1,729.64</td>
<td>$316.40</td>
<td>$301.06</td>
<td>$742.68</td>
<td>$310.50</td>
<td>$59.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr Management Analyst</td>
<td>FTA 2017 Roundtable</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>8/27/17-8/30/17</td>
<td>$1,687.98</td>
<td>$425.40</td>
<td>$121.50</td>
<td>$899.58</td>
<td>$241.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Manager</td>
<td>SCADA Testing</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>8/27/17-8/31/17</td>
<td>$1,369.58</td>
<td>$316.40</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$742.68</td>
<td>$310.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCADA Network Administrator</td>
<td>SCADA Testing</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>8/27/17-8/31/17</td>
<td>$1,369.58</td>
<td>$316.40</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$742.68</td>
<td>$310.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Systems Engineer</td>
<td>SCADA Testing</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>8/27/17-8/31/17</td>
<td>$1,369.58</td>
<td>$316.40</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$742.68</td>
<td>$310.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Way Supervisor</td>
<td>SCADA Testing</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>8/27/17-8/31/17</td>
<td>$1,372.58</td>
<td>$316.40</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$742.68</td>
<td>$310.50</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Activation Manager</td>
<td>SCADA Testing</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>8/27/17-8/31/17</td>
<td>$1,369.58</td>
<td>$316.40</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$742.68</td>
<td>$310.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Engineer</td>
<td>CQM Contractor's Course</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>8/8/17-8/10/17</td>
<td>$531.26</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$417.26</td>
<td>$114.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Engineer</td>
<td>CQM Contractor's Course</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>8/8/17-8/10/17</td>
<td>$956.24</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$396.98</td>
<td>$417.26</td>
<td>$114.00</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Utilities Manager</td>
<td>CQM Contractor's Course</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>8/8/17-8/10/17</td>
<td>$369.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$255.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$114.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Security Coordinator</td>
<td>Transit Rail Incident Investigation</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>8/20/17-8/25/17</td>
<td>$2,663.13</td>
<td>$733.95</td>
<td>$50.38</td>
<td>$1,499.30</td>
<td>$379.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Report reflects Out of State (AZ) Travel*

*Parking*
<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>20170825W004</td>
<td>FirstGroup America, Inc.</td>
<td>July 2017 Fixed Route Bus Service - Unification</td>
<td>8/25/2017</td>
<td>5,172,662.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170915W</td>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>Wages Payable PPE 9-10-17</td>
<td>9/15/2017</td>
<td>480,405.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170901W005</td>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>PPE 8-27-17 Wages Payable - Reverse Wire</td>
<td>9/1/2017</td>
<td>461,988.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170901W004</td>
<td>United Healthcare</td>
<td>Sept 2017 EE Dental, Medical, Vision Coverage</td>
<td>9/1/2017</td>
<td>334,731.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170915W</td>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>Payroll Taxes PPE 9-10-17</td>
<td>9/1/2017</td>
<td>200,539.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170901W005</td>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>PPE 8-27-17 Federal, State, SS/Med EE/ER Tax - ACH</td>
<td>9/1/2017</td>
<td>194,584.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170901W003</td>
<td>Total Transit Enterprises, LLC</td>
<td>July 2017 Zoom (Avondale) Bus Run</td>
<td>9/1/2017</td>
<td>128,111.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170915W001</td>
<td>ASRS</td>
<td>ASRS Contributions Employee PPE 9-10-17</td>
<td>9/15/2017</td>
<td>87,147.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170915W001</td>
<td>ASRS</td>
<td>ASRS Contributions Employer</td>
<td>9/1/2017</td>
<td>84,127.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170901W006</td>
<td>ASRS</td>
<td>PPE 8-27-17 ASRS Contributions Employee</td>
<td>9/1/2017</td>
<td>84,127.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170901W006</td>
<td>ASRS</td>
<td>PPE 8-27-17 ASRS Contributions Employer</td>
<td>9/1/2017</td>
<td>84,127.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170901W003</td>
<td>Total Transit Enterprises, LLC</td>
<td>July 2017 Vee Quiva Bus Run</td>
<td>9/1/2017</td>
<td>81,578.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170901W003</td>
<td>Total Transit Enterprises, LLC</td>
<td>July 2017 Total Maintenance Costs</td>
<td>9/1/2017</td>
<td>75,112.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37299</td>
<td>City of Scottsdale - Remittance Processing</td>
<td>FY17 East Valley Recon</td>
<td>8/30/2017</td>
<td>66,347.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37360</td>
<td>Moses, Inc.</td>
<td>July &amp; Aug 2017 Marketing and Advertising</td>
<td>9/14/2017</td>
<td>51,570.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170825W001</td>
<td>CopperPoint Mutual Insurance Company</td>
<td>Sept 2017 Mobility Center Rent</td>
<td>8/25/2017</td>
<td>49,670.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R20170831W002</td>
<td>City of Mesa</td>
<td>August 2017 Utilities</td>
<td>8/31/2017</td>
<td>48,632.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37332</td>
<td>Creative Bus Sales dba Arizona Bus Sales</td>
<td>49192 2017 Ford Transit Van Silver</td>
<td>9/7/2017</td>
<td>47,314.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37332</td>
<td>Creative Bus Sales dba Arizona Bus Sales</td>
<td>49193 2017 Ford Transit Van Silver</td>
<td>9/7/2017</td>
<td>47,314.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37332</td>
<td>Creative Bus Sales dba Arizona Bus Sales</td>
<td>49194 2017 Ford Transit Van Silver</td>
<td>9/7/2017</td>
<td>47,314.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37332</td>
<td>Creative Bus Sales dba Arizona Bus Sales</td>
<td>49177 2017 Ford Transit Van Silver</td>
<td>9/7/2017</td>
<td>41,298.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37332</td>
<td>Creative Bus Sales dba Arizona Bus Sales</td>
<td>49180 2017 Ford Transit Van Silver</td>
<td>9/7/2017</td>
<td>40,788.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37332</td>
<td>Creative Bus Sales dba Arizona Bus Sales</td>
<td>49185 2017 Ford Transit Van Silver</td>
<td>9/7/2017</td>
<td>40,788.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37332</td>
<td>Creative Bus Sales dba Arizona Bus Sales</td>
<td>49191 2017 Ford Transit Van Silver</td>
<td>9/7/2017</td>
<td>40,788.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37332</td>
<td>Creative Bus Sales dba Arizona Bus Sales</td>
<td>49157 2017 Ford Transit Van Silver</td>
<td>9/7/2017</td>
<td>40,788.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37332</td>
<td>Creative Bus Sales dba Arizona Bus Sales</td>
<td>49170 2017 Ford Transit Van Silver</td>
<td>9/7/2017</td>
<td>40,788.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37332</td>
<td>Creative Bus Sales dba Arizona Bus Sales</td>
<td>49172 2017 Ford Transit Van Silver</td>
<td>9/7/2017</td>
<td>40,788.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37332</td>
<td>Creative Bus Sales dba Arizona Bus Sales</td>
<td>49173 2017 Ford Transit Van Silver</td>
<td>9/7/2017</td>
<td>40,788.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37332</td>
<td>Creative Bus Sales dba Arizona Bus Sales</td>
<td>49176 2017 Ford Transit Van Silver</td>
<td>9/7/2017</td>
<td>40,788.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37308</td>
<td>Graffiti Protective Coatings, Inc.</td>
<td>Apply Next Ride Decals to Phoenix Bus Stops</td>
<td>8/30/2017</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9152017</td>
<td>Wells Fargo</td>
<td>August 2017 Wells Fargo Credit Card Purchases</td>
<td>9/15/2017</td>
<td>36,047.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R20170831W009</td>
<td>SRP</td>
<td>August 2017 Utilities</td>
<td>8/31/2017</td>
<td>32,255.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37269</td>
<td>Knowledge Services</td>
<td>June 2017 IT Consultant Services</td>
<td>8/24/2017</td>
<td>29,237.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170901W003</td>
<td>Total Transit Enterprises, LLC</td>
<td>July 2017 Engine Replacement</td>
<td>9/1/2017</td>
<td>26,095.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 8,396,871.87
## Valley Metro Rail, Inc.
### Monthly AP Payments over $25,000
#### August 21, 2017 to September 20, 2017

<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>029419</td>
<td>Brookville Equipment Corp</td>
<td>Tempe Streetcar Acquisition Program</td>
<td>9/13/2017</td>
<td>3,488,434.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170901W</td>
<td>City of Mesa</td>
<td>May 2017 Gilbert Rd Ext Reimbursement #20</td>
<td>9/1/2017</td>
<td>2,985,496.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170825W006</td>
<td>Stacy and Witbeck-Sundt JV GRE</td>
<td>July 2017 Stacy and Witbeck Gilbert Rd Extension</td>
<td>8/25/2017</td>
<td>2,228,032.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170901W002</td>
<td>Stacy and Witbeck 50th St/Tempe SC</td>
<td>June 2017 Tempe Streetcar Project</td>
<td>9/1/2017</td>
<td>1,082,368.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029450</td>
<td>Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.</td>
<td>July 2017 Tempe Streetcar Design</td>
<td>9/13/2017</td>
<td>977,772.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170908W</td>
<td>AECOM Technical Services</td>
<td>June 2017 S Central Extension</td>
<td>9/8/2017</td>
<td>825,211.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170915W003</td>
<td>Stacy and Witbeck 50th St/Tempe SC</td>
<td>July 2017 50th ST Station</td>
<td>9/15/2017</td>
<td>533,503.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029359</td>
<td>Aconex (North America) Inc.</td>
<td>New Licenses, Project Controls</td>
<td>9/7/2017</td>
<td>423,545.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029316</td>
<td>SRP Miscellaneous Accts Receivable</td>
<td>June 2017 Gilbert Rd Extension Utilities</td>
<td>8/23/2017</td>
<td>313,230.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170901W</td>
<td>City of Mesa</td>
<td>June 2017 Gilbert Rd Ext Reimbursement #21</td>
<td>9/1/2017</td>
<td>260,152.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20170831W</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>August 2017 Utilities</td>
<td>8/31/2017</td>
<td>226,555.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170901W001</td>
<td>DMS - Facility Services, Inc.</td>
<td>July 2017 Facilities and LRV Cleaning Services</td>
<td>9/1/2017</td>
<td>171,905.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170908W004</td>
<td>PB-Wong Joint Venture</td>
<td>July 2017 GRE Project Management Construction Management</td>
<td>9/8/2017</td>
<td>161,770.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170908W001</td>
<td>ARCADIS</td>
<td>July 2017 Task 14 Consulting Support Services</td>
<td>9/8/2017</td>
<td>130,233.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029381</td>
<td>Hill International, Inc.</td>
<td>July 2017 Tempe Streetcar Task 2</td>
<td>9/7/2017</td>
<td>125,968.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029381</td>
<td>Hill International, Inc.</td>
<td>July 2017 S Central Extension Task 3</td>
<td>9/7/2017</td>
<td>100,681.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20170831W020</td>
<td>SRP</td>
<td>August 2017 Utilities</td>
<td>8/31/2017</td>
<td>89,209.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170825W004</td>
<td>RouteMatch Software, Inc.</td>
<td>July 2017 Routematch Services</td>
<td>8/25/2017</td>
<td>72,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170825W002</td>
<td>Jacobs Engineering</td>
<td>June 2017 Gilbert Rd Extension Design Svcs</td>
<td>8/25/2017</td>
<td>61,909.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170915W001</td>
<td>Jacobs Engineering</td>
<td>July 2017 Gilbert Rd Extension Design Services</td>
<td>9/15/2017</td>
<td>53,802.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029395</td>
<td>Motorola Solutions</td>
<td>16 System Radios</td>
<td>9/7/2017</td>
<td>53,562.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20170831W004</td>
<td>City of Mesa</td>
<td>August 2017 Utilities</td>
<td>8/31/2017</td>
<td>46,420.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029441</td>
<td>Motorola Solutions</td>
<td>14 System Radios</td>
<td>9/13/2017</td>
<td>45,671.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029421</td>
<td>City of Phoenix</td>
<td>TVM Ticket Rolls</td>
<td>9/13/2017</td>
<td>44,485.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170825W005</td>
<td>Scheidt &amp; Bachmann</td>
<td>7/1/17-6/30/18 TVM and HHV Hardware Support</td>
<td>8/25/2017</td>
<td>44,136.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170908W001</td>
<td>ARCADIS</td>
<td>July 2017 Task 13 Consulting Support Services</td>
<td>9/8/2017</td>
<td>42,231.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029337</td>
<td>City of Phoenix</td>
<td>Aug. 2017 - Fare Handling Fee</td>
<td>8/30/2017</td>
<td>38,907.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029356</td>
<td>United Right-of-Way</td>
<td>July 2017 Facilities Landskpeing Services</td>
<td>8/30/2017</td>
<td>35,658.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029381</td>
<td>Hill International, Inc.</td>
<td>July 2017 50th ST Station PMCM Services</td>
<td>9/7/2017</td>
<td>31,865.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20170831W013</td>
<td>City of Phoenix</td>
<td>August 2017 Utilities</td>
<td>9/13/2017</td>
<td>29,562.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029443</td>
<td>Nelson Engineering Company</td>
<td>HVAC Brackets</td>
<td>9/13/2017</td>
<td>28,980.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029421</td>
<td>City of Phoenix</td>
<td>June 2017 NWE Costs</td>
<td>9/13/2017</td>
<td>28,214.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14,862,102.20
### ACTIVE SOLICITATIONS

<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>RFQ</td>
<td>Northwest Extension Design</td>
<td>4/25/2017</td>
<td>7/6/2017</td>
<td>Cancelled - To be reissued September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Agency Owned Vehicle Fleet Maintenance</td>
<td>6/19/2017</td>
<td>7/24/2017</td>
<td>11/16/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Federal Legislative Consulting Services</td>
<td>8/21/2017</td>
<td>9/21/2017</td>
<td>11/16/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>State Legislative Consulting Services</td>
<td>8/21/2017</td>
<td>9/21/2017</td>
<td>11/16/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFB</td>
<td>Motor and Center Truck Overhaul Parts</td>
<td>9/21/2017</td>
<td>10/19/2017</td>
<td>11/16/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Marketing Materials Storage &amp; Distribution Service</td>
<td>9/28/2017</td>
<td>10/26/2017</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>OMC Expansion - 2 step Design/Build</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>5/17/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>CARE Evaluation</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>2/1/2018</td>
<td>5/17/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Ride Choice</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>2/1/2018</td>
<td>5/17/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFQ</td>
<td>Northwest Extension Design</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>11/2/2017</td>
<td>2/15/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFB</td>
<td>Uniforms</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UPCOMING SOLICITATIONS

<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>OMC Expansion - 2 step Design/Build</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>5/17/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>CARE Evaluation</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>2/1/2018</td>
<td>5/17/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Ride Choice</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>2/1/2018</td>
<td>5/17/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFQ</td>
<td>Northwest Extension Design</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>11/2/2017</td>
<td>2/15/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFB</td>
<td>Uniforms</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE
September 27, 2017

SUBJECT
Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events

PURPOSE
Chairs Basha and Brady 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

September 27, 2017

Transit Management Committee

Wednesday, October 4, 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 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 September 6, 2017 TMC meeting are presented for approval.

3. **Valley Metro Code of Conduct**

   Memo under development.

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

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

5. **Next Meeting**

   The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for Wednesday, November 1, 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
DATE
September 27, 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
Members Present
Paul Basha, City of Scottsdale, Chair
Kevin Phelps, City of Glendale, Vice Chair
Roger Klingler, City of Buckeye
Marsha Reed, City of Chandler
James Shano, City of El Mirage
Jacob Ellis, Town of Gilbert
Reed Kempton, Maricopa County
Chris Brady, City of Mesa
Jeff Tyne, City of Peoria
Ed Zuercher, City of Phoenix
Nicole Lance, City of Surprise - phone
Steven Methvin, City of Tempe

Members Not Present
Gina Montes, City of Avondale
Aubree Perry, ADOT
City of Tolleson

Chair Basha called the meeting to order at 11:32 a.m.

1. Public Comment on Agenda Action Items

Mr. Crowley said I consider myself a resident of Maricopa County, but at the moment I have a permanent residence in Phoenix.

The items that I'll be addressing on this are the fixed route paratransit and also the proposed changes.

On the fixed route paratransit eligibility certification and travel training services, you guys get a gold star in what you've done with that, because your mission statement and what you're doing coalesce and you do it according to what the federal standards are. As onto the proposed changes, where are each one of your communities working with Valley Metro to, oh, let's say, where's the Litchfield bus? It's enough for your west side
communities that supposedly was in the works for this year in the document you put out back in '06 and I'll bring it to the next meeting so that you can see, sir, what it is that you guys have stated you were going to be doing in the past and see if we can get it to where it's what it's supposed to be.

On the proposed changes, which one of your communities is going to be intermodal with your changes? I love that the joint meeting a moment ago is supposedly both sides of the coin, but when it comes to intermodal, I look at the stop up there on Dunlap and 19th Avenue and I go, well, wait a minute. The transit police don't work on the bus there. They're there for the light rail. And it's also fascinating with the murder that happened this weekend where their high definition camera work that they said they didn't know who the suspect was or anything like that.

Now that might have been just for the media's dispersal, but from what I understood the reason you got that was to be able to help that situation or situations like that out so that the police would have a leg up on who did what. And since you've got cameras there at that stop both in the bus part and the light rail and this did happen in the light rail, why isn't there a better resolution for this or the communication that they had on the TV. So I'd like you to expand all of your routing that way your fixed route paratransit has to match it. Let's get both of them more and both of your communities.

2. Minutes

Chair Basha said the minutes from the August 2, 2017 TMC meeting were presented for approval.

IT WAS MOVED BY KEVIN PHELPS, SECONDED BY ED ZUERCHER AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE AUGUST 2, 2017 TMC MEETING.

3. Authorization to Issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Paratransit Eligibility Certification and Fixed-Route Travel Training Services

Chair Basha said Mr. Smith, Item 3. Authorization to Issue a Request for Proposals.

Mr. Smith said thank you. This is simply what will allow us to issue a request for proposal related to our evaluation services and certification services at our Mobility Center. It takes place there.

When anyone uses our eligible paratransit or whatever, they must go through a process where they're evaluated. And what we try to do is match a person with the services that fit them best. There are many people that actually if they are coached and are told how to use the system can actually use our fixed-route system better than they can use a paratransit and it suits their needs. It also allows us to have some sort of cost containment because we have the right people and people who truly need the service using a service for which costs the most.
And this is to issue an RFP to an outside -- we use an outside contractor to perform these evaluation and certification services, and this is just to issue the RFP to start that process.

Chair Basha said thank you, Mr. Smith. Are there any questions or comments from the Board?

Mr. Klingler said Mr. Chair, Mr. Smith, just the best value selection method is -- means not necessarily low cost, not necessarily most qualified but sort of a combination of that. Just clarification, please.

Mr. Smith said that is correct. It's taking the entire panel and taking basically a lowest cost as opposed to a lowest price. There's a variety of factors that go into evaluating these firms: experience, personnel, and cost is certainly an important one. We want to make sure we have the right people doing in here doing that, so, yes.

Chair Basha said thank you, Mr. Klingler. Any other comments? Is there a motion and a second to approve this authorization?

**IT WAS MOVED BY STEVEN METHVIN, SECONDED BY KEVIN PHELPS AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO FORWARD TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CEO TO ISSUE A FEDERALLY COMPLIANT RFP FOR A TOTAL TERM OF SIX YEARS (THREE-YEAR BASE CONTRACT, PLUS ONE THREE-YEAR RENEWAL OPTION) TO PROVIDE PARATRANSIT ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION AND FIXED-ROUTE TRAVEL TRAINING SERVICES.**

4. **Proposed April 2018 Transit Service Changes**

Chair Basha said Item No. 4, Mr. Smith, Proposed April 2018 Transit Service Changes.

Mr. Smith said thank you. As you are now all very well familiar I think by this time, twice a year we actually go through formal service changes. This process is a lengthy one, and we have changes coming up that will be implemented in October. The next ones will be in April of 2018.

And to satisfy both our public outreach requirements and also legal requirements, federal law specifically, we start early with the proposed changes and go through a variety of steps. Today is one of the first steps in that, and we'll hear from Joe Gregory.

Mr. Gregory provided a presentation which included the following:

- Proposed Changes (4 slides)
- Public Outreach Plan

Ms. Lance said one quick question from the City of Surprise, how far in advance are we going to get notice of where and when you're holding the public information meetings?
Mr. Gregory said we'll let you know as soon as we get that locked down and, at least, probably, hopefully, like a month ahead of time.

Chair Basha said Ms. Lance, is a month in advance sufficient for you?

Ms. Lance said yes, that will be good. I just need to give council enough lead time because they're going to want to publicize it and make sure they can attend.

Chair Basha said very good. Any other questions for Mr. Gregory? This item is for information only so no motion or action is necessary.

5. Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events

None.

With no further discussion the meeting adjourned at 11:43 a.m.
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This memo is currently be developed.
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Rail Management Committee
Wednesday, October 4, 2017
Lake Powell Conference Room
101 N. 1st Avenue, 10th Floor
11:00 a.m.

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 September 6, 2017 RMC meeting are presented for approval.

CONSENT AGENDA

3A. Gilbert Road LRT Extension Construction Manager at Risk Contract Contingency Modification

Staff recommends that the RMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to increase the Gilbert Road LRT Extension (GRE) construction contingency by $5 million, which will be held by Valley Metro staff and made available to the Construction Manager at Risk (CM@Risk), Stacy and Witbeck/Sundt, a Joint Venture, as needed to complete the construction of the project.

3B. Gilbert Road LRT Extension Public Art Services Contract Amendments

Staff recommends that the RMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to amend two Public Art Services contracts for GRE for an amount not to exceed $117,365 plus an additional $11,737 (10%) contingency.
REGULAR AGENDA

4. **South Central Light Rail Extension Project Update and Contract Amendments**

Scott Smith, CEO, will introduce Wulf Grote, Director, Capital and Service Development, who will request that the RMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to approve contract amendments to facilitate the proposed downtown changes as follows:

- Design (AECOM) - $2,487,000
- Construction Manager at Risk (Kiewit) - $400,000
- Public Artist Services (Artists to be defined) - $700,000

4. For action

5. **Valley Metro Code of Conduct**

   Memo under development.

5. For action

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

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

6. For information

7. **Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the RMC is scheduled for **Wednesday, November 1, 2017 at 11:00 a.m.**

7. For Information

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)
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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.
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602-262-7433
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Minutes

DATE
September 27, 2017

Minutes from the
Rail Management Committee
Wednesday, September 6, 2017
Lake Powell Conference Room
101 N. 1st Avenue, Suite 1000
Phoenix, AZ
11:00 a.m.

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

Chair Brady called the meeting to order at 11:44 a.m.

1. Public Comment on Agenda Action Items

Mr. Crowley said for the action items it's all of them that I'll be trying to deal with.
First off, well, do you remember that design you showed us didn't have my bike stuff in
there. Is this going to be in compliance with the bike lane and having it being both
multimodal and safe?

The Systems Design Contract I'd go into, but it's more confusing for me than it should
be.

As to the Motor and Center Truck Overhaul Program, one of the things that we have to
keep on overhauling these vehicles on is wear and tear on the wheels. That was a big
expenditure you guys just did, what, two months ago. One of the ways I would suggest
for both improving the system and cutting down on that amount of wear and tear would
be to start considering magnetic levitation as a part of the way you get these things
down the road. Because if you're using mag lev, the amount of abrasive on the wheels
isn't because it's floating on air.

As to the Northwest Extension, I still believe that you're doing the wrong routing. That
instead of going up to Mountain View and then making a new transit center up on
Peoria and 19th, I know that the elected feels that this is the best way she knows to get
the rail to be going to ASU West, but I see it as where you could have put the routing
through the AC/DC there and taking it to the already existing Park-and-Ride and
multiple bus. But then why would you do that when you've already spent, what,
seventeen million originally in the seventies for that bus situation and another how many
for the 250 Park-and-Ride spaces. I know we just got it on a lease, but when you invest
like that, you should be getting more bang for the buck.

And then lastly with your having the transit police, which are actually just the rail police going through all this new training and that, what is their primary job in that? What I thought it was to check the passes, not to enforce what you may feel is a socialization of those people on the rail. Thank you for your time.

2. **Minutes**

Chair Brady said minutes from the September 6, 2017 RMC meeting are presented for approval.

**IT WAS MOVED BY KEVIN PHELPS, SECONDED BY ED ZUERCHER AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 6, 2017 RMC MINUTES.**

3. **Consent Agenda**

Chair Brady said we now have a consent item which includes 3A, 3B and 3C. There is an item 3B that's fairly large. Maybe you'd like to get a briefing on that. Okay.

Mr. Smith said I will introduce Wulf Grote.

Mr. Grote said Chair, members of the committee, the Systems Design Contract is one that’s going to actually support a number of our extension projects for rail. Initially, we used to include in the past couple of projects, we include the systems engineering element as part of the design package. We decided in this case for the future that we wanted to separate that out because we wanted to have some consistency in the systems elements: in our communication systems, our fare collection system, our traction power systems. We wanted to make sure that we had consistency from one contract to the next and one project to the next. So we felt that having a separate systems designer would help us to provide the consistency that we’re looking for.

So we're looking to have this team to be on board with us for the initial five-year period with options to extend for three more years beyond that.

Chair Brady said so, maybe, trying to be clear, so it's for a period of time, not necessarily for the actual scope that will be laid down?

Mr. Grote said it's for a period of time for a maximum amount that we'll expend and we will negotiate each individual task order with them for each individual project going forward.

Mr. Zuercher said how do you allocate the cost? By project? By membership? How do
you allocate this $30 million cost?

Mr. Grote said it gets allocated by project. We have a budget as part of each of our project budgets. It includes systems engineering cost as part of that. That’s correct.

Chair Brady said and this cost would have otherwise have been in the actual -- the specific designers for that project. You’re just pulling this all back so you’ll be comprehensive for the whole system.

Mr. Grote said that’s correct.

Mr. Smith said we would have normally let, you know, four separate contracts, which obviously creates challenges. And since we have South Central, Northwest, Cap/I-10, all those the idea was to bring them together under one -- have one single firm that would handle all of them to create that consistency in integration.

Chair Brady said I think the point is that the $30 million doing it the other way would have still been spent. It would have been just spread among the different design teams.

Mr. Smith said correct.

Chair Brady said now you’re pulling that out -- you're not having that service provided now by those other individuals.

Mr. Smith said that’s correct.

Chair Brady said very good. Okay. Any other questions on the consent items? All right. It's proposed that we approve the consent items again, 3A, 3B and 3C. Do I have a motion for approval?

**IT WAS MOVED BY ED ZUERCHER, SECONDED BY KEVIN PHELPS AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA.**

4. **Northwest Phase II Light Rail Extension Project Overview**

Chair Brady said we're now ready to go on for some items for information. We have Items 4 and 5 related to the Northwest Phase II Light Rail Extension Project Overview.

Mr. Smith said Chair, we figure that since Northwest II is now rapidly coming upon the scene and we’re working diligently to get things started that we haven't really had an overview for quite a while, so I'd like to introduce Abhi Dayal, who is our capital development manager, to give you a quick overview of exactly what Northwest II is because it's sort of slipped into somewhat obscurity with all the talk of Gilbert Road and Tempe Streetcar and South Central, but it's obviously still very important, so Abhi.
Mr. Dayal provided a presentation which included the following:

✓ Future Transit System
✓ Previous Board Actions
✓ Locally Preferred Alternative – Feb. 2015
✓ Project Funding
✓ Project Status
✓ Northwest Phase II LRT Extension
✓ Dunlap/25th Avenue Station
✓ 25th Avenue Station
✓ Metrocenter Station
✓ Project Design Considerations
✓ End-of-Line Configuration
✓ Next Steps

Mr. Methvin said this is exactly what that area needs. I'm happy to see it moving forward. With the buildings where the transit center are going to be, is Metro looking to any adaptive re-use of any of those buildings there, or are they planning on just raising the buildings and building new?

Mr. Dayal said thank you for that question. In fact, let me actually go back to that slide. So one of the key landmarks in this area is the Souper Salad building, which has a very unique architecture, and so we've been working with the City of Phoenix Historic Preservation Office to identify ways to preserve the integrity of that building and explore some ways to see if there are any adaptive re-use opportunities.

We've also been engaging with City of Phoenix Public Transit Department to potentially see if there might be any uses that this proposed transit center might be able to accommodate.

Mr. Smith said we're very sensitive to the fact that buildings built in the 1970s really have significant historical presence here in the Phoenix area. But actually, this one, it is sort of a landmark. It's a unique design and we're working closely -- Phoenix and Valley Metro -- to integrate that as best we can into the transit.

And I actually think it makes sort of a cool presence, so there is no movement to just scrape the site. We are going to try and re-use and adapt whatever structures that we can in that area. And it will be sort of cool because of the elevated stop, so you combine that you'll have very much of a modernistic type of experience anyway.

Mr. Methvin said Mr. Smith, there's a, you know, great history in the Valley with those old bank buildings, so while it's a salad place now it wasn't once a salad place. And I don't remember which one. I think it was a savings and loan, so it's great that we are able to maintain some of that history.
Mr. Smith said we're going to do the best we can.

5. **Northwest Phase II Light Rail Extension Construction Management at Risk Contract Award**

Mr. Smith said we will have Wulf do a very quick overview of this award because we're both awarding this, but also -- and the reason why I want him to do one was we're bringing a construction manager at risk (CMAR) on earlier than we normally might have. We're trying something new, which has created a couple little hiccups.

Normally, we wait until actually after 30 percent design to bring on the CMAR, which is somewhat counter-productive because the idea of having a construction manager on early is to take advantage of their knowledge and their involvement to help design the project. So we're bringing the construction manager on much earlier than we have in the past, and so I wanted Wulf to give you just a little bit of overview of what we expect and then also present the item that relates to the first part of work that we want this construction manager to do. Wulf.

Mr. Grote said Chair, members of the committee, the idea is to bring the contractor on board early to work very closely with our design team to make sure that we address constructability issues early, we have a better understanding of cost, you know, all those kinds of things that are very important to us.

So we did receive four qualification statements, and we interviewed all four of those firms. And the recommendation that we have is to award to Kiewit-McCarthy, which is a joint venture. And the award at this point in time is for the pre-construction period only, so it's $1.6 million that we're requesting that we award the contract for now plus a 10 percent contingency that we want to hold for unforeseen circumstances, but we will be back to the Board at a later date to work out the guaranteed maximum price as we get closer to the construction phase.

Chair Brady said all right. Very good. So do we have a motion to award this portion of the CMR to Kiewit-McCarthy. Do I have a motion to approve?

Mr. Zuercher said my memory is we've not had this combination of contractors before; is that correct? Kiewit-McCarthy, is that a unique combination to any of our work before?

Mr. Grote said I don't believe that McCarthy has been a part of our team that I can remember in the past, so the Kiewit-McCarthy joint venture is definitely a first that we've seen.

Mr. Zuercher said and what was it that distinguished this as the number one firm?

Mr. Grote said I would have to call upon our panel that -- is there anybody here.
Mr. Spong said this team was number one in the technical, and they were also number one in their proposal for the costing. They were basically the number one group out of all the other teams and they basically technically had the best proposal as for coming across with the overall technical needs, staffing approach -- it was the technical.

It's the staffing and with the technical approach for the bridge. And there's basically three bridges that are there and one is a major bridge plus the station itself. McCarthy as we all know is a very large vertical building contractor which helped out with the structure itself and the station. The bridge itself over the I-17 is unique -- and the geotechnical aspects of the foundations were discussed and pointed out. Also with the bridge and the rail, it's a unique system. And they did a very good job. There were four very good proposals, but two of them were outstanding. Again, the McCarthy-Kiewit team was the best.

IT WAS MOVED BY ED ZUERCHER, SECONDED BY MARSHA REED AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO FORWARD TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CEO TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT FOR THE NORTHWEST PHASE II LIGHT RAIL EXTENSION CM@RISK CONTRACTOR FOR PRE-CONSTRUCTION SERVICES, WITH KIEWIT-MCCARTHY FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $1,600,000 PLUS AN ADDITIONAL $160,000 (10%) CONTINGENCY.

6. Administrative Office Space Lease – 14th Floor

Chair Brady said we will now move to Item 6. Office Space Lease 14th Floor.

Mr. Smith said I'm just going to introduce Rob Antoniak. Just to give you a brief introduction, which I think I did during our CEO report, I think we've been talking for a while about the increased space needs related to these projects, so I'll turn it over to Rob who's been managing this process for us. Rob.

Mr. Antoniak said good afternoon, Chair and RMC members, and I was hoping to get up here and say ditto to what Scott said, but I don't get that luxury.

In front of you today is basically a request to authorize the CEO to execute an expansion of our existing lease. And what's the driving force behind this is the capital projects, as Mr. Smith alluded to in his CEO comments, that we will, in essence, go to the 11th floor, which is currently housed by four different divisions, and move the capital service and delivery team to the 11th and the 12th floor, so all of our capital projects will be housed between those two floors.

We'll gain some efficiencies by doing so. And in doing so we need to expand, so with more projects comes more staff comes more space needs. And we ended up in a situation where the 14th floor right above us was vacant, keeps our staff in a building that's contiguous with each other, and we gain a lot of efficiencies through that.
The details and the numbers of which are in front of you in that memo. I would add that it also allows us to work through some procurements to make sure we outfit the office accordingly.

So if you have any questions, that's a display board in front of you. It's also up on the screen -- that's a simple floor plan, and it shows that the executive offices as well as the human resource office moved to 14.

Chair Brady said Rob, an eight-and-a-half-year term what dictated that number?

Mr. Antoniak said the termination date of the existing lease with the existing space we have drove us to that number. The landlord was able to co-terminate this to June of 2026. So funding sunsets for some reason or another that's not far after the funding sunset.

Chair Brady said okay. That makes sense. Yes Kevin you have a question?

Mr. Phelps said so when we were going through budget for 17/18 there was a case presented to the Board going in-house with FTEs versus using outside. And it was kind of a business case that was kind of presented. Just curious as to -- I can't recall -- did we put in that analysis what our additional cost for office space is going to be as part of that?

Mr. Smith said Chair, Kevin, absolutely. This $400,000 was included in the budget projections and the budgeting for those.

Mr. Phelps said when we were being asked to approve kind of going to a different model, which is having more full-time staff versus the use of consultants, when we did that analysis there was some cost savings that were presented to us. And I was just trying to recall whether or not that when we showed what the net savings were going to be by going in-house versus using outside consultants, did we also factor in kind of the half million the first year and then $400,000 subsequent years as part of that analysis?

Mr. Smith said we did not, as I recall, include a specific number, and Paul can give better numbers, because the space needs are the same whether we use consultants or in-house. The only difference is that when we use consultants they actually charge us a lower rate than -- which helps supposedly to cover the cost as opposed to if they're sited offsite, they charge us full rate. They give us a little bit of a rate reduction. And Paul can you give you some more details as to how we handle that in the budget.

Mr. Hodgins said that's actually exactly correct. It doesn't impact the space needs because we're using the same space whether they're a consultant or agency staff member.

Mr. Phelps said and I guess just a final question then, in light of still I think we're getting
less concern, but there's still uncertainty regarding New Start moneys and the feds. This is obviously an 8.5-year commitment on space, you know, walk me through kind of your risk assessment of whether we're going to sit here at one point in time kind of scratching your head and being tied down to an eight-and-a-half-year lease.

Mr. Smith said our thought process was the reason we're here in September as opposed to last April or March when this first came up was that very analysis.

And frankly, we waited to see what the tenor was in Washington related to the overall funding of transit projects through the Capital Investment Grant Program. And we waited till we got a little bit of certainty that Congress, for example, was not going to follow the administration's proposal to eliminate that. Congress both through the '17 budgeting and through the bills that have been passed out of committee so far have included full funding for the capital -- the CIG program as it relates back to the FAST Act that was approved. It's funding House levels, I think at FAST Act -- you have a legislative update in front of you.

We waited until those were completed before we moved on. So we actually waited four months to bring this to you. I will tell you this is still -- we're at risk. But we're always at risk. We have done our programs where we front the money for planning and then were reimbursed with federal moneys. From the beginning program through every Gilbert Road, Tempe, South Central, all the ones that we have now we front the money, either through city funds or through regional funds.

So basically we're going to need this space. And there's always the chance that we may plan a project and then not receive federal funding on it. That's always the risk, but you have to plan it before you get to that stage.

We decided that after seeing Congress move toward a sense of normalcy where they were going to continue to fund these projects that the risk level had lowered to the point that we were willing to basically go forward, satisfy our space needs, and proceed as if we are going to get funded out of the normal course.

Mr. Phelps said when negotiating the lease, normally on an eight-and-a-half-year lease you get the landlord to participate in tenant allowances. So kind of walk me through the kind of the analysis of why we choose to, you know, kind of absorb those costs rather than build them into a lease, get some credit by the landlord, and then amortize those over a longer period of time.

Mr. Antoniak said the additional allowance is for the purposes of furniture and fixtures and equipment. The actual tenant improvements that you see, right now the shell on the 14th floor is literally a shell except for about a third of it which will get slightly re-purposed, but the landlord is taking care of 100 percent of that as a part of that lease.

Mr. Smith said the reason why it's worded like it is now, we obviously have a timing
issue here where we needed the space yesterday.

We're asking for specific approval of the lease, but we'll also have allowance there for the FF&E. And the reason for that is if we were to wait for this whole process to go through, once we then went out and procured for the FF&E we'd be sitting with empty space -- paying rent for 60 to 90 days.

So we're asking for a little bit of leeway as far as being able to jointly negotiate and procure some furniture fixtures while the lease process is going through so that we can have that ready for when the space is actually ready which is anticipated probably in December sometime.

Mr. Methvin said thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Smith, Mr. Grote, when I read this memo the first time I thought I had an understanding of what it was that Valley Metro was attempting to do. I'm probably not too far off.

But now when I look at this 14th floor plan, it says that the executive offices and human services are going to -- human resources are going to move up to the 14th floor. So when I read this, I thought this was a temporary eight-and-a-half-year fix to something. But when I look at this, that's your offices and human services moving up there, so this isn't an eight year temporary thing. We're taking over this floor and in perpetuity; correct?

Mr. Smith said the funding for this entire agency really is up in question after December 31, 2025. I mean, once Prop 400 funds move out -- actually, 2026 because we do have funds to carry over. But once those funds are out, there are no funds available to continue on. And we would have to make significant decisions or changes based on that reality regardless of what we are doing.

So the question is what would happen if the funding continues. We'll still have the need for all these projects because I'm assuming whatever the replacement is for Prop 400 it will contain several capital projects and this space will probably be necessary.

Worst-case scenario what will happen is if capital projects are reduced after 2026 we'll move out of one of the probably floor 11, let's say, and we might have a gap in the floors between what we have and what we have expanded and what we really need.

So from your standpoint, yes, we're moving up to gain some efficiencies so that we can have our planning our capital group using all of the floor, so that if those projects continue they still have that space. If they don't, we can easily repurpose or walk away from one of the floors and still have more efficiencies than had we had this bifurcated where we have planning spread among three or floor different floors which would have been very inefficient if the situation we're talking about where funding does expire, we would be scrambling at that point in time to move divisions and departments to consolidate them. We're doing that right now.
Mr. Methvin said I had connected all were one-time consultants and we brought them in as staff a couple meetings ago. I had connected the expansion to a new floor being that we're bringing in all of these new staff members, but then I was, I guess, I was just surprised to see this floor was for human resources and the executive office. I understand what you're saying is that you're going to get some efficiencies by you vacating the executive offices moving up to the new space and being able to expand in there. I just had a different understanding from the memo.

Mr. Smith said and, once again, whether we have outside consultants or in-house, the space needs are exactly the same.

For example, we have several offices that the City of Phoenix occupies because of their involvement in two major projects: 50th Street project and South Central, which will then expand more. So we provide office space for efficiency purpose to the City. We also provide office space to our consultants. And whether it is a consultant or Valley Metro employee, the space needs are virtually the same.

Mr. Methvin said sure. I guess what I would ask is that you would expand the memo to be more clear for the Board just who's moving where and what we're doing. We're getting these and maybe they were provided to staff.

Mr. Smith said we can do that. As opposed to saying we're moving up to the 14th, basically -- and we can do that in the memo. We're moving, for example, human resources who takes up a part of the 11th. We're moving them up to 14 for a couple reasons. First is to clear space for capital.

The other thing is provide them a secure space. Right now they have no dedicated interview conference room. It's difficult physically for them to separate employment records.

So, you know, there's a couple things we're doing by moving them from the 11th. First of all, we clear space and accomplish efficiencies there. But the other thing is we have a better, more secure situation for our human resources as we hire these people or manage these people. So we'll expand the memo to include those explanations.

Mr. Phelps said so two quick questions then. So what is our average rate for the first four floors? Approximately, what are we paying?

Mr. Antoniak said currently we're paying $24.50 on this current year and it escalates $.50 cents a foot per year until the end of the lease; correct? And keep in mind that that was negotiated in 2014 coming out of the downturn of the economy when this building didn't have a lot of -- or it had a lot of vacancy. Today, the effective rate is $28.50 a foot and escalates in the same rate.

Mr. Phelps said so, following up kind of on Mr. Methvin's comments, I mean, it seems to
me obviously when you build out for your executive level departments, the quality of build out is going to be a little bit different. Is that what's driving the differential between 24 and 30 dollars -- or $30.48 that we currently or it's embedded in this new lease?

Mr. Antoniak said actually, the build out and the tenant improvements were based on the 13th and the 12th floor build outs. The materials that are being used are based on the 13th floor, so it's basically identical materials to what we have today. There was definitely some -- and I can go through them in detail with anybody that wants to about kind of what divisions are moving and some of the stuff that Mr. Smith alluded to here in terms of some of the efficiencies if you'd like me to.

Chair Brady said are there any other questions? If not, can I get a motion to approve entering into the lease for the 14th floor?

IT WAS MOVED BY KEVIN PHELPS, SECONDED BY ED ZUERCHER AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO FORWARD TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER (CEO) TO EXECUTE AN 8.5-YEAR LEASE AGREEMENT FOR THE 14TH FLOOR IN THE 101 NORTH FIRST AVENUE BUILDING WITH USBC REAL ESTATE, LLC AT AN AVERAGE RATE OF $403,668 PER YEAR, EXCLUDING TAXES AND AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CEO TO ISSUE PROCUREMENTS AND ENTER INTO AGREEMENTS FOR STAFF RELocation, FURNISHINGS AND EQUIPMENT NOT TO EXCEED $500,000 IN TOTAL.

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

None.

With no further discussion the meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.
DATE
September 27, 2017

AGENDA ITEM 3A

SUBJECT
Gilbert Road LRT Extension Construction Manager at Risk Contract Contingency Modification

PURPOSE
To request authorization for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to increase the Gilbert Road LRT Extension (GRE) construction contract contingency by $5,000,000, which will be held by Valley Metro staff and made available to the Construction Manager at Risk (CM@Risk), Stacy and Witbeck/Sundt (SWS), a Joint Venture, as needed to complete the construction of the project.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
The contract for SWS was executed in October 2015. There have also been two Board approved amendments as summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>Preconstruction</td>
<td>$1,275,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>Early Construction</td>
<td>$9,676,228</td>
<td>$967,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2017</td>
<td>Full Notice to Proceed</td>
<td>$99,999,308</td>
<td>$4,999,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$110,950,536</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,967,588</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since that time construction contract changes have occurred including several City of Mesa funded Concurrent Non-Project Activities (CNPA) such as sewer replacement and lining, upgrades of the LeSueur Street pedestrian crossing, and overhead to underground electrical related changes totaling nearly $2 million. While the Concurrent Non-Project Activities are funded outside of the project, their execution still increase the CM@Risk Contractor’s total contract value. The current Board authorized contingency for the CM@Risk contract totals $5,967,588, or approximately 5% of the awarded contract total of $110,950,536. Most of the remaining CM@Risk contract contingency is either spent or anticipated to be used through pending change orders. Approximately $700,000 remains.

Given that project construction will not be complete until mid-2019, it is anticipated that additional change orders will occur and that more construction contract contingency will be needed. To avoid project delay and allow the contractor to continue with their efforts, staff recommends that an additional $5 million be allocated to the CM@Risk contract contingency. This will bring the total contract contingency to just under 10% of the construction contract, which is typically the amount of contingency requested from the Board for other Valley Metro construction projects.

Board action is needed to authorize the CEO to allocate the proposed $5 million increase to contract contingency for the CM@Risk contract.
COST AND BUDGET
The current total CM@Risk contract authority is $116,918,124. The amount of the proposed increase to contract contingency is $5 million, bringing the total contract authority to $121,918,124. Funds are available in the project’s overall contingency and this change will not increase the overall project budget of $186,029,221.

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: September 19, 2017 for information
RMC: October 4, 2017 for action
Board of Directors: October 19, 2017 for action

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the RMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to increase the Gilbert Road LRT Extension (GRE) construction contingency by $5 million, which will be held by Valley Metro staff and made available to the Construction Manager at Risk (CM@Risk), Stacy and Witbeck/Sundt, a Joint Venture, as needed to complete the construction of the project.

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

ATTACHMENT
None
SUBJECT
Gilbert Road LRT Extension Public Art Services Contract Amendments

PURPOSE
To request authorization for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to amend two Public Art Services contracts for the Gilbert Road LRT Extension (GRE) for an amount not to exceed $117,365, plus an additional $11,737 (10%) contingency.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
In October 2015, the Board authorized the CEO to execute four contracts for the GRE Public Art Services for a not-to-exceed amount of $731,365. The original contracts included public art at two stations, the park-and-ride, and a traction power substation.

During the project’s design process, the community has been actively engaged in review of proposed public art. As a result of input received from stakeholders, it was agreed that art at the Stapley Drive and Gilbert Road stations would be swapped. In addition, the City of Mesa requested that art medallions be added to light poles along the entire light rail extension. This will affect funding amounts for two of the public art contracts for the project, including the Hans Van Meeuwen and John Randall Nelson contracts. Additional contingency funds are also needed to accommodate remaining uncertainties in the artist’s design.

Board action is required to amend the two Public Art contracts to accommodate the additional work.

COST AND BUDGET
The total current Public Art contract authority (for four artists) is $731,365. Additional funding for two public artist contracts is proposed to be $117,365 to facilitate recommended changes. An additional $11,737 (10%) contingency, to be held by staff, is also needed to address unforeseen changes that may arise during the completion of the artists’ work. The total contract authority for the art program would be $860,467. All additional funds are available in the GRE’s project contingency and will not increase the overall project budget.

The GRE project is funded with federal Surface Transportation Program and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality grants funds. Local matching funds are provided by the City of Mesa. No regional funds are used for this project.

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: October 3, 2017 for information
RMC: October 4, 2017 for action
Board of Directors: October 19, 2017 for action

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the RMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to amend two Public Art Services contracts for GRE for an amount not to exceed $117,365 plus an additional $11,737 (10%) contingency.

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

ATTACHMENT
None
DATE
September 27, 2017

SUBJECT
South Central Light Rail Extension Project Update and Contract Amendments

PURPOSE
To provide an update on proposed downtown Phoenix light rail design modifications in conjunction with the South Central Light Rail Extension and to request authorization for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to approve contract amendments to facilitate the proposed downtown changes.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION
The South Central Light Rail Extension is approximately five miles long. The extension begins at Washington Street in downtown Phoenix and extends southward along Central and First avenues toward Baseline. South of downtown, First and Central avenues merge and the alignment proceeds on Central Avenue to Baseline Road.

Final design for the project started this summer and construction is anticipated to begin in 2019. An early focus has been to evaluate how this new extension will connect with the existing light rail line in downtown Phoenix.

The South Central project was added to the Regional Transportation Plan in 2014 and given a programmed completion date of 2034, which was outside of the defined funding envelope for light rail projects. Following approval of Transportation 2050 funding by Phoenix voters in 2015, project funding became more certain, and the City of Phoenix advanced the project’s completion to 2023. This is the same year the light rail line from downtown to the State Capitol is also scheduled to be completed. Having two new rail lines converge in the downtown area concurrently has created a new dynamic, which caused Valley Metro and Phoenix staff to reconsider how the lines should connect and operate in the area.

Key factors to consider as the two new light rail lines are implemented in downtown Phoenix include:

- minimizing light rail construction impacts on downtown intersections
- maximizing the positive impact of transit in downtown Phoenix
- creating the most efficient and effective light rail system configuration
- optimizing station locations to facilitate connections between light rail lines
- maintaining existing light rail operations during construction
- minimizing traffic impacts created by implementing multiple rail lines
- providing light rail operating flexibility
Proposed Downtown Configuration

The completion of the South Central and the Capitol light rail extensions creates an opportunity to establish a two-line, east-west/north-south light rail system that intersects in downtown Phoenix. This two-line system provides several efficiencies and opportunities for transit riders, downtown stakeholders and light rail operations. It also minimizes traffic impacts on Central and 1st Avenues.

Staff proposes to shift certain design elements and costs from the Capitol/I-10 Light Rail Extension to the South Central project in an effort to construct all proposed light rail within downtown Phoenix within a single time period, to optimize passenger connections and to facilitate flexibility in rail operations. New project elements are also included to improve operability of the proposed downtown light rail configuration.

The proposed South Central project components for downtown include:
- Addition of track on Washington Street from Central to 3rd avenues
- Addition of track on Jefferson Street from 1st to 3rd avenues
- Relocation of two passenger stations (from the Capitol/I-10 project) on the north side of Washington Street between Central and 1st Avenue, and on the south side of Jefferson Street between 1st and Central avenues
- Construction of a new passenger station on the east side of Central Avenue between Jefferson and Washington streets
- Addition of light rail track on 5th Street and 3rd Avenue to provide operational connections and flexibility

Attachment 1 depicts the light rail configuration in the downtown area as currently defined in planning documents, while Attachment 2 depicts the proposed configuration.

Staff will provide a presentation at the meeting to further explain the proposed downtown light rail configuration and the reasons for proposed project elements.

Contract Modifications Needed

The Board has awarded several contracts that will be affected by the proposed downtown configuration changes. Board authorization to increase funding for these contracts is needed. Included are:
- Design services with AECOM Technical Services Inc.
- Construction Manager at Risk (CM@Risk) with Kiewit Infrastructure Co.
- Public Art Services, which will involve multiple contracts
COST AND BUDGET
The costs for contract amendments needed to perform the proposed additional downtown work are defined in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Current Contract Authority (including contingency)</th>
<th>Added Contract Amount</th>
<th>Additional Contingency (10%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design (AECOM)</td>
<td>$35,621,938</td>
<td>$2,487,000</td>
<td>$249,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM@Risk (Kiewit)</td>
<td>$2,640,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art (multiple)</td>
<td>$3,300,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,561,938</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,587,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$359,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These additional services would be funded entirely from regional Public Transportation Funds (PTF) already programmed for the South Central and Capitol/I-10 Light Rail Extensions. Additional construction costs for all proposed downtown changes are currently being evaluated.

The South Central Light Rail Extension is funded by a combination of federal, regional and City of Phoenix funds. All costs identified herein will be included in the South Central Light Rail Extension’s project cost forecast and expenses expected within FY18 will be included in the Valley Metro Rail FY18 Operating and Capital Budget as part of a mid-year budget adjustment. Contract obligations beyond FY18 will be incorporated into the FY19 thru FY23 Five-Year Operating Forecast and Capital Program.

STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT
This item relates to the following goals and strategies in the Five-Year Strategic Plan:

- **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: September 15, 2017 for information
RMC: October 6, 2017 for action
Board of Directors: October 21, 2017 for action

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the RMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to approve contract amendments to facilitate the proposed downtown changes as follows:
• Design (AECOM) - $2,487,000
• Construction Manager at Risk (Kiewit) - $400,000
• Public Artist Services (Artists to be defined) - $700,000

In addition, a 10% contingency to be available for each of these contracts is recommended for Board approval.

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

ATTACHMENT
Map 1: Downtown Phoenix Light Rail Configuration as Currently Defined
Map 2: Downtown Phoenix Light Rail Configuration as Proposed
Map 1
Downtown Area Light Rail Configuration as Currently Defined

Map 2
Downtown Area Light Rail Configuration as Proposed
South Central Light Rail Extension Project Update and Contract Amendments

October 2017

Downtown Phoenix LRT Configuration: Purpose

- Key factors to consider as the two new light rail lines are implemented in downtown Phoenix:
  - Minimize light rail construction impacts on downtown intersections
  - Maximize positive impact on light rail in downtown
  - Create the most efficient and effective LRT system configuration
  - Optimize station locations to facilitate LRT connections
  - Maintain existing light rail operations during construction
  - Minimize traffic impacts created by multiple rail lines
  - Provide light rail operating flexibility
Light Rail System Configuration - 2023
The proposed South Central project components for downtown include:

- Addition of track on Washington Street from Central to 3rd avenues
- Addition of track on Jefferson Street from 1st to 3rd avenues
- Relocation of Capitol/I-10 passenger stations on Washington and Jefferson streets from 3rd Avenue to Central/1st Avenue
- Construction of passenger station on Central Avenue between Jefferson and Washington streets
Downtown Phoenix LRT Configuration: Two-Line Concept

Downtown Phoenix LRT Configuration Concept
Phoenix, Arizona
Jefferson Street near Central Avenue

Downtown Phoenix
Jefferson Street near Central Avenue
Downtown Phoenix
Central Avenue near Washington Street
Contract Modifications Needed

- The Board has awarded contracts that will be affected by the proposed downtown configuration changes
  - Design services with AECOM Technical Services Inc.
  - Construction Manager at Risk with Kiewit Infrastructure Co.
  - Public Art Services, which will involve multiple contracts

- Board authorization to increase funding for these contracts is needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Current Contract Authority (including contingency)</th>
<th>Added Contract Amount</th>
<th>Additional Contingency (10%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design (AECOM)</td>
<td>$35,621,938</td>
<td>$2,487,000</td>
<td>$249,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM@Risk (Kiewit)</td>
<td>$2,640,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art (multiple)</td>
<td>$3,300,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,561,938</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,587,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$359,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding

- South Central Extension is funded by a combination of federal, regional and City of Phoenix funds.

- Funding for additional services would be 100% regional PTF including programmed funds shifted from Capitol/I-10 LRT Extension.

Recommendation

- Staff recommends that the RMC forward to the Board of Directors authorization for the CEO to approve contract amendments to facilitate the proposed downtown changes as follows:
  - Design (AECOM) - $2,487,000
  - Construction Manager at Risk (Kiewit) - $400,000
  - Public Artist Services (Artists to be defined) - $700,000
  - Available contingency at 10% for each of these contracts.
DATE
September 27, 2017

SUBJECT
Code of Conduct

PURPOSE
This memo is currently being developed.

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
September 27, 2017

SUBJECT
Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events

PURPOSE
Chair Brady 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>