Board of Directors Regular Meeting
May 14, 2018

Frank J. Lichtanski Administrative Building
Board Room, First Floor
19 Upper Ragsdale Dr., Suite 100, Monterey 93940
10:00 a.m.

TRANSPORTATION: Ride Line 8 from Monterey Transit Plaza (Munras Gate) at 9:15 a.m. or Sand City Station at 9:30 a.m. Request a taxi voucher from MST Customer Service at the board meeting for your return trip or a trip to the destination of your choice up to $17.00.

1. CALL TO ORDER

   1-1. Roll Call.

   1-2. Pledge of Allegiance.

   1-3. Review Highlights of the agenda. (Carl Sedoryk)

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

   Members of the public may address the Board on any matter related to the jurisdiction of MST but not on the agenda. There is a time limit of not more than three minutes for each speaker. The Board will not take action or respond immediately to any public comments presented, but may choose to follow-up at a later time either individually, through staff, or on a subsequent agenda.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

   These items will be approved by a single motion. Anyone may request that an item be discussed and considered separately.

3-2. Minutes of the August 22, 2017, Measure Q Oversight Committee Meeting. (Jeanette Alegar-Rocha)(Page 9)

3-3. Minutes of the MST Board Meeting on April 9, 2018. (Jeanette Alegar-Rocha) (Page 13)


3-5. Appoint FY 2019 MST Board Nominating Committee. (Carl Sedoryk)(Page 27)

3-6. Solicit interest for MST subcommittees. (Carl Sedoryk)(Page 29)

3-7. Disposal of Property left aboard buses. (Sonia Wills)(Page 33)

3-8. Approve Purchase of Barracuda Backup Software in the amount not to exceed $60,000. (Mark Eccles)(Page 35)

3-9. Approve expenditure of $93,750 for Graniterock Construction to resurface pavement at One Ryan Ranch Road operations and maintenance facility that was not impacted by the current construction project. (Hunter Harvath) (Page 37)

3-10. Approve Grant easement to PG&E at MST Bus Facility at 440 Victor Way in Salinas to accommodate electric bus charging infrastructure. (Hunter Harvath) (Page 39)

End of Consent Agenda

4. RECOGNITION AND SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

4-1. Employee of the Month, May–Ruben Cano, Jr. (Robert Weber)

4-2. 25 Years of Service- George Alvarez, Coach Operator. (Robert Weber)

4-3. 35 Years of Service- Janet Madler, Maintenance Supervisor. (Norman Tuitavuki)

4-4. Receive update on Summer Youth Go Pass promotional efforts. (Beronica Carriedo)(Page 43)

4-5. Update on Risk and Liability Statistics. (Kelly Halcon)

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

5-1. Program of Projects FY 2018. (Michelle Overmeyer)(Page 45)

6. ACTION ITEMS
6-1. Consider the Measure Q committee’s recommendation to extend the veteran’s half-fare discount to spouses and caregivers. (Hunter Harvath) (Page 47)

6-2. Appoint Jessica McKillip, Executive Director for the ITN Monterey County; Aimee Cuda, Community Relations Manager for the Central Coast Senior Services, and Maria Magaña, Community Advocate for the Central Coast Center for Independent Living as new members on the Mobility Advisory Committee. (Cristy Subago) (Page 49)

6-3. Authorize staff to renew lease for the temporary MST bus facility on Joe Lloyd Way on the former Fort Ord for a term not to exceed 18 months at a cost of $8,305 per month. (Hunter Harvath) (Page 51)

7. REPORTS & INFORMATION ITEMS

The Board will receive and file these reports, which do not require action by the Board.

7-1. General Manager/CEO Report. – March 2018 (Page 53)

7-2. Washington, D.C. Lobby Report. – April 2018 (Page 81)

7-3. State Legislative Advocacy Update. – March 2018 (Page 83)

7-4. Staff Trip Reports. (Pages 85-89)

7-5. Correspondence. (Pages 91-103)

8. REPORTS, COMMENTS, AND REFERRALS

8-1. Reports on meetings attended by board members at MST expense. (AB 1234) (Pages 105-109)

8-2. Board member comments and announcements.
   a) Results of Federal and State Funding Applications

8-3. Board member referrals for future agendas.

9. CLOSED SESSION

Members of the public may address the Board on any matter related to Closed Session. There is a time limit of not more than three minutes for each speaker. The Board will not take action or respond immediately to any public comments presented, but may choose to follow-up at a later time individually, through staff, or on a subsequent agenda.

As permitted by Government Code §64956 et seq. of the State of California, the Board of Directors may adjourn to Closed Session to consider specific matters.
dealing with personnel and/or pending possible litigation and/or conferring with the Board's Meyers-Milias-Brown Act representative.

9-1. Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation (§ 54956.9) State Of California, et al., v. United States Department of Labor, et al. (D. Laredo, K. Halcon) (No enclosure)


9-3. Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation, Gov. Code § 54956.9(b): AECOM (No Enclosure)

9-4. Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation, Gov. Code § 54956.9(b): BlueScope (No Enclosure)

10. RETURN TO OPEN SESSION
10-1 Report on Closed Session and possible action.

10-2. Revise contingency budget for Monterey Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility construction project. (Hunter Harvath)(Page 111)

11. ATTACHMENTS
11-1. The detailed monthly Performance Statistics and Disbursement Journal for March 2018 can be viewed online within the GM Report at http://mst.org/about-mst/board-of-directors/board-meetings/

12. ADJOURN
Board member site visit to One Ryan Ranch Road directly following meeting adjournment. Transportation provided by MST.

NEXT MEETING DATE: June 11, 2018
19 Upper Ragsdale Dr., Suite 100, Monterey, CA 93940
Boardroom First Floor
10:00 a.m.

NEXT AGENDA DEADLINE: May 29, 2018
*Dates and times are subject to change.
Please contact MST for accurate meeting date and times or check online at http://mst.org/about-mst/board-of-directors/board-meetings/

Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Board after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection at the Monterey-Salinas Transit
Administration Building at 19 Upper Ragsdale Dr., Suite 200, Monterey, CA 93940 during normal business hours.

Upon request, Monterey-Salinas Transit will provide written materials in appropriate alternative formats, including disability-related modifications or accommodations, auxiliary aids, or services to enable individuals with disabilities to participate in public meetings. Please send a written request, including your name, mailing address, phone number, description of the requested materials, and preferred alternative format or auxiliary aid or service at least three working days prior to the meeting. Requests should be sent to MST – c/o Clerk to the Board, 19 Upper Ragsdale Dr., Suite 200, Monterey, CA 93940 or clerk@mst.org.

888-678-2871 / Free language assistance / Asistencia de Lenguaje Gratuito / Libreng tulong para sa wika / Hỗ trợ ngôn ngữ miễn phí / 무료 언어 지원
RUBEN CANO JR.
MAY 2018
EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH

WHEREAS, each month Monterey-Salinas Transit recognizes an outstanding employee as Employee of the Month; and

WHEREAS, the Employee of the Month is recognized for their positive contribution to MST and to the entire community; and

WHEREAS, Ruben Cano started his career with Monterey-Salinas Transit District as a Coach Operator in August of 2008. A recent recipient of 7 years of Safe Driving, he has been recognized with multiple attendance awards and several special service citations; and

WHEREAS, Ruben Cano has shown his leadership and outstanding performance through his leadership as Line Instructor. He has also completed three-six month tours of duty as an Interim Operations Supervisor; and

WHEREAS, Ruben Cano was named as one of three recipients of the 2017 General Manager’s Coach Operator Excellence Award. This annual award recognizes Operators who have maintained; perfect attendance, on time performance of 90% or higher, and have received no valid employee conduct complaints. This is the fifth time in which he has received this award since 2011; and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of Monterey-Salinas Transit District recognizes Ruben Cano as Employee of the Month for May 2018; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Ruben Cano is to be congratulated for his excellent work at Monterey-Salinas Transit District.

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF MONTEREY–SALINAS TRANSIT PASSED AND ADOPTED RESOLUTION 2018-25 this 14th day of May 2018.

_______________________   _______________________
Tony Barrera                        Carl G. Sedoryk
Chairperson                                                   Secretary
Measure Q Oversight Committee
Monterey-Salinas Transit
19 Upper Ragsdale Dr.,
Suite 100

Minutes
August 22, 2017

Present: Cuda, Aimee  Mobility Advisory Committee
         Lopez, Juan Pablo  Salinas Urbanized
         Miller, Susan  Urbanized Non-urbanized
         Mucha, Harry  Unincorporated Taxpayer’s Association
         Williams, Sid  Seaside-Marina-Monterey Urbanized Non-urbanized

Absent: Kazuko Wessendorf

Staff: Hunter Harvath, Asst. GM of Finance & Administration; Michael Laredo, General Counsel; Jeanette Alegar-Rocha, Deputy Secretary, Andrea Williams, Accountant, Carl Sedoryk, General Manager/CEO

Public: None

1. Call to Order

Chairperson Sid Williams called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.

2. Public Comment on Matters Not on the Agenda

No public comments.

3. Announcements

None

4. Consent Agenda
4-1. Approve and recommend August 16, 2016 minutes to the MST board.

4-2. Approve and recommend March 17, 2017 minutes to the MST board.

Public Comment - none.

5. **New Business**

5-1. Review Measure Q funded expenditures planned as part of MST’s FY 2018 Budget as adopted by the MST Board of Directors.

Public Comment - none.

Hunter Harvath presented the Measure Q funded expenditures planned with $8,536,572 of Measure Q funds being allocated to the FY 2018 operating budget and $180,000 in Measure Q funds being allocated to the FY 2018 capital budget.

**Director Lopez arrived at 2:07 p.m.**

5-2. Review Committee Appointments and Vacancy.

Hunter Harvath presented the current Measure Q Committee Appointments and the vacancy for representation of the County of Monterey Unincorporated.

Public Comment – Carl Sedoryk, General Manager/CEO of Monterey-Salinas Transit commented that volunteers for reappointment and interest in serving as Vice Chair can be announced in the committee.

6. **Staff and Committee Member Comments or Questions**

Aimee Cuda asked when the next Measure Q Oversight committee is planned and requested for a copy of the MQC Resource Guide.

Hunter Harvath announced that the next meeting will be in March 2018.

Susan Miller announced her impending resignation resulting in a vacancy on the committee to represent non-urbanized areas in South County.

Chair Sid Williams, Harry Mucha, Juan Pablo Lopez and Aimee Cuda announced the desire to renew their terms and continue serving on the committee.

Juan Pablo Lopez announced his interest in serving as Vice Chair on the committee.

7. **Adjourn**
There being no further business, Chairperson Williams adjourned the meeting at 3:05 p.m.

Prepared by: ____________________  Reviewed by: ____________________
1. CALL TO ORDER

1-1. Roll Call.

1-2. Pledge of Allegiance.

Chair Barrera called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. The pledge of allegiance was led by Hunter Harvath, Assistant General Manager of MST and roll call was taken.

1-3. Review Highlights of the agenda.

Mr. Sedoryk reviewed the highlights of the agenda.

Present:

Carolyn Hardy  City of Carmel-by-the-Sea
Kristin Clark   City of Del Rey Oaks
Robert Bonincontri  City of Gonzales
Yanely Martinez  City of Greenfield
Mike LeBarre    City of King
Frank O’Connell  City of Marina
Dan Albert   City of Monterey
Tony Barrera    City of Salinas
Mary Ann Carbone  City of Sand City
Dave Pacheco    City of Seaside
Anna Velazquez City of Soledad
Luis Alejo  County of Monterey

Absent:

Ken Cuneo  City of Pacific Grove

Staff:

Carl Sedoryk  General Manager/CEO
Hunter Harvath  Assistant General Manager
Robert Weber   Chief Operating Officer
Norman Tuatavuki  Deputy Chief Operating Officer
Kelly Halcon Directory of HR and Risk Management
Lisa Rheinheimer  Director of Planning and Marketing
Mark Eccles  Director of Information Technology
2. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Public Comment – Cheryl Wilson a customer requested that bus arrivals be announced by MST dispatchers as a courtesy to the rider. Ms. Wilson commented that she appreciates the reduced fares and the free fares on weekends.

Mr. Sedoryk informed Ms. Wilson that Alvin Johnson from MST Staff, who manages the MV contract was present at the meeting and could further assist her.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

3-1. Adopt Resolution 2017-21 recognizing Paul Lopez, as Employee of the Month for April 2018.


3-3. Adopt Resolution 2017-23 Support Prop 69. (Carl Sedoryk)

3-4. Minutes of the Planning/Operations Committee on March 12, 2018. (Jeanette Alegar-Rocha)
3-5. Minutes of the MST Board Meeting on March 12, 2018. (Jeanette Alegar-Rocha)


3-7. Disposal of Property left aboard buses. (Sonia Wills)

3-8. Approve Purchase of Five Military Bus Pass Vending Machines. (Mike Gallant)

3-9. Receive update on the progress of planning, permitting and financing for the South County Maintenance & Operations facility in King City. (Hunter Harvath)

3-10. Authorize the purchase of one (1) Maintenance service truck with aftermarket equipment and components at the lowest price/best options at the time of purchase not to exceed $40,000.00. (Sandra Amorim)

End of Consent Agenda

Public Comment – None

Vice-Chair LeBarre requested to pull item 3-6 for further discussion.

Director O’Connell requested that the resolution from item 3-3 be forwarded to the various city councils on the MST Board.

Director Velazquez requested to pull item 3-9 for further discussion.

Director Martinez made the motion to approve all remaining items on the consent agenda and was seconded by director Clark. The motion passed unanimously.

Vice-Chair LeBarre asked what caused the increase on outside labor reported for the current month actual in item 3-6. Hunter Harvath stated the increase related to the cost of doing business with a specific outside contracted armored car service.

Director Velazquez had a question related the construction timeline and the FTA environmental document update for item 3-9 and which Mr. Harvath addressed with no concerns.

Vice-Chair LeBarre made the motion to approve items 3-6, and 3-9 and was seconded by director Albert. The motion passed unanimously.

4. RECOGNITION AND SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

4-1. Employee of the Month, April 2018–Paul Lopez, Facilities Supervisor

Carl Wulf, Facilities and Capital Projects Manager, recognized Paul before the MST board of directors for his outstanding achievement and dedication.

Robert Weber and Carl Sedoryk recognized Carlos Dominguez and Tiziano Minelli as recipients of the 2017 Coach Operators Excellence Award.

Ruben Cano was not present.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

6. ACTION ITEMS

6-1. Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) FY 18/19 Allocation. (Michelle Overmeyer)

Public Comment – None

Director Carbone made the motion to approve the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) FY 18/19 Allocation and Resolution 2018-24 and was seconded by director Albert. The motion passed unanimously.

6-2. Receive results of transportation funding opinion survey. (Hunter Harvath)

Public Comment – None

The board received an updated from Hunter Harvath on the Transportation Funding Opinion Funding Survey conducted by Tulchin Research.

6-3. Receive update on the status of the Monterey Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility Construction Project. (No Enclosure) (Hunter Harvath)

Public Comment- None

Hunter Harvath updated the MST board of directors regarding unanticipated schedule issues. Brian Aldritch from Bluescope Construction and Steve Goldman from SSB were present to also address the MST board of directors and provide an update on the status of the project and the new estimated timeline for completion.

The MST Board of Directors requested staff to provide a report in the next board agenda and provide a tour of the construction site following May 14 board meeting.

Director Alejo arrived 10:49 a.m.

7. REPORTS & INFORMATION ITEMS

The Board will receive and file these reports, which do not require action by the Board.
7-1. General Manager/CEO Report – February 2018
7-3. State Legislative Advocacy Update – February 2018
7-4. Staff Trip Reports.
7-5. Correspondence.

8. BOARD REPORTS, COMMENTS, AND REFERRALS
8-1. Reports on meetings attended by board members at MST expense (AB 1234)
8-2. Board member comments and announcements.
8-3. Board member referrals for future agendas.

9. CLOSED SESSION

Members of the public may address the Board on any matter related to Closed Session. There is a time limit of not more than three minutes for each speaker. The Board will not take action or respond immediately to any public comments presented, but may choose to follow-up at a later time individually, through staff, or on a subsequent agenda.

As permitted by Government Code §64956 et seq. of the State of California, the Board of Directors may adjourn to Closed Session to consider specific matters dealing with personnel and/or pending possible litigation and/or conferring with the Board's Meyers-Milias-Brown Act representative

10. RETURN TO OPEN SESSION

11. ATTACHMENTS

11-1. The detailed monthly Performance Statistics and Disbursement Journal for February 2018 can be viewed online within the GM Report at http://mst.org/about-mst/board-of-directors/board-meetings/

12. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Barrera adjourned the meeting at 11:28 a.m.

Prepared by: Jeanette Alegar-Rocha
Clerk to the Board

Reviewed by: Carl G. Sedoryk
General Manager/CEO
To: Board of Directors

From: Lori Lee

Subject: Financial Reports – March 2018

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Accept report of March 2018 cash flow presented in Attachment #1
2. Approve March 2018 disbursements listed in Attachment #2
3. Accept report of March 2018 treasury transactions listed in Attachment #3

FISCAL IMPACT:

The cash flow for March is summarized below and is detailed in Attachment #1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning balance March 1, 2018</td>
<td>$9,215,888.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>8,364,351.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbursements</td>
<td>&lt;7,232,228.25&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending balance March 31, 2018</td>
<td>$10,348,012.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Disbursements are approved by your Board each month and are shown in Attachment #2. Treasury transactions are reported to your Board each month, and are shown in Attachment #3.

DISCUSSION:

At the end of March, the District continues to manage its expenses, resulting with a year-to-date surplus of $2,398,916 on the fixed-route side of the budget. MST RIDES is also showing a positive variance on revenues, resulting in a $12,562 surplus year to date.
The following fixed-route expenses have negative variances of greater than 5% or have a monetary value greater than $5,000 as seen in the March Budget vs. Actual reports contained in Attachment #4:

1. **Benefits** – This 6.8% negative variance is due in large part to assessments from CalPers for unfunded liabilities. Public agencies who are CalPers members are subject to these extra assessments, which will grow over the next five years.

2. **Professional & Technical** – For the month of March, the 44.9% negative variance was generated by a special telephone survey that was conducted in light of a potential ballot measure to repeal transportation funding. Nevertheless, for the year to date, expenses in this category are nearly $60,000 under budget.

3. **Vehicle Maintenance** – As MST’s fleet gets older, vehicle maintenance costs gradually increase. While an 6.0% negative variance for March in this category was reported, for the year MST’s maintenance costs are still 7.0% below budget. In addition, replacement buses are being delivered to MST from the manufacturer in March, April, and May of 2018. These new buses will replace the oldest of MST’s vehicles, which will be retired and sold at auction in the coming months.

4. **Interest Expense** – The 72.5% negative variance in this category can be attributed to the $3 million line of credit that the District has to help maintain cash flow as reimbursements from Caltrans are slow to be processed for the $10 million state grant that is funding almost half of the construction project at One Ryan Ranch Road

A detail of disbursements can be viewed within the GM Report at http://www.mst.org/about-mst/board-of-directors/board-meetings/

PREPARED BY: ___________________ REVIEWED BY: ___________________
### CASH FLOW

**Beginning balance 03/01/18**  
9,215,888.87

**Revenues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Revenue</td>
<td>299,583.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD Revenue</td>
<td>443,620.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTF / STA / 5307</td>
<td>2,860,179.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>771,405.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>2,456,466.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line of Credit</td>
<td>1,500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>11,130.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Transit Revenue</td>
<td>21,966.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,364,351.80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disbursements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations (See Attachment #2)</td>
<td>4,876,414.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>2,355,813.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Disbursements</strong></td>
<td><strong>(7,232,228.25)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ending balance 03/31/18**  
10,348,012.42

### COMPOSITION OF ENDING BALANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Checking - Rabo Bank</td>
<td>1,589,734.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking(s) - Wells Fargo Bank</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF)</td>
<td>2,386,849.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Market - Homeland Security</td>
<td>778,772.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Market - Rabo MM</td>
<td>3,300,047.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Market - PTMISEA</td>
<td>833,405.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Market - LCTOP</td>
<td>495,838.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Market - Rabo Prop. 1 B</td>
<td>943,833.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America - Escrow</td>
<td>8,985.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty cash fund, STC Coin Machine, and 2 change funds</td>
<td>10,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,348,012.42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PAYROLL ACCOUNT

March 2 Payroll & Related Expenses 599,637.10
March 16 Payroll & Related Expenses 608,982.24
March 30 Payroll & Related Expenses 708,620.00
PERS & 457 224,433.30
Garnishments 7,695.07
PERS Health Insurance 338,934.96

2,488,302.67  2,488,302.67

GENERAL ACCOUNT

Disbursements on Attached Summary 4,130,715.04
Paydown loan 14,101.24
LOC Paydown 500,000.00
Workers Comp. Disbursements 70,579.47
Interest expense 12,789.61
Bank Service Charge 15,740.22

4,743,925.58  4,743,925.58

Total Disbursements 7,232,228.25

Less Capital Disbursements & Transfers (2,355,813.33)

Operating Disbursements 4,876,414.92
### DISBURSEMENTS SUMMARY:
GENERAL ACCOUNT DISBURSEMENTS FOR March 01, 2018 - March 31, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VENDOR / DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CHECKS</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable 03/02/2018</td>
<td>48053 - 48138</td>
<td>1,159,246.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable 03/06/2018</td>
<td>48139 - 48139</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable 03/09/2018</td>
<td>48140 - 48221</td>
<td>1,715,186.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable 03/12/2018</td>
<td>48222 - 48245</td>
<td>1,514.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable 03/14/2018</td>
<td>48246 - 48246</td>
<td>4,352.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable 03/21/2018</td>
<td>48247 - 48247</td>
<td>10,835.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable 03/23/2018</td>
<td>48248 - 48350</td>
<td>489,411.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable 03/28/2018</td>
<td>48351 - 48360</td>
<td>684,402.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable 03/29/2018</td>
<td>48361 - 48361</td>
<td>65,547.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable 03/30/2018</td>
<td>48362 - 48362</td>
<td>192.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 4,130,715.04

### CHECKS $100,000 AND OVER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VENDOR / DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>BOARD APPROVED</th>
<th>CHECK NUMBER</th>
<th>CHECK DATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GIRO INC</td>
<td>December 8, 2014</td>
<td>48088</td>
<td>3/2/18</td>
<td>128,180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV TRANSPORTATION SERVICES INC</td>
<td>Recurring Expense TDA Rehab</td>
<td>48103</td>
<td>3/2/18</td>
<td>640,848.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLUESCOPE CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>September 19, 2016</td>
<td>48145</td>
<td>3/9/18</td>
<td>1,493,077.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV TRANSPORTATION SERVICES INC</td>
<td>Recurring Expense</td>
<td>48360</td>
<td>3/28/18</td>
<td>656,610.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LAIF ACCOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Bank</th>
<th>Deposit</th>
<th>Withdrawal</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance Forward at 03/01/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,376,771.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Agency Investment Fund:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly interest earned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,078.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,386,849.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAIF Treasury Balance at 03/31/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,386,849.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RABOBANK MM ACCOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Bank</th>
<th>Deposit</th>
<th>Withdrawal</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance Forward at 03/01/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,395,438.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/18</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>to AP/Payroll</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,700,000.00</td>
<td>1,695,438.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/08/18</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Military Vending</td>
<td></td>
<td>450,000.00</td>
<td>2,145,438.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/08/18</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>to AP/Payroll</td>
<td></td>
<td>340,000.00</td>
<td>1,805,438.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/09/18</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>LTF</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,450,731.10</td>
<td>3,256,169.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/15/18</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>to AP/Payroll</td>
<td></td>
<td>980,000.00</td>
<td>2,276,169.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/23/18</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>FOR A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>3,276,169.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/23/18</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td>3,376,169.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/30/18</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>LTF</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,409,448.63</td>
<td>4,785,618.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/30/18</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>to AP/Payroll</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,486,000.00</td>
<td>3,299,618.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/31/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interest @ 0.30%</td>
<td>428.91</td>
<td>3,300,047.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RABO MM Balance at 03/31/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,300,047.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MONTEREY-SALINAS TRANSIT

### Revenue & Expense - Consolidated

**Budget vs Actual**

For the Period from March 1, 2018 to March 31, 2018

*(Amounts are in USD)*

*(Includes Fund: 001/004)*

*(Includes G/L Budget Name: BUDFY18)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cur Mo. Actual</th>
<th>Cur Mo. Budget</th>
<th>Cur Mo. Variance</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>YTD Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Fares</td>
<td>-261,123</td>
<td>-350,659</td>
<td>88,536</td>
<td>-2,803,700</td>
<td>-3,155,931</td>
<td>352,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Revenue</td>
<td>-38,036</td>
<td>-26,936</td>
<td>-11,100</td>
<td>-309,170</td>
<td>-242,424</td>
<td>-66,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-3,444,820</td>
<td>-3,495,373</td>
<td>50,553</td>
<td>-31,792,927</td>
<td>-31,458,357</td>
<td>-334,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

1.  
2.  
3.  

### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cur Mo. Actual</th>
<th>Cur Mo. Budget</th>
<th>Cur Mo. Variance</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>YTD Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>1,363,749</td>
<td>1,340,540</td>
<td>23,209</td>
<td>11,490,577</td>
<td>12,064,860</td>
<td>-574,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>847,700</td>
<td>793,407</td>
<td>54,293</td>
<td>7,352,169</td>
<td>7,140,663</td>
<td>212,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>4,919</td>
<td>-2,886</td>
<td>42,236</td>
<td>44,271</td>
<td>-1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Technical</td>
<td>106,294</td>
<td>73,361</td>
<td>32,933</td>
<td>600,793</td>
<td>665,249</td>
<td>-59,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Services</td>
<td>33,692</td>
<td>35,125</td>
<td>-1,434</td>
<td>276,921</td>
<td>316,134</td>
<td>-40,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Labor</td>
<td>89,813</td>
<td>106,366</td>
<td>-16,553</td>
<td>808,429</td>
<td>957,264</td>
<td>-148,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel &amp; Lubricants</td>
<td>227,929</td>
<td>256,927</td>
<td>-28,998</td>
<td>1,863,085</td>
<td>2,672,343</td>
<td>-809,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>59,821</td>
<td>82,642</td>
<td>-23,021</td>
<td>590,555</td>
<td>745,578</td>
<td>-155,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td>99,984</td>
<td>94,334</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>789,945</td>
<td>849,006</td>
<td>-59,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Supplies</td>
<td>2,749</td>
<td>2,876</td>
<td>-127</td>
<td>15,718</td>
<td>25,884</td>
<td>-10,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>32,096</td>
<td>44,690</td>
<td>-12,594</td>
<td>321,139</td>
<td>402,210</td>
<td>-81,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>54,220</td>
<td>61,074</td>
<td>-6,854</td>
<td>497,157</td>
<td>549,666</td>
<td>-52,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>15,207</td>
<td>17,387</td>
<td>-2,180</td>
<td>136,873</td>
<td>156,483</td>
<td>-19,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased Transportation</td>
<td>405,457</td>
<td>443,582</td>
<td>-38,125</td>
<td>3,708,134</td>
<td>3,992,238</td>
<td>-284,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>18,753</td>
<td>51,676</td>
<td>-32,923</td>
<td>465,513</td>
<td>465,084</td>
<td>-4,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass Thru/Behalf of Others</td>
<td>717</td>
<td></td>
<td>717</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,453</td>
<td>-6,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Expense</td>
<td>15,959</td>
<td>9,250</td>
<td>6,709</td>
<td>92,076</td>
<td>82,250</td>
<td>9,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases &amp; Rentals</td>
<td>35,041</td>
<td>36,299</td>
<td>-1,258</td>
<td>335,691</td>
<td>326,691</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>3,411,455</td>
<td>3,495,373</td>
<td>-83,918</td>
<td>29,394,011</td>
<td>31,458,357</td>
<td>-2,064,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating (Surplus) Deficit</strong></td>
<td>-33,356</td>
<td>-33,366</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2,398,916</td>
<td>-2,398,916</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MONTEREY-SALINAS TRANSIT

Revenue & Expense - Consolidated

For the Period from March 1, 2018 to March 31, 2018

(Amounts are in USD)

(Includes Fund: 002)

(Includes Gil Budget Name: BUDFY18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Cur Mo. Actual</th>
<th>Cur Mo. Budget</th>
<th>Cur Mo. Variance</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>YTD Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Fares</td>
<td>-16,607</td>
<td>-16,454</td>
<td>2,647</td>
<td>-228,227</td>
<td>-175,066</td>
<td>-53,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Grants &amp; Reimbursement</td>
<td>-363,599</td>
<td>-363,599</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3,272,391</td>
<td>-3,272,391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>-380,206</strong></td>
<td><strong>-383,053</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,647</strong></td>
<td><strong>-3,600,618</strong></td>
<td><strong>-3,447,477</strong></td>
<td><strong>-53,141</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Cur Mo. Actual</th>
<th>Cur Mo. Budget</th>
<th>Cur Mo. Variance</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>YTD Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>9,138</td>
<td>9,673</td>
<td>-435</td>
<td>72,950</td>
<td>86,157</td>
<td>-13,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>4,802</td>
<td>4,802</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>59,266</td>
<td>43,758</td>
<td>15,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising &amp; Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Technical</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>-417</td>
<td>3,753</td>
<td>3,753</td>
<td>-3,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Labor</td>
<td>5,037</td>
<td>7,042</td>
<td>-2,005</td>
<td>37,866</td>
<td>63,378</td>
<td>-25,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel &amp; Lubricants</td>
<td>49,632</td>
<td>43,378</td>
<td>6,254</td>
<td>354,186</td>
<td>393,402</td>
<td>-36,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>-1,773</td>
<td>22,341</td>
<td>18,366</td>
<td>3,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased Transportation</td>
<td>341,610</td>
<td>295,650</td>
<td>45,960</td>
<td>2,814,520</td>
<td>2,669,850</td>
<td>153,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>-7,970</td>
<td>20,087</td>
<td>-28,057</td>
<td>151,430</td>
<td>180,783</td>
<td>-29,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass Thru/Behalf of Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases &amp; Rentals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>402,560</strong></td>
<td><strong>383,053</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,507</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,513,180</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,447,477</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,703</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating (Surplus) Deficit</td>
<td><strong>22,354</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,384</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,562</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,562</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To:       Board of Directors

From:    Carl Sedoryk, General Manager/CEO

Subject: Ad Hoc Nominating Committee

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the Chair to appoint an Ad Hoc Nominating Committee and identify
volunteers for this committee.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Article VI. Officers, of the MST Bylaws requires your board to “appoint members
to a Nominating Committee responsible for recommending officer appointments to the
full Board.”

DISCUSSION:

MST officers are elected to serve a two-year term. The current officers, Tony
Barrera, MST Chair; and Mike LeBarre, MST Vice-Chair, were elected at the June 9,
2016, meeting of your Board.

Your board has indicated a preference for appointing to the Nominating
Committee those members who are not interested in serving as Chair or Vice-Chair for
the upcoming term. For your Board’s reference, the following Directors were appointed
to the Nominating Committee in June 2016: O’Connell (Marina), Pacheco (Seaside),
Miller (Pacific Grove), Stephens (Soledad).

Board members interested in serving on the Nominating Committee are encouraged to
notify the board clerk or indicate their preference at the board meeting. The FY 2017-2018
roster of current officers and staff appointments is attached.

Attachment:    MST Officers and Appointments, FY 2017-2018

Submitted by    Carl Sedoryk, General Manager/CEO
### MST District Officers and Appointments

**Fiscal Years 2017-2018**

**Officers elected by the Board:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Tony Barrera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chair</td>
<td>Mike LeBarre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Carmel-by-th-Sea</td>
<td>Carolyn Hardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Del Rey Oaks</td>
<td>Kristin Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Greenfield</td>
<td>Yanely Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gonzales</td>
<td>Robert Bonincontri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Marina</td>
<td>Frank O'Connell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Monterey</td>
<td>Dan Albert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pacific Grove</td>
<td>Ken Cuneo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sand City</td>
<td>Mary Ann Carbone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seaside</td>
<td>Dave Pacheco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Soledad</td>
<td>Anna Velazquez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Monterey</td>
<td>Luis Alejo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-elected officers and appointments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary to the Board</td>
<td>Carl G. Sedoryk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Secretary to the Board</td>
<td>Jeanette Alegar-Rocha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Carl G. Sedoryk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Treasurer</td>
<td>Hunter Harvath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Counsel</td>
<td>David C. Laredo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative to TAMC</td>
<td>Carl G. Sedoryk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate to TAMC</td>
<td>Lisa Rheinheimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate to TAMC</td>
<td>Hunter Harvath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative to FORA</td>
<td>Lisa Rheinheimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate to FORA</td>
<td>Hunter Harvath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative to California Transit Indemnity Pool (CALTIP)</td>
<td>Ben Newman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates to CalTIP</td>
<td>Kelly Halcon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative to AMBAG</td>
<td>Lisa Rheinheimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate to AMBAG</td>
<td>Hunter Harvath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Board of Directors

From: Carl Sedoryk, General Manager/CEO

Subject: MST Subcommittees

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff seeks input from individual board members regarding their preference to serve on one of the new MST subcommittees.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Article VII – Board Responsibilities – of the MST Bylaws states that, "subject to the will of a majority of the Board, the Chair may establish permanent and ad hoc committees as determined necessary." Your Board has adopted, as a strategic goal, to implement board protocols and best practices to achieve effective and efficient board operations and board meeting management.

DISCUSSION:

Your board approved the following alternative board committee structure at the 2018 Strategic Planning Workshop:

ALTERNATIVE BOARD COMMITTEE STRUCTURE:

1. Board Administrative Performance Committee (BAPC)

   Purpose:
   To provide policy direction to the Board and monitor performance in areas of Finance and Budget, Procurement, Legislative, Intergovernmental Relations, Business Development, Planning, Marketing, and Customer Service, Regulatory Compliance, Risk Management, Employee Compensation/Benefit Programs, and Information Technology.

2. Board Operations Performance Committee (BOPC)
Purpose:

3. Ad hoc Committees

Purpose:
The chair may appoint ad hoc committees to provide policy direction to the Board as needed on a variety of issues that may including, but not limited to: board governance, board strategic planning, reviewing overall organizational performance, CEO performance, general counsel performance, board officer nominations, or to advise BOPC and BAPC on matters of special concern.

Staff request individual board members to contact the GM/CEO or board clerk regarding their preference on which committee (Administration or Operations) they wish to serve. The Board Chair will announce the committee assignments at the June 2018 board meeting.

The FY 2017-2018 roster of current committee appointments is attached.

Attachment: MST Committee Appointments, FY 2017-2018

Submitted by ______________________________
Carl Sedoryk, General Manager/CEO
## FY 2017-2018 MST Committee Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Human Resources</th>
<th>Legislative</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Planning/Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td>City of Carmel-by-the-Sea</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>City of Del Rey Oaks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonincontri</td>
<td>City of Gonzales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>City of Greenfield</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeBarre</td>
<td>City of King City</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Connell</td>
<td>City of Marina</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>City of Monterey</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuneo</td>
<td>City of Pacific Grove</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrera</td>
<td>City of Salinas</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbone</td>
<td>City of Sand City</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacheco</td>
<td>City of Seaside</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velazquez</td>
<td>City of Soledad</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejo</td>
<td>County of Monterey</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Board of Directors  
From: Sonia Wills, Customer Service Supervisor  
Subject: Disposal of lost and found property

Per MST’s Disposal of Lost and Found Property Policy adopted on November 13, 2017, lost items listed below which are left on buses, bus benches, at transit centers, at bus stops, and/or which have been turned in to bus or RIDES operators, customer service representatives, or any MST employee will be held at one of MST’s customer service locations for a three (3) month period.

MST makes an attempt to contact the owners of Lost and Found items. The items listed below have been unclaimed after 90 days and will be auctioned off per Policy:

**Electronic devices: (cell phones, laptops, iPods, iPads, tablets, etc)**
- 12 cell phones
- 1 walkie-talkie
- 1 Apple Mac charger
- 1 Voice recorder
- 1 Stun Gun
- 1 Mobile Hotspot Device
- 1 Headphone

**Wallets/purses and Driver’s License or Identification Cards:**
- 1 Wallet
- 1 Purse
- 1ID

**Keys, glasses, jewelry, credit cards, cash:**
- 6 Sets of keys
- 1 Heart-shaped necklace
- 4 Pairs of prescription eyeglasses
- 11 Pairs of Sunglasses
- 2 Watches
- 6 Pairs of reading glasses
- 4 Credit cards

**Musical instruments:**
None

**Umbrellas:**
- 4 Umbrellas

**Bicycles, bike helmets, and locks:**
None
Briefcases, portfolios, books and backpacks:
5 Books
1 Backpack

PREPARED BY: ___________________ REVIEWED BY: ___________________
Sonia Wills Carl G. Sedoryk
To: Board of Directors

From: M. Eccles, Director of Information Technology

Subject: Computer Systems Back-up Server and Licensing

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the purchase of a back-up server and licensing for a five year period, not to exceed $60,000.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Up to $60,000 over a five year period. Funding is available in the FY 2019 Budget.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Your Board approves contracts and expenditures over $25,000.

DISCUSSION:

MST has a server/cloud-based system in place that creates nightly back-ups of the data generated from the entire suite of computer systems. This is essential in the event of any computer software or hardware failures as the back-ups are needed to recover system data.

The agreement also incorporates a standard plan for back-up server replacement every three years and instant replacement of the server, if necessary. The five year option essentially means that we only pay for 4 years, a saving of over $15,000.

By approving the purchase and licensing for the five year period, MST will ensure back-up and recovery of systems support for the entire computer system infrastructure.

PREPARED BY: Mark Eccles  REVIEWED BY: Carl G. Sedoryk
To: Board of Directors

From: Hunter Harvath – Assistant General Manager

Subject: Parking Lot Resurfacing at One Ryan Ranch Road

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Approve expenditure of $93,750 to contract with GraniteRock Construction to resurface pavement at One Ryan Ranch Road operations and maintenance facility that was not impacted by the current construction project.

FISCAL IMPACT:

$93,750, funded through the MST Capital reserves.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Your Board authorizes expenditures of funds in excess of $25,000.

DISCUSSION:

Prior to the commencement of the major construction project at One Ryan Ranch Road, staff identified the deterioration of the pavement in numerous places around the bus parking lot (see attachment). As this area would not be demolished during construction, staff decided to delay resurfacing this portion of the lot until near the end of construction work on the expanded and rehabilitated operations and maintenance facility. As such, staff solicited bids from three construction companies to conduct this resurfacing work. The bids are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Company</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MHK Construction</td>
<td>$97,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Pavement Solutions</td>
<td>$100,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GraniteRock Construction</td>
<td>$93,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In that regard, staff is requesting authorization from your Board to enter into a contract with GraniteRock Construction in the amount of $93,750 to resurface the parking lot at One Ryan Ranch Road.

PREPARED BY: Hunter Harvath

REVIEWED BY: Carl G. Sedoryk
To: Board of Directors

From: Hunter Harvath – Assistant General Manager

Subject: Easement to PG&E at MST Bus Garage at 440 Victor Way, Salinas

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Approve granting an easement on MST property at 440 Victor Way to accommodate the installation of electric charging infrastructure.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

PG&E requires authorization by the MST Board of Directors to grant an easement at 440 Victor Way prior to completing work on the installation of electric chargers for MST’s forthcoming electric buses.

DISCUSSION:

At the November 13, 2017, meeting, your Board authorized staff to upgrade the electric infrastructure at the Salinas bus maintenance and operations facility at 440 Victor Way. This project was necessary to accommodate charging stations for MST’s forthcoming electric bus fleet. As work is nearing completion, PG&E requires an easement from the MST property line to the location of the charging equipment in the bus parking area. In that regard, staff requests that your Board grant this easement to PG&E by adopting Resolution 2018-26. (Attachment 1).
A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE GRANTING OF AN EASEMENT ON MST PROPERTY AT 440 VICTOR WAY IN SALINAS TO PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC

WHEREAS, the MST Board of Directors has adopted a strategic plan that includes as goal number 4 “Promote policies and practices that encourage environmental sustainability and resource conservation;” and

WHEREAS, to further this goal the MST Board of Directors authorized the purchase of two plug-in electric buses from BYD Corporation; and

WHEREAS, these electric buses are now being built for MST at the BYD factory in Lancaster, California; and

WHEREAS, at the November 13, 2017, meeting, the MST Board of Directors authorized the expenditure of up to $300,000 to upgrade the power supply infrastructure at the MST bus facility at 440 Victor Way in Salinas to accommodate plug-in electric buses; and

WHEREAS, in order to complete the electric upgrade project, PG&E has requested an easement from the MST property line to the connection point of the electrical infrastructure; and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of Monterey-Salinas Transit District grants an easement to PG&E as required to complete the electrical infrastructure upgrade project at the MST property at 440 Victor Way in Salinas, California.

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF MONTEREY–SALINAS TRANSIT PASSED AND ADOPTED RESOLUTION 2018-26 this 14th day of May 2018.

_____________________________ ____________________________
Tony Barrera Carl G. Sedoryk
Chairperson Secretary
To: MST Board of Directors

From: Beronica Carriedo, Community Relations Coordinator

Subject: FREE Summer Youth Pass Program

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive update on the Summer Youth Pass Program promotional efforts.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None. The program is funded with a Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) grant through the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

None. This is a free fare program previously authorized by the Board with approval of the grant.

DISCUSSION:

In 2012, Senate Bill 535 was passed requiring Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund investments to benefit disadvantaged communities as defined by the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). The Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) draws from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund to provide operating and capital assistance for transit agencies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve mobility, with a priority on serving disadvantaged communities.

Last year, your board approved using some of MST’s FY17 allocation for the purchase and distribution of 600 free summer youth passes this season. One requirement of the LCTOP is that 50% of funds must benefit a disadvantaged community. For FY 17 allocations, CalEPA utilized the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen 2.0) to assess all census tracts in California to identify the areas disproportionately burdened by and vulnerable to multiple sources of pollution. In Monterey County, the designated disadvantaged communities are located in portions of Salinas, Moss Landing and Pajaro. At a minimum, 50% of the summer youth passes must be distributed in these communities to benefit the residents of the disadvantaged area.
We have identified six schools in the disadvantaged communities and partnered with them to distribute 300 FREE summer youth passes. These schools are:

- Sherwood Elementary School, Salinas
- Monterey Park Elementary School, Salinas
- Spreckels Elementary School, Spreckels
- Los Padres Elementary School, Salinas
- Pajaro Middle School, Watsonville
- Marina High School, Marina

With the remaining 300 FREE summer youth passes, we have partnered with the following agencies and schools:

- Peacock Acres (a transitional housing program serving youth), Salinas
- Monterey County Behavioral Health – Avanza/Juvenile Justice Teams, Salinas
- Rancho Cielo, Salinas
- International School of Monterey, Seaside
- Monterey Bay Charter School, Pacific Grove
- Greenfield High School, Greenfield
- King City Library, King City
- Monterey County Office of Education - Summer Migrant Program in South County
- Dual Language Academy of the Monterey Peninsula, Seaside

There are a limited number passes available for MST Board members wishing to distribute FREE passes to youth groups and/or schools within their jurisdiction.

All summer youth passes are scheduled to be distributed by Friday, May 18th and are valid from June – August.

Additionally, MST will promote the $38 Summer Youth Pass on social media to help bring awareness to the discounted rate and to help drive sales.

PREPARED BY: _______________ REVIEWED BY: _______________
Beronica Carriedo Carl G. Sedoryk
To: Board of Directors

From: Michelle Muller Overmeyer, Grants Analyst

Subject: Conduct public hearing and adopt FY 2018 Program of Projects

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Conduct public hearing for FY 2018 Program of Projects

2. Adopt the FY 2018 Program of Projects; and

3. Authorize the filing of the appropriate grant applications with the Federal Transit Administration and Caltrans.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Your Board must conduct a public hearing and approve MST’s Program of Projects to comply with federal regulations.

DISCUSSION:

The Program of Projects (POP) allocates federal funds to specific projects each fiscal year. The POP becomes part of MST’s application for federal grant funding that is submitted to the Federal Transit Administration via the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG). According to federal regulations, MST is required to develop, publish and afford an opportunity for a public hearing on and submit for approval a POP. In addition, the projects listed in the POP are submitted to AMBAG for inclusion in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP).
Monterey-Salinas Transit  
Final Program of  
Section 5307 Federally Funded Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-Route Bus Planning &amp; Operations</td>
<td>$7,364,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$7,364,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hearing notices were published in the *Herald* (4/12/18), the *Californian* (4/11/18) and in *El Sol* (4/14/18). It is appropriate for your Board to conduct a public hearing to receive comments on the POP and then consider its adoption.

PREPARED BY  
Michelle Overmeyer  
REVIEWED BY  
Carl G. Sedoryk
To: Board of Directors

From: Hunter Harvath – Assistant General Manager

Subject: Half-fare for Spouses and Caregivers of Veterans

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Approve recommendation from the Measure Q Citizens Oversight Committee to extend the half-fare discount to spouses and caregivers of veterans.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Minimal / Immaterial. Currently only 180 veterans are enrolled in the MST Courtesy Card system, which grants discount-eligible persons access to the half-fare program.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Your Board adopts revisions to MST fare policies.

DISCUSSION:

In November of 2014, Monterey County voters approved Measure Q, a 1/8% sales tax to support transit services and programs for seniors, veterans and persons with disabilities. As a result of this new sales tax revenue, your Board voted to extend MST’s half-fare program to veterans, whose discounted fares would be eligible under the language of Measure Q.

At the March 26, 2018 meeting of the Measure Q Citizens Oversight Committee, a recommendation was made to your Board to extend the half-fare program further to spouses and caregivers of veterans. As members of the committee pointed out, some veterans, including those who may be elderly and/or disabled, may need assistance from a spouse or other caregiver as they travel on MST to medical appointments, shopping errands, and other trips. As their help is often essential for veterans’ travel needs, the committee voted to recommend to your Board to extend the half-fare program to spouses and caregivers of these Measure Q-eligible persons. With your Board’s approval, this expanded eligibility would be accounted for in the FY 2019 budget, which will be considered for adoption by your Board at the June 11, 2018, meeting.

PREPARED BY: Hunter Harvath

REVIEWED BY: Carl G. Sedoryk
To: Board of Directors

From: Cristy Sugabo, Mobility Services Manager

Subject: Mobility Advisory Committee Membership

RECOMMENDATION:

Appoint membership to your Mobility Advisory Committee.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Your board appoints members to the MST Mobility Advisory Committee.

DISCUSSION:

The Mobility Advisory Committee (MAC) is a standing advisory committee of the MST Board of Directors. It makes recommendations to MST staff and to your Board regarding the transportation needs of; seniors, veterans, persons with disabilities, low income, youth and isolated populations. The Committee acts as a liaison between MST and these communities to assure that their constituents and clients have input into the MST service planning process.

There are currently five (5) vacancies on the MAC and its current members recommend that your Board appoint Jessica McKillip, Executive Director for the ITN Monterey County; Aimee Cuda, Community Relations Manager for the Central Coast Senior Services, and María Magaña, Community Advocate for the Central Coast Center for Independent Living to fill one of these vacancies.

Approval by your Board of this item shall appoint Jessica McKillip, Aimee Cuda, and María Magaña to the MST Mobility Advisory Committee.

A current listing of Committee members for the MAC is attached.

PREPARED BY: Cristy Sugabo  REVIEWED BY: Carl G. Sedoryk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>ADVOCACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kasuko Wessendorf</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interim, Inc.</td>
<td>Adult Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kathleen Murry-Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td>Area Agency on Aging</td>
<td>Seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ronn Rygg</td>
<td></td>
<td>United Way – 211 Program</td>
<td>I &amp; R – Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maureen McEachen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Visiting Nurses Association</td>
<td>Nonprofit Health Care Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Melissa McKenzie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carmel Foundation</td>
<td>Senior Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alejandro Fernandez</td>
<td></td>
<td>DaVita Dialysis Clinic</td>
<td>Health Care Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kurt Schake</td>
<td></td>
<td>Veterans Transition Center</td>
<td>Veterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reyna Gross</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alliance on Aging</td>
<td>Seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Virginia Murillo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Agency for Monterey County</td>
<td>Transportation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Diana Trapani</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blind and Visually Impaired Center</td>
<td>Blind and Visually Impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Amie Cuda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Central Coast Senior Services</td>
<td>Seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Maria Magana</td>
<td></td>
<td>Central Coast Center for Independent Living</td>
<td>People With Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jessica McKillip</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Transportation Network</td>
<td>Nonprofit Senior Transportation Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Board of Directors

From: Hunter Harvath, Assistant General Manager

Subject: Temporary Bus Facility Lease Renewal

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize staff to renew lease for the temporary MST bus facility on Joe Lloyd Way on the former Fort Ord for a term not to exceed 18 months at a cost of $8,305 per month.

FISCAL IMPACT:

$149,490 over the 18-month life of the lease. This expenditure has been included in the draft FY 2019 operating budget.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Your Board approves expenditures over $25,000.

DISCUSSION:

MST staff has been utilizing a temporary operations and bus yard during the construction of MST’s Ryan Ranch facility since January of 2017. This original lease is set to expire on June 20, 2018. As construction will not be fully complete by this date, staff and the US Army have agreed to an 18-month renewal of the lease so that MST’s Peninsula bus operations can continue to utilize this temporary facility beyond June 20th.

After Peninsula bus operations move back to the remodeled and expanded facility at One Ryan Ranch Road, staff envisions utilizing the temporary facility on Joe Lloyd Way to, among other activities, in-process dozens of new buses as they are delivered in the coming months as well as decommissioning old buses that are due to be retired. If at some point during the 18-month lease period MST staff find that the property is no longer needed, the lease renewal document contains a provision that would allow MST to terminate the lease with 30 days notice. In that regard, staff requests your Board’s authorization to renew this lease for a period of not-to-exceed 18 months at a cost of $8,305 per month.

PREPARED BY: Hunter Harvath

REVIEWED BY: Carl G. Sedoryk
To: Board of Directors
From: C. Sedoryk, General Manager/CEO
Subject: Monthly Report – March 2018

Attached is a summary of monthly performance statistics for the Transportation, Maintenance, and Administration departments for March 2018. MST continue to see strong growth in passenger boardings while other performance indicators remain at or near standard.

During the month staff continued providing public presentations to MST member jurisdictions. During the month the General Manager/CEO and Assistant General Manager along with Chair Barrera and Vice-Chair LeBarre travelled to Washington DC to attend the American Public Transportation Association Legislative Conference and meet with key legislative staff. A list of Capitol Hill meetings attended is contained within Attachment 5.

Attachment #1 – Dashboard Performance Statistics
Attachment #2 – Operations Dept. Report – March 2018
Attachment #3 – Facilities & Maintenance Dept. Report – March 2018
Attachment #4 – Administration Dept. Report – March 2018
Attachment #5 - March 19 - 20 Federal Legislative Meeting Schedule
Attachment #6 - FY 2018 Action Plan Status Update

A complete detail of Monthly Performance Statistics can be viewed within the GM Report at http://www.mst.org/about-mst/board-of-directors/board-meetings/

Prepared by: ________________________
## MST Fixed Route

### YTD Dashboard Performance Comparative Statistics

**March 2018**

**Fiscal Years 2016-2018**

### Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Passenger Boardings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>3,186,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017</td>
<td>3,179,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018</td>
<td>3,307,328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal** = 3,179,055 passengers

**Minimum** = 3,020,102 passengers

### Passengers Per Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Passengers Per Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>15.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017</td>
<td>14.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018</td>
<td>15.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal** = 20 passengers p/h

**Minimum** = 15 passengers p/h

### Percentage of Service Delivered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage of Service Delivered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>99.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017</td>
<td>99.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018</td>
<td>99.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal** = 99% completed

**Minimum** = 95% completed

### On Time Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage of Passengers within 5 minutes of Scheduled Arrival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal** = 90% on time

**Minimum** = 75% on time
FY 2016-2018

MST RIDES
YTD Dashboard Performance Comparative Statistics
March 2018
FY 2016-2018

Ridership

Goal = 93,178 passengers
Maximum = 102,496 passengers

Goal = 2.0 passengers p/h
Minimum = 1.8 passengers p/h

On Time Performance

Goal = 90% on time
Minimum = 80% on time

Maximum = 88,431 one-way trips
Goal = 80,392 one way trips

One Way Trips

Goal = 80,392 one-way trips
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MST RIDES
YTD Dashboard Performance Comparative Statistics
March 2018
FY 2016-2018

Fare Box Recovery Ratio
(Ratio of passenger fares to total operating costs)

Goal = 11%
Minimum = 10%

Cost Per Revenue Hour
(Total operating cost per hour of service)

Goal = $72.16
Maximum = $79.38

Miles Between Preventable Collisions
(Total miles travelled between preventable collisions)

Goal = 110K Miles
Minimum = 100K Miles

Miles Between Road Calls
(Miles travelled between mechanical failure)

Goal = 60,000 miles
Minimum = 30,000 miles
MST Fixed Route
Financial Performance Comparative Statistics
Month of March 2018
Fiscal Year 2018

MST Fixed Route Total Revenue
YTD Actual and Budget

MST Fixed Route Total Expenses
YTD Actual and Budget
MST RIDES
Financial Performance Comparative Statistics
Month of March 2018
Fiscal Year 2018

MST RIDES Total Revenue
YTD Actual and Budget

MST RIDES Total Expenses
YTD Actual and Budget

Minimum 95%

Maximum 105%
May 1, 2018

To: Carl Sedoryk, General Manager / C.E.O.

From: Robert Weber, Chief Operating Officer

Cc: MST Board of Directors

Subject: Transportation Department Monthly Report – March 2018

FIXED ROUTE BUS OPERATIONS:

System Wide Service: (Fixed Route & On Call Services):

Preliminary boarding statistics indicate that ridership decreased by 3.57% in March 2018, (342,255), as compared to March 2017, (254,919). For the Fiscal year – passenger boardings have increased by 4.13% as compared to last Fiscal year.

Productivity decreased slightly from March of last year (14.6) to 14.0 passengers per hour in March of this year.

Supplemental / Special Services:

March 10, 11, & 17: Special services were deployed in support to the Monterey Aquarium’s “Free to Learn” program. Services transported 266 passengers between the Cities of Salinas, Greenfield, and Castroville and the Monterey Bay Aquarium.

System Wide Statistics:

- Ridership: 342,255
- Vehicle Revenue Hours: 24,298
- Vehicle Revenue Miles: 396,239
- System Productivity: 14.0 Passengers Per Vehicle Revenue Hour
- One-Way Trips Provided: 33,660

Time Point Adherence: Of 129,629 total time-point crossings sampled for the month of March, the Transit Master™ system recorded 14,814 delayed arrivals to MST’s published time-points system-wide. This denotes that 88.57% of all scheduled arrivals at published time-points were on time. (See MST Fixed-Route Bus ~ On Time Compliance Chart FY 2017 - 2018.)
**Note:** Service arriving later than 5 minutes beyond the published time point is considered late. The on-time compliance chart, (attached), reflects system wide “on-time performance” as a percentage to the total number of reported time-point crossings.

**Cancelled Trips:** As listed below, there were a total of twenty (20) cancelled trips for the month of March for both directly operated and contracted services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>MST</th>
<th>MV</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Error</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Shortage</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Documented Occurrences:** MST Coach Operators are required to complete an occurrence report for any unusual incident that occurs during their work day. The information provided within these reports is used to identify trends, which often drive changes in policy or standard operating procedures. The following is a comparative summary of reported incidents for the month(s) of March 2017 and 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence Type</th>
<th>March-17</th>
<th>March-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collision: MST Involved</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Injury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Emergency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Hits Coach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Conflict</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Fall</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Injury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Miss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel / fluid Spill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported Damage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTRACTED TRANSPORTATION SERVICES:**

**MST RIDES ADA / ST Paratransit Program:**

Preliminary boarding statistics for the MST RIDES program reflect that for the month of March there were 12,678 passenger boardings. This denotes a 14.88% increase in passenger boardings from March of 2017, (11,036). For the Fiscal year – passenger boardings have increased by 14.89% as compared to last Fiscal year.
- Productivity for March of this year was at 1.80 passengers per hour, increasing from 1.76 in March of 2017.

- For the month of March, 91.47% of all scheduled trips for the MST RIDES program arrived on time, which remained virtually unchanged from March of 2017 (91.65%).

**COMMUNICATIONS CENTER:**

In March, MST's Communications Center summoned public safety agencies on twenty five (25) separate occasions to MST’s transit vehicles and facilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Type</th>
<th>Incident Type</th>
<th>Number Of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Passenger Incident / Other</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>Passenger / Employee Illness / Injury</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department</td>
<td>Hazardous Material Clean up</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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April 25, 2018

To: Carl Sedoryk, General Manager/CEO
From: Robert Weber, Chief Operating Officer
Subject: Monthly Maintenance Operations Report: March 2018

This report summarizes the performance and major activities of the Maintenance Department as well as fuel and operating expenses during the past month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY18 Fuel Budget:</th>
<th>Average Fuel Price March 2018:</th>
<th>Average Fuel Price: FY2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diesel: $3.10</td>
<td>$2.45</td>
<td>$2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline: $3.20</td>
<td>$3.18</td>
<td>$2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year:</th>
<th>Revenue Fleet: Operating Cost Per Mile:</th>
<th>Revenue Fleet: *Miles Between Major Mechanical Road Calls:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March: 2018</td>
<td>$0.91</td>
<td>15,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTD: FY 2018</td>
<td>$0.91</td>
<td>23,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017</td>
<td>$0.89</td>
<td>18,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>$0.93</td>
<td>19,862</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Minimum: 7,000 Miles; Goal: 15,000 Miles

Department Activities/Comments:

The MST revenue fleet travelled 15,529 miles between major mechanical road calls during the month of March. The total number of road-call incidents was 26, with 23 for major mechanical failures ¹ and 3 for other mechanical ² issues. The highest number of major mechanical road calls (43%) was attributed to engine system failures. Fiscal year to date, average miles traveled between major mechanical road calls has increased by 26.69% from the same period last year.

¹ These are failures of a mechanical element of the revenue vehicle that prevents the vehicle from completing a scheduled revenue trip or from starting the next scheduled revenue trip because actual movement is limited or because of safety concerns.
² These are failures of some other mechanical element of the revenue vehicle that, because of local agency policy, prevents the revenue vehicle from completing a scheduled revenue trip or from starting the next scheduled revenue trip even though the vehicle is physically able to continue in revenue service.
In March, two new forklifts were delivered – replacing equipment that was 28-32 years old. Following acceptance of the new equipment, all Maintenance Technicians and Facilities / Parts Department employees shall receive certification training on the new lifts.

In March, Maintenance staff continued to work with Creative Bus Sales to finalize the acceptance of three (3) new medium duty but cut-a-way buses for fixed route service, and six (6) type II RIDES Paratransit vehicles. The final acceptance on all of this equipment has been substantially delayed due to manufacture defects, production delays, and the limited availability of Cal Trans Inspectors.

Recruitment efforts began in March for a Utilities Services Worker, which shall replace the vacant Shop Helper position. Aside for this recruitment, the Department remains fully staffed.
Date: March 14, 2018

To: C. Sedoryk, General Manager/CEO

From: Hunter Harvath, Assistant General Manager; Andrea Williams, General Accounting & Budget Manager; Mark Eccles, Director of Information Technology; Kelly Halcon, Director of Human Resources/Risk Management; Lisa Rheinheimer, Director of Planning and Marketing; Sonia Wills, Customer Service Supervisor; Mike Butler, Marketing Manager.

Subject: **Administration Department** Monthly Report –March 2018

The following significant events occurred in Administration work groups for the month of March 2018:

**Human Resources – March 2018**

A total employment level for March 2018 is summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Budget FY18</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coach Operators F/T</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Operators Limited Duty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO Occupational Injuries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Staff</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Facilities</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative (Interns 1 PT)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>266</strong></td>
<td><strong>258</strong></td>
<td><strong>-8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total budget numbers do not include the C/O on Long Term Leave as those numbers are already reflected in the Coach Operators/Trainees number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March Worker’s Compensation Costs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indemnity (paid to employees)</td>
<td>$44,183.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (includes Legal)</td>
<td>$17,070.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical includes Case Mgmt, UR, Rx &amp; PT</td>
<td>$9,260.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA Administration Fee</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Insurance</td>
<td>$8,939.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$84,454.67</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reserves</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,945,535.29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess Reserved</strong></td>
<td>(<strong>$1,103,669.64</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># Ending Open Claims</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Coach Operator Verification of Transit Training</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Safety Training: Back safety, hearing loss myths and facts, and ladders and falls</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Accident/Incident Re-training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Operator Return to Work Training</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Safety Training: 1901 Weekly probing and servicing at JLW</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Career Training: Crystal Report Writing Level 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service: 2018 Gillig Model 35’ Low Floor Bus</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment Prevention Training for Transit Employees</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTI: Disadvantage business enterprise course</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAICPA Education Foundation: Auditing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AICPA: Accounting, auditing, business management, MAS, Taxes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laredo: AB1825-Sexual Harassment Prevention Education and Training</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Career Training Solution: Excel Level 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance In-Service Training: Harassment Prevention</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Risk Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>March 2018 Preventable</th>
<th>March 2017 Preventable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POV Vehicle hits MST Vehicle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST bus hit stationary object</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the month of March there was one minor occurrence of a bus making contact with a stationary object that was considered “preventable.”
Accident Statistics

Number of Accidents

Non-Preventable
Preventable

Month
Mar-17
Apr-17
May-17
Jun-17
Jul-17
Aug-17
Sep-17
Oct-17
Nov-17
Dec-17
Jan-18
Feb-18
Mar-18

Monthly Miles Between Preventable Collisions (MBPC) with 12 Month Rolling Average

Miles Between Prev. Collisions
MBPC: 12 Month Average

Standard = Not more than 1 preventable collision per 100k miles
# Customer Service Update – March 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Report Type</th>
<th>MST</th>
<th>Other Provider*</th>
<th># of valid reports</th>
<th>% of reports received**</th>
<th>March 2017</th>
<th>% of reports received**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA Compliance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Policy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Amenities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried By</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminatory behavior by employee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Departure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare / Transfer Dispute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full bus / Left behind</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment by Employee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Driving</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Employee Conduct</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccurate Public Information</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Arrival</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Departure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Route</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed By</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Conduct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Injury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable Modification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request To Add Service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request To Reduce Service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Animal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Schedule</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VI Complaint</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe Conditions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total reports MST and *Other Provider 60 100.0% 58 100.0%

Employee Compliment 1
Customer Service Call Center Report:
During the month of March 2018, MST received a total of 4,259 calls which lasted a total of 82 hours and 33 minutes. The average call duration was one minute and ten seconds (1:10). MST received the most number of calls on Wednesday, March 28 at 202. Of the total number of calls, 961* were routed to RealTime bus arrival information. Call volume was heaviest during the weekdays and lightest during the weekends, although average call duration spikes on the weekends due to the fact that there are no customer service representatives on duty. Rather, customers are attempting to get information from MST’s pre-recorded automated system, which appears to take more time.

*The number of MST RealTime phone calls received during the month of March was below average. This irregularity was a result of the RealTime phone system being unavailable due to a lost data connection March 17-20. During these four days, there were no RealTime phone calls received. The average daily number of calls received through the RealTime phone system was 31 during the month of March.
Finance Update – March 2018

General Accounting/Accounts Payable

During the month of March, staff processed timely and accurate vendor payments, recorded appropriate revenues, and prepared monthly financial reporting and analysis. Throughout the month, staff gathered the information necessary to begin the FY19 Budget compilation process to present to the Finance Committee in May and the Board for approval in June 2018.

Payroll

Routine changes and adjustments to payroll records were maintained along with filing of all federal, state, and retirement reports and payments on a timely basis. Payroll continued to provide hours and earnings reports upon request to MST departments.

Grants

Staff continued working with Caltrans and BlueScope for invoicing and grant reimbursements on the TDA Renovation Project. Reimbursement requests were sent to FORA and Caltrans for the Gillig procurement. Work was initiated to compile information for the FY18 Capital Budget.

Purchasing

During the month of March, staff worked on a number of procurement and inventory management objectives. Parts staff worked diligently placing orders and managing inventory levels at both CJW and JLW locations. The inventory value for the month of March was $199,204, which was a slight decrease over February. MST received approximately 10 of the 25 Gillig buses on order. Approximately 5 were placed into service at month’s end. Staff supported the registration process and set up of the assets in our management software.

Information Technology Update –March 2018

Staff worked with Operations and Maintenance Department personnel in monitoring the Intelligence Transportation Systems (ITS) equipment installed on the vehicles. These include the hardware and software for the Trapeze Group Automatic Vehicle Location system on the fixed-route and Paratransit fleets. Staff monitored the Fixed Route Real-Time bus arrival/departure system. Staff replaced vandalized glass on a Real-Time electronic sign.

Staff monitored the Trapeze Group Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) vehicle maintenance system. Staff continued to support the users of the Serenic Navision accounting/payroll system. Staff monitored the functionality of the customer service database. Staff monitored and configured the WiFi systems installed on 15 buses used on the commuter routes.
Staff worked with Giro and MST staff in the ongoing implementation of the latest modules in the Hastus system.

Staff worked with vendors and MST departments in relation to the continuing remodel of the TDA Maintenance/Operations site.

Staff liaised with the County of Monterey Information Technology Department and Trapeze Group regarding the maintenance of the radio/data communications in the MST service area.

Staff monitored and configured the AT&T-managed Voice-Over-Internet Protocol (VOIP) telephone system. Staff worked with AT&T regarding the VOIP telephone system installations at 1 Ryan Ranch Road and 15 Lincoln Avenue locations.

Staff continued to support other MST staff members as needed, proactively ensuring that all were supported fully with their IT requirements.

Marketing Update – March 2018

RealTime Usage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>RealTime Phone</th>
<th>CSR Phone</th>
<th>App Sessions</th>
<th>App Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July+</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,364**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>3,959</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>4,463</td>
<td>70,282</td>
<td>4,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>5,297</td>
<td>1,379</td>
<td>4,614</td>
<td>99,289</td>
<td>4,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>6,168</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>3,769</td>
<td>112,114</td>
<td>5,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>5,805</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td>4,278</td>
<td>107,642</td>
<td>4,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>5,956</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>3,913</td>
<td>86,928</td>
<td>4,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>5,520</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>4,013</td>
<td>99,050</td>
<td>4,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>5,536</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>4,028</td>
<td>118,088</td>
<td>4,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>5,758</td>
<td>961***</td>
<td>4,259</td>
<td>115,521</td>
<td>4,994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
* RealTime was launched July 24, 2017.
* RealTime phone and Transit App usage is not available for July.
** Due to an AT&T system glitch, there was no phone data recorded from July 20-31 even though calls were received.
*** The number of MST RealTime phone calls received during the month of March was below average. This irregularity was a result of the RealTime phone system being unavailable due to a lost data connection March 17-20. During these four days, there were no RealTime phone calls received. The average daily number of calls received through the RealTime phone system was 31 during the month of March.

Press releases sent include: “MST Puts New Buses Into Service” (3/26/2018)

Marketing activities: Staff continued planning the Monterey Operations and Maintenance Facility (TDA) ribbon-cutting event and made a site visit; staff designed and began production of TDA facility signage; staff made updates to the Mobility Services booklet, and began updates to two other brochures; staff created the Free Summer Youth GoPass flyer; staff updated the Title VI notice of language assistance; staff made minor revisions to mst.org and created posts for Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram.

Community outreach: Staffed an information booth at MPC Mobile Clinic in Monterey; staffed an information booth at Walgreens in Seaside with the Montage mobile health clinic; staffed an informational booth at the Kinder Family Festival in Greenfield; attended the annual International Women's Day luncheon at Alisal High School in Salinas; staffed an information booth at Sherwood Village in Salinas; staffed an information booth at Hartnell in Salinas; staffed an information booth at Montage Wellness Center in Marina; staffed an information booth at the Job Fair/Resource Fair at the Monterey County Jail in Salinas.

Presentations: Presented to parents from King City High in King City and from El Puente in Salinas; presented to students from CSUMB - CSP Student Assistants program in Seaside; participated in Career Day at Cesar Chavez Elementary in Greenfield.

Collaborative/Meeting/Committee's: Attended second Leadership Monterey class; attended P.A.R.T.S collaborate in Soledad.
Overview by Social Media Platform:

Twitter:

- Tweets: 76 (+25)
- Followers: 563 (+5)
- Engagement: 15 (+2)
- Traffic: 21 (+17)
Facebook:

![Facebook Metrics]

Instagram:

![Instagram Metrics]

**Notes:** On Twitter, “following” someone means that you will see their tweets (Twitter updates) in your personal timeline. Twitter lets you see who you follow and also who is following you. Followers are people who receive other people’s Twitter updates.

A Facebook “fan” is a user who likes a particular Facebook page. Users who “like” a page are able to receive updates from that page's administrator through status updates, posted content, and event invitations. A list of pages a fan has liked will appear on his or her profile page.

“Engagement” is the sum of likes and comments received by all posts.

“Traffic” is the total number of clicks on all the links posted.
Planning Update – March 2018

During the month of March, staff continued to monitor the revenues and expenses for the military partnerships and visited the Presidio approximately one day each week to assist with the program. Revenues received from the federal transit benefit have stabilized and increased during recent months so that revenues are matching expenses and have fully made up for previous losses. Staff has been actively advocating for this program during its Congressional visits to ensure that it continues with the comprehensive tax reform bill that was passed in December 2017. As such, staff will continue discussions with the Presidio to reevaluate the program with some expansions possible for the future. Staff worked with the Presidio on identifying locations for new bus stop shelters, which have been delivered from the supplier. The Presidio staff is working on the required site work to allow installation of the shelters. As reported in February, only one new shelter had been installed at one of the higher ridership stops. Staff also collected comprehensive ridership information at the request of the Presidio. This information will be used to better deliver transportation throughout the base.

In March, staff continued a bi-weekly check-in meeting with the consultant and Santa Cruz METRO for the Bus Operations on Highway 1 Shoulders and the Monterey Branch Line Feasibility Study. Staff reviewed the Administrative Draft Study submitted by the consultant in March.

Staff continued planning efforts in support of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the South County Operations and Maintenance Facility. A draft NEPA document was submitted to the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for review and comment in August 2017. Since August, the USDA and FTA have had multiple comments which have required additional work. The federal environmental document submitted was under the category of Categorical Exclusion. As of March, USDA approved the NEPA documentation while no concurrence was made by FTA. After receiving feedback from King City staff about a January submittal of a conditional use permit application, MST staff and consultant team worked on providing additional information to complete the permit application.

In March, staff began planning work on the Salinas Valley Express Transit Corridor Study with consultant staff from Fehr and Peers. The study will review options for faster transit service along the US 101 corridor between King City and Salinas.

Throughout the month, staff continued participating in meetings with various local agencies, including the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, Salinas Valley Chamber of Commerce Government Relations Committee, Monterey County Business Council, and the Fort Ord Reuse Authority.
## Federal Congressional Visits March 19 - 20, 2018

### Monday March 19, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noon</td>
<td>Senate Banking Committee</td>
<td>Jen Deci, Professional Staff to Chairman Mike Crapo (R-ID), Homer Carlisle, Professional Staff to Ranking Minority Member Sherrod Brown (D-OH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 p.m - 5:00pm</td>
<td>Senator Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Trevor Higgins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tuesday March 19, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 am - 10:00 am</td>
<td>Rep. Mark DeSaulnier (House T&amp;I)</td>
<td>Rep. Mark DeSaulnier, Andrew Perlstein Legislative Aide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 am - 10:45 am</td>
<td>Rep. Anna Eshoo</td>
<td>Eric Henshall Legislative Aide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 pm - 1:00 pm</td>
<td>Congressman Panetta</td>
<td>Rep. Jimmy Panetta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 pm - 1:45 pm</td>
<td>Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi</td>
<td>Robert Edmonson Chief of Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 pm - 2:30 pm</td>
<td>House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee</td>
<td>Nicole Christus Professional Staff, Auke Mahar-Piersma Professional Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 pm - 3:15 pm</td>
<td>Rep. Jeff Denham (House T&amp;I)</td>
<td>Rep. Jeff Denham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 pm - 4:00 pm</td>
<td>Rep. Jackie Speier</td>
<td>Rep. Jackie Speier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 pm - 5:00 pm</td>
<td>Rep. John Garamendi (House T&amp;I)</td>
<td>Rep. John Garamendi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY 2018 Project Action Plan Status Update
March 31, 2017

1. Complete construction of Monterey Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility and begin operations. March 2018
   Status: Project is delayed several months due to weather and contractor project management issues. Construction costs are nearing budget limits and final budget may need to be adjusted. Permanent occupancy planned for June 2018.

2. Execute grants, complete environmental documentation, begin procurement for design/build, permitting, and construction of South County maintenance facility. June 2018
   Status: Your board approved CEQA environmental documents and staff is waiting for approval of NEPA documentation from federal regulators.

3. Implement new Measure Q projects including intelligent voice recording, enhanced out-of-area medical trips, volunteer mileage reimbursement program, ADA emergency rapid response module, and begin planning effort for the Flex Voucher Pilot Program. June 2018
   Status: English Intelligent voice recording is active with Spanish. Enhanced out-of-area medical trips implemented; executed lease for Salinas Mobility Center at 25 Lincoln Avenue and staff will take occupancy in June 2018. Volunteer driver reimbursement program started.

4. Accept delivery and place in to service new buses, trolleys, mini buses, service and support vehicles .Ongoing.
   Status: Received first 13 new GILLIG buses and began placing in to service. Procurements for new buses, trolleys and support vehicles are proceeding in a timely manner.

5. Complete feasibility study of Bus Operations on State Route 1 Shoulders and Monterey Branch Line in coordination with Santa Cruz Metro. June 2018
   Status: Administrative draft received with final study results to be shared with your Board at July 2018 board meeting

6. Commence Salinas Valley express transit corridor planning study.
   Status: Complete. Consultant for study selected at February 2018 Board meeting and preliminary work has commenced.

7. Develop facilities and fleet maintenance workforce development program. March 2018
   Status: Preliminary work has been done to identify ways to better incentivize training and workforce development within the maintenance department.
8. Install updated point of sale system at customer service locations. June 2018
   Status: Staff met with several potential vendors at the APTA Expo and has identified two potential vendors pending review of compatibility with MST information technology.

   Status: Board approved a budget and staff is awaiting permits from City of Salinas.

10. Implement MST RealTime traveler information system and marketing campaign. Sept. 2017
    Status: Complete. Customers have responded favorably to the new service.

11. Procure consulting services to develop 5-year program of major projects and identify resources required to implement including, but not limited to:

   a. Identify locations for necessary facilities expansion including Salinas Maintenance and Operations Facility and Salinas Mobility Center.
   b. Develop plan for potential continued use of Joe Lloyd Way facilities.
   c. Develop strategy for future of contracted services.
   d. Develop a plan for short- and long-term use of Suite 110 of Lichtanski Administration Building.
   e. Develop strategy for operation and maintenance of zero emission fleet
   f. Conduct comprehensive operational analysis of service area.
   g. Develop recommendations for uses/disposition of undeveloped MST property.

   Status: Preliminary discussions have been had with a variety of consultants to identify projects where assistance is needed. A consultant has been hired to assist with Salinas Transit Center improvements. Staff has identified locations for Salinas Maintenance and Operations Facility. Staff has developed a 3 year plan for consolidation of contracted services with MST directly operated services. Staff has plans for continued use of Joe Lloyd Way facilities contingent upon funding of Salinas Operations and Maintenance Facility rehabilitation project. Staff has developed a plan for short and long-term use of Suite 110 of Lichtanski Administration Building.
TO: Carl Sedoryk
FROM: Don Gilchrest

The following report summarizes actions taken on behalf of Monterey-Salinas Transit in April.

**Fiscal Year 2019 Budget**

The President’s Budget Proposal to Congress on February 12 officially began the FY 2019 appropriations process and the House and Senate funding subcommittees are holding hearings in anticipation of drafting their bills. The appropriations bills are widely considered to be some of the few must-pass bills remaining in Congress this year. The Bipartisan Budget Agreement that was enacted in February included a two-year deal to increase the budget caps, which means that the Appropriations Committees already know the overall top-line funding number that they will be working with this year. It is hoped that this will make it possible for them to draft the 12 individual appropriations bills and move them through initial floor consideration in the House or Senate. Even if that occurs, though, final enactment will remain a challenge and a lame-duck session of Congress will likely be needed to complete the funding process.

**Transportation Funding**

The *FY 2018 Consolidated Appropriations Act* provided increased amounts of infrastructure funding for certain FTA programs, including $209 million for the Bus Formula Program, $161.4 million for the Bus and Bus Facilities Discretionary Program, and $29.4 million for Low- or No-Emission Buses. The TIGER Grant Program was also increased to $1.5 billion and DOT released the NOFA for this program on April 20. The program is being renamed as the Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD) Transportation Discretionary Grants program and applications to DOT will be accepted until July 19, 2018.

**Lobbying Strategies & Opportunities**

In April, we represented MST at a meeting of APTA’s Washington Area Transit Industry Representatives Task Force to discuss joint advocacy strategies and to share information regarding implementation of the FY 2018 omnibus funding bill and the FY 2019 appropriations process. We were briefed by the Majority and Minority staff from the Senate Appropriations Committees and our discussion included the potential for future infrastructure funding and development of the Administration’s Infrastructure Initiative. One point of shared advocacy
moving forward will be to ensure that the additional transportation funding that was enacted in FY 2018 is also included in the FY 2019 bills under development. We will continue to work in coordination with APTA, CTA, the Bus Coalition and other public transportation stakeholders to monitor these developments for any opportunities to advocate your Board’s Federal agenda.

TPW:dwg
To: Board of Directors

From: Carl Sedoryk, General Manager/CEO

Subject: State Legislative Update

The California State Transit Agency (CalSTA) provided notice of project approvals for the State Transit Assistance State of Good Repair Program which is solely funded with SB 1 moneys and includes $772,000 to replace 14 MST mini buses that are used to provide lifeline transit services on MST routes in low density and rural communities within Monterey County. CalSTA also announced awards of the Transit Intercity Rail Program and the MST Salinas Operations and Maintenance Facility rehabilitation project was not selected this year for funding.

Staff continues to monitor and support several bills that are moving through the state legislature including:

**AB 3201 (Daly) California Clean Truck, Bus, and Off-Road Vehicle Equipment Technology Program**

This bill would clarify the Legislature’s support for a well-funded and stable transition to a zero-emission transit bus fleet by ensuring transit agencies retain access to vital incentive funding. More specifically, this would require ARB to create a three-year plan for developing, deploying, and investing in, cleaner heavy-duty truck and bus technologies, and incentive funding to be used to meet current and future regulatory compliance obligations, like the Innovative Clean Transit regulation.

**AB 3124 (Bloom) Vehicles: Length Limitations: Buses: Bicycle Transportation Devices**

This bill would amend Section 35400 of the Vehicle Code to authorize the use of three position bike racks (bike racks capable of accommodating three bicycles) on 60-foot articulated transit buses, subject to the approval of a route review committee.

**SB 1119 (Newman) Low Carbon Transit Operations Program**

This bill would allow public transit agencies to more effectively and efficiently utilize their Low Carbon Transit Operations funding shares by waiving the disadvantaged community requirements for certain types of expenditures – transit passes and expanded or improved bus service.
SB 1434 (Leyva) Transportation Electrification: Electricity Rate Design

This bill would support and accelerate the deployment of battery-electric transit buses by requiring the California Public Utilities Commission to initiate a ratemaking proceeding that addresses the high cost of electricity as a fuel.

On April 18, the General Manager / CEO travelled to Sacramento to attend meetings with Assembly members Caballero and Stone, and met with the staff of Senators Monning and Canella to discuss MST state projects and legislative priorities. Also that day the GM/CEO met with the Chair of the state Air Resources Board (ARB), Mary Nichols and her staff to discuss purchase mandates proposed by ARB staff to achieve the vision of Governor Brown for a statewide 100% zero emission public transit fleet.

Finally, proponents of the SB 1 Repeal have submitted approximately 830,000 signatures to the Secretary of State’s Office for validation. In order to qualify the initiative for the November ballot, the Secretary of State must validate approximately 585,000 signatures by May 21. Staff will continue to educate and inform members of the communities we serve on the importance of retaining SB1 gas tax funds within Monterey County.

Submitted by Carl G. Sedoryk
March 12, 2018

To: Carl Sedoryk

From: Hunter Harvath, Assistant General Manager

Subject: TRIP REPORT – March 2018

From February 9th through 12th, I traveled to Miami, Florida, to participate in the American Public Transportation Association’s 2018 Transit CEOs Seminar. While at the seminar, I participated on a panel of three Assistant General Managers and gave a short presentation on my leadership experiences working at MST at the executive level. Additionally, I attended the following committees and sessions:

- APTA Bus & Paratransit CEO’s committee
- Welcome session featuring the director of Miami-Dade Transit as well as APTA leadership
- CEO Leadership Development
- Mobility at a Crossroads: Transit Adaptation Strategies and the Path Forward
- FTA Update featuring the Honorable K. Jane Williams, Deputy Administrator
- Workforce of the Future
- Labor Best Practices Roundtable
- Legislative and Regulatory Landscape
- Three Topical Issues: Sustainability, Resilience and Ridership
- Terrorism and Cyber Security Address and Exchange
- Transit’s Value Added and Ways to Monetize It

PREPARED BY: Hunter Harvath

REVIEWED BY: Carl G. Sedoryk
To: Carl Sedoryk

From: Michelle Overmeyer, Grants Analyst

Subject: TRIP REPORT – April 2018

I traveled to Newport Beach to participate in the CalAct Spring Conference which was held April 3rd through April 6th. During the conference I attended the following sessions:

- Mobility As a Force for Health, Wealth & Happiness
- Facility Preparation & Operation of a Zero Emission Bus
- Microtransit: Wave of the Future? Or Flavor of the Month?
- Rider-Centric Solutions: A Shift Towards Understanding the Rider’s Perspective
- The Future of Automated Vehicles in Transportation
- Using Data to Improve Performance, Reliability & Sustainability
- California Transit Plan & State Transit Programs Update
- California Air Resources Boards’ Innovative Clean Transit Regulations for Zero Emission Buses
- Future Transportation Challenges & Opportunities
- California’s Rural & Intercity Bus System: 2018 Study

I also participated in networking events with my counterparts from transit agencies across the state. The conference sessions and networking events provided with me with information and professional contacts that I will use in my day-to-day duties as Grants Analyst.

PREPARED BY: Michelle O. Overmeyer

REVIEWED BY: Carl G. Sedoryk
To: Carl Sedoryk  
From: Mike Butler, Marketing and Customer Service Manager  
Subject: TRIP REPORT – April 2018

I attended the CalACT Spring Conference & Expo in Newport Beach, CA, and I attended the following workshops/ events:

- Micro-Transit: Wave of the Future or Flavor of the Month?
- Rider-Centric Solutions
- The Future of Automated Vehicles in Transportation
- Ridership: Different Approaches for Different Generations
- Web-Based Find-a-Ride Portal
- OCTA Maintenance Facility Tour
- Future Transportation Challenges and Opportunities
- Renewable Diesel — Diesel Made Better
- Your Travel Training Program

I attended the product Expo where I met and spoke with several vendors. I attended events that provide networking opportunities with industry peers. I rode public transit to the OCTA facility tour which provided a unique opportunity to chat with colleagues.

Friday’s session enlightened me to politically charged environment we operate in. Tuesday’s keynote speech from Gil Penalosa was inspiring. My takeaway from him is that we should to design our city considering people first (particularly those 8 and 80 years old), with public spaces, and public transit as priorities.
Gas tax repeal heading for the November ballot, campaign says

By KATY MURPHY | kmurphy@bayareanewsgroup.com | Bay Area News Group
PUBLISHED: April 30, 2018 at 12:55 pm | UPDATED: April 30, 2018 at 3:06 pm

A campaign to roll back California's new vehicle and gas taxes — and the $50 billion they are expected to generate over the next decade for road repairs and transit upgrades — is likely heading to the November ballot, say organizers who Tuesday plan to deliver more than enough signatures to qualify.

If the repeal initiative lands on the November ballot, voters can expect a costly and highly visible showdown between repeal supporters and the powerful coalition of labor, transportation and business groups that pushed for the new taxes and fees last year alongside Gov. Jerry Brown. Advocates are alarmed by the prospect of the money — already dedicated to thousands of projects, including the San Jose BART extension — vanishing.

But Sacramento lawmakers underestimated the voter backlash when they pushed through the hikes last year, said Carl DeMaio, the San Diego talk-show host who launched the repeal effort.

"Even I was a little surprised at the intensity of voter revolt here," DeMaio said in an interview Monday before a rally in San Diego.

In April 2017, without a vote to spare, California lawmakers managed to pass Sen. Jim Beall's Senate Bill 1, raising gas and diesel taxes and adding an annual vehicle registration fee to repair the state's crumbling roads and bridges and improve public transit. State transportation authorities have already committed billions of dollars from the new pot of money to highway repairs and traffic-easing projects. And in June, voters will consider a constitutional amendment, Proposition 69, to ensure the Legislature can't raid the fund for non-transportation purposes.
Like other fiscal conservatives, DeMaio argues that the state needed to spend its existing dollars more wisely and says that the average family can’t afford the 12-cent-per-gallon tax or higher vehicle registration fees. He also asserts that the governor and others have consistently discounted the power of the repeal campaign — and that they are in denial about the tax revolt underway.

“They don’t understand,” he said, “what sort of tsunami is ready to crash on their shores.”

TRANSPORTATION TAXES: $50 BILLION RAISED OVER 10 YEARS

$24.4 billion by increasing gasoline excise tax 12 cents

$200 million from an annual $100 “zero emission vehicle fee” beginning in 2020

$7.3 billion by increasing diesel excise tax by 20 cents

$3.5 billion by increasing diesel sales tax to 5.75 percent

$16.3 billion from an annual “transportation improvement fee” based on a vehicle’s value

$706 million in General Fund loan repayments.

An Incredible $200 Intro Bonus Just For Using This Card

By NextAdvisor

A leading bank just upped the intro bonus on its top cash back card to an insane $200. Plus get unlimited 1.5% cash back, no annual fee and more.

Tags: California Ballot Measures, California legislature, Regional, Taxes, Transportation

Katy Murphy Katy Murphy is based in Sacramento and covers state government for The Mercury News and East Bay Times, a beat she took on in January 2017. Before that, she was the news organization’s higher education reporter, writing about UC, CSU, community colleges and private colleges. Long ago,
April 30, 2018

California Air Resources Board, Members
1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Update on Innovative Clean Transit Discussion Document

Chair Nichols and Members of the California Air Resources Board:

On behalf of the California Transit Association, I submit the following comments in response to the "Update on Innovative Clean Transit Discussion Document," (Update) released March 27, 2018.

Our membership, comprised of more than 80 transit agencies, greatly appreciates the various forums ARB has sponsored to-date to allow our industry to voice its concerns with the regulatory concept first proposed in the "Innovative Clean Transit Regulation Discussion Document," (Discussion Document) released December 12, 2017. These forums include: a Regulatory Workshop, held December 15, 2017; and, a Transit Agency Subcommittee meeting, held January 26, 2018. Additionally, we thank ARB staff for their openness to meeting with us separately to discuss the merits and viability of the draft counterproposal we shared electronically on March 5, 2018 (see Attachment A), which would: require each transit agency in the state to develop and submit an individualized zero-emission bus (ZEB) deployment plan to ARB by 2020; and, guarantee that all standard transit buses in active operation in California are zero-emission by 2040.

We appreciate that the Update seeks comment on several provisions of the Innovative Clean Transit regulatory concept that the Association has long-deemed onerous or problematic for our transit agency members. We thank you for recognizing the importance of getting these provisions right for California's transit agencies and the riders who rely on their service; and, we look forward to continuing to work with you to construct a ZEB rule that is workable for all parties.

**Regulation Starting Date:** The Association and its members continue to believe that a purchase mandate, regardless of its start date, is the wrong approach for facilitating a statewide transition to ZEB technologies. As we have asserted many times before, every transit agency in the state operates under vastly different constraints, with unique operational needs, varied financial positions and different fleet compositions; therefore, necessitating regulatory flexibility and the opportunity to develop an individualized plan for introducing ZEB technology.

In our comments to the Discussion Document, submitted to you on January 22, 2018, we attempted to distill our position and present a workable path forward by stipulating that the transition to ZEBs should be done:
• "Methodically, with full consideration of, and clear solutions to, barriers outside the control of transit agencies (e.g. the high upfront capital costs of zero-emission buses and charging infrastructure, the excessive costs of electricity relative to conventional fuels, and the untutored costs of retraining maintenance workers and bus operators);

• Iteratively, evaluating cost and operational data as it is collected from real-world ZEB deployments as well as changing funding landscapes, and allowing for adjustments to long-term targets based on budgetary, operational and technology feasibility, and,

• In a Manner That Retains Local Decision-Making to allow the public servants who manage and operate our transit agencies to make operational investments and procurement decisions that avoid the operational impacts that could result from an overly-prescriptive and forced transition to ZEB technology."

At the urging of our members, the Association has developed a counterproposal that fully adheres to the principles outlined above. In developing this counterproposal, the Association very consciously worked to address the calls of ARB and other stakeholders to facilitate early actions, guarantee ZEB deployments, and secure measurable emission reductions.

The Association’s counterproposal would:

• Require each transit agency in the state to develop and submit an initial zero-emission bus deployment plan to ARB by 2020 outlining how they will transition to a fully zero-emission standard transit bus fleet by 2040;

• Fund early deployments of ZEBs in disadvantaged communities (DACs), state and federal non-attainment areas of the state, and for transit agencies that demonstrate an expertise in ZEB technologies, beginning in 2020; and,

• Commit each transit agency to operating standard transit bus fleets that are 100% zero-emission by 2040, provided barriers to ZEB deployment – such as ZEB cost and performance, high electricity rates, weight, infrastructure availability and funding – have been resolved.

The plan would authorize ARB to impose an individualized purchase mandate on transit agencies that fail to meet the ZEB deployment targets, beginning in 2025, if those same barriers are resolved.

We believe our counterproposal offers a more appropriate approach to facilitating a statewide transition to ZEB technologies, because unlike an across-the-board purchase mandate, it does not treat all agencies equally. Instead, it recognizes that agencies are operating under different constraints, and allows agencies to contemplate and plan for important considerations that are often lost on organizations that have never overseen the implementation of a bus project. These considerations include an agency’s financial position, its operational and infrastructural needs, its planned procurement schedule, its depot configuration and its ability to develop and secure a workforce capable of operating and maintaining new technology. Additionally, our counterproposal allows agencies to develop ZEB deployment plans that, unlike a purchase mandate, acknowledge and support various other mandates, including the federal asset management requirement, ADA paratransit service and an agency’s emergency response functions.

Taken as a whole, our counterproposal will drive ZEB deployments and measurable emission reductions that are consistent with the ARB’s objectives. To provide assurance that these outcomes will
be met, our counterproposal allows ARB to impose an individualized purchase mandate on a transit agency, beginning in 2025, if it fails to meet its ZEB deployment targets.

Finally, our counterproposal, by proposing preferential incentive funding for early deployments of ZEBs in DAs and/or non-attainment areas, and/or for those agencies that are already experimenting with operating this technology, ensures that the communities most in need of clean air and access to zero-emission transportation are first in line for ZEB deployments.

With our counterproposal, we endeavored to develop a proposal that is workable for transit agencies from the start; instead of one where off-ramps and one-off considerations are essential to making an inherently inflexible ZEB purchase mandate flexible enough to work in almost any circumstance.

**Recommendation:** We urge ARB to adopt the Association’s counterproposal in full. The counterproposal would: substitute the proposed ZEB purchase mandate with a mandate that each transit agency in the state develop and submit a ZEB deployment plan to ARB by 2020; and, fund the deployment of ZEBs in disadvantaged communities, state and federal non-attainment areas of the state, and/or at transit agencies with experience in the deployment of ZEBs. These provisions combined would allow for a regulation starting date of 2020.

**Please see Attachment A for more details on the Association’s counterproposal.**

**Role of Incentives:** Several transit agencies in the state, representing approximately 25% of California’s entire transit bus fleet, have committed to operating 100% ZEB fleets by 2040 or sooner. These same agencies are now procuring and deploying ZEBs, consistent with these long-term targets, as funding, infrastructure buildout, and technology allow; many more agencies are seeking and securing state and/or federal funding to launch their own ZEB pilot projects that will inform their long-range fleet planning.

Some stakeholders have observed this progress and have concluded that the time is right to institute a ZEB purchase mandate that would, by design, limit access to incentive funding. The purported logic behind this position is that, only by compelling the purchase of ZEBs and reserving incentive funding for the most able ZEB adopters – i.e. those agencies that can go above and beyond the regulatory requirements ARB sets – will the state guarantee its ZEB deployment targets are met. Additionally, we know of at least one prominent environmental organization that has told members of the Legislature that limiting access to incentive funding, as described, is a non-starter for transit agencies, because they would simply rush to make procurements the month, week or day before a purchase mandate goes into effect to secure incentive funding. We disagree on the logic and question what environmental benefit is provided by this approach.

Instead, we maintain that the progress seen to-date is illustrative of the significant uptake of ZEB technology that is possible when agencies develop thoughtful plans for ZEB deployment; can identify and address agency-specific barriers to electrification and/or hydrogen access, without regard to centrally-mandated ZEB deployment schedules; and, have access to **reliable funding streams – free of arbitrary limits or barriers** – that offset the upfront cost of ZEBs relative to conventional technologies.

We assert that the state’s experience with ZEB deployments – i.e. 450 ZEBs now operating, or on order, all purchased with the help of state and/or federal incentives – and the role that robust transit service **must** play in reducing emissions from the transportation sector suggests that the state should
remove all barriers to transit agencies accessing incentive funding for the foreseeable future and fully fund the transition to ZEBs, even if that requires directly funding regulatory compliance.

As you evaluate this request, which breaks from board policy that establishes a principle of "polluter pays (for regulatory compliance)," we remind you that transit agencies are unique as regulated entities in that they are not private sector companies that produce pollution to create profit. Rather, transit agencies are public entities that rely almost exclusively on public funding – i.e. state and federal formula funding and competitive grants, and fares – to provide essential mobility options to millions of Californians, including those who are transit dependent. We believe strongly that to extend the principle of "polluter pays" to resource-constrained transit agencies is to consign on a ZEB deployment strategy that deliberately okays the diversion of funding from transit service, state of good repair, other capital projects or from transit riders via higher fares, when the Legislature has already provided ARB with funding to support the purchase of cleaner buses.

Our counterproposal would: require transit agencies to develop ZEB deployment plans detailing their individualized strategy for introducing ZEBs and attaining a 100% ZEB fleet; and, charge ARB with converting incentive funding into dedicated funding to offset the upfront cost of ZEBs relative to conventional technologies, to be made available to transit agencies as they are ready to deploy ZEBs.

**Recommendation:** We urge ARB to adopt the Association’s counterproposal in full. The counterproposal would charge ARB with identifying dedicated funding to offset the upfront cost of ZEBs relative to conventional technologies, to be made available to transit agencies as they are ready to deploy ZEBs, regardless of the final framework of the ZEB rule.

**Please see Attachment A for more details on the Association’s counterproposal.**

**Overall Cost:** The Association has long-contested the findings of ARB’s Total-Cost-of-Ownership model, which we believe underestimates the cost of a statewide transition to a 100% ZEB fleet. We would argue that, even if you dismiss the findings of the ARB-convened Lifecycle Cost Modeling Subgroup, it should be compelling that the transit agencies across the state are reporting to us – and to ARB staff – that the cost of operating ZEBs is currently significantly higher than operating conventionally-fueled buses. This feedback includes observations from several transit agencies operating some of the most battery-electric transit bus miles anywhere in the country that the cost of electricity as a fuel can be 40% to 2x higher than compressed natural gas and diesel, respectively. Reports from King County METRO in Seattle, Washington suggest that the experience of these California agencies is not an anomaly.

After close to three years of in-depth debate about this issue, we acknowledge that our members, ARB and the various other stakeholder involved may never be at full agreement on the total cost of the ZEB rule. Rather than allow this divide to continue to thwart the rulemaking process, we have developed a counterproposal, which attempts to manage the risks inherent in any modeling effort that guides capital expenditures – including this costing exercise – by committing transit agencies to carrying out ambitious ZEB deployment plans, provided mutually agreed to cost, performance, and funding benchmarks are met. These benchmarks, which would be informed by ARB’s cost model assumptions and findings would roughly establish that: ZEB cost will continue to fall, reaching parity with conventionally-fueled technologies; ZEB performance and reliability will continue to improve, bringing ZEBs in alignment with conventionally-fueled technologies; funding and offset programs will remain robust; and, that ZEBs will prove cheaper to operate than conventionally-fueled technologies.
While you review our counterproposal, we urge ARB to release an addendum to its existing cost model that more directly acknowledges and communicates the uncertainty inherent in any modeling exercise by presenting a cost range for the regulation. As currently presented and often discussed, the model assumes favorable inputs across several important cost drivers, which result in a total cost of the regulation that is lower than the business-as-usual case. While ARB’s model is manipulatable, allowing a user to conduct their own assessment of the cost range of the regulation, we believe this level of transparency should be central to ARB’s discussion of the ZEB rule, not a buried feature of its cost model. Additionally, we urge ARB to better highlight how changes in key inputs drive changes in the cost projections, particularly for the early years of the regulation when the cost of transitioning to ZEBs is expected to be highest.

**Recommendation:** We urge ARB to adopt the Association’s counterproposal in full. The counterproposal would help manage the risk inherent in our collective cost modeling efforts.

Please see Attachment A for more details on the Association’s counterproposal.

**Cutaways and Non-Standard Buses:** The Association raised concerns about the application of the regulatory concept to cutaway buses in our comments to the Discussion Document, submitted January 22, 2018.

At the time, we argued that ‘Battery-electric cutaway buses are a nascent technology and, to the best of our knowledge, have not yet been approved for purchase with federal funding. Cutaway buses are critical to providing service in low-density rural areas and to persons who qualify for paratransit service under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Additionally, unlike fixed route operations, FTA regulates the paratransit operating environment providing explicit requirements for pick up windows, denial of service as well as acceptable travel times. In the dynamic operating environment of paratransit services these unproven new buses could result in unintended violations of ADA law.’

For that reason, we are generally pleased with the findings of the Update that “the priority [of the ZEB rule] should be to focus near term electrification efforts on larger buses that are already available from multiple manufacturers.” However, based on feedback from our membership, we believe this near-term exemption should also be extended to over-the-road coaches which, like cutaway buses, are a nascent technology with limited real-world demonstrations.

**Recommendation:** We urge ARB to adopt the Association’s counterproposal in full. The counterproposal would apply only to standard transit buses above 26,000 lbs. gross vehicle weight, and would defer its applicability to cutaway buses and over-the-road coaches until 2030. In 2030, ARB would commission an independent and/or peer-reviewed analysis of the cost and performance of these technologies, and ensure their viability in transit operations, before considering their inclusion in the ZEB rule.

Additionally, we urge ARB to guarantee that the ZEB rule will not require electric trolley buses to be converted to battery-electric or hydrogen fuel cell technologies.

Please see Attachment A for more details on the Association’s counterproposal.

**Regulatory Assessments:** In March 2017, ARB Executive Staff engaged us on the possibility of an alternative path to facilitating a statewide transition to a 100% ZEB fleet, known then as the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) approach.
During the MOU conversations, the Association proposed that the approach include a regulatory assessment. Within that context, the regulatory assessment was to serve as a risk management strategy for transit agencies and the state against a future that offers uncertainty on ZEB cost and performance, the cost of electricity as a fuel, vehicle weight, infrastructure availability and funding. While the regulatory concept currently under consideration has transformed into a more straightforward rulemaking, these uncertainties and associated risks continue to hold true, underscoring the criticality of this provision to the viability of the ZEB rule.

Our counterproposal would create the foundation and an actionable framework for impartial regulatory assessments by first requiring ARB in 2018 to establish benchmarks for future ZEB cost and performance relative to non-ZEB cost and performance, as well as for the cost of electricity as a fuel, vehicle weight, infrastructure availability and funding. This concept was drawn from the years of ARB work regulating various aspects of combustion engine emissions requirements. The Association is requesting the ARB follow this long-standing practice and in so doing, create an environment where manufacturers must achieve critical benchmarks, ultimately to assure air quality. This provision asks ARB staff to identify the assumptions and projections they are relying on today to guarantee to you, transit agencies and the public that the transition to a 100% ZEB fleet is achievable. The counterproposal would then, in 2023 and every two years thereafter, require ARB to initiate an independent and/or peer-reviewed analysis of these benchmarks against real-world data. Finally, in 2025 and every two years thereafter, ARB would require transit agencies to submit evidence of progress relative to the ZEB deployment plans these agencies established in 2020. If ARB finds that expected costs, performance, infrastructure availability and weight benchmarks are being met in the real world, adequate funding is available statewide (and to the transit agency, specifically), but, also that an agency has failed to make appropriate progress to reach its 2030 ZEB deployment target and/or a fully ZEB fleet by 2040, as outlined in accordance with its ZEB deployment plan, ARB could then institute a purchase mandate for that agency to ensure its targets are met. These provisions, combined, would guarantee that, if these cost, performance, infrastructure availability, weight and funding benchmarks are being met, transit agencies will meet their ZEB deployment targets. Conversely, if these benchmarks are not being met, transit agencies would be provided with additional flexibility in the form of an off-ramp from a strict purchase mandate.

Recommendation: We urge ARB to adopt the Association’s counterproposal in full. The counterproposal would create the foundation and an actionable framework for impartial regulatory assessments.

Please see Attachment A for more details on the Association’s counterproposal.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Please contact Legislative and Regulatory Advocate Michael Pimentel at 916-446-4656 or at michael@caltransit.org, if you have any questions or comments about the Association’s feedback on this regulatory concept.

Sincerely,

Joshua W. Shaw
Executive Director
California Transit Association’s INITIAL DRAFT Zero-Emission Bus Deployment Proposal

Highlights:
The California Air Resources Board (ARB) shall, in 2018, adopt a regulation containing the following elements –

- All transit agencies operating in California are required to transition their standard transit bus fleets to 100% zero-emission by 2040
- The ARB, working alongside transit agencies, directs initial funding to deploy zero-emission buses (ZEBs) (equal in # to the ZEBs that would have been purchased under the draft ICT mandate, from 2020-2023) in disadvantaged communities, state or federal non-attainment areas of the state, and/or, transit agencies with experience in the deployment of ZEBs and the potential to demonstrate the scalability of the technology
  - This ensures communities most impacted by poor air quality, and agencies with the dirtiest fleets, are first in line for ZEB deployments
- By 2020, each transit agency is required to develop and submit an individualized ZEB deployment plan to ARB that details its strategy for reaching 2030 and 2040 ZEB deployment targets (with the 2040 target required to be 100% zero-emission)
  - This approach provides transit agencies with the opportunity to plan for their transition to a ZEB fleet, similar to LA Metro in their Strategic Plan for Metro’s Transition to Zero-Emission Buses, adopted October 2017 and King County METRO (Seattle) in their Feasibility of Achieving a Carbon-Neutral or Zero-Emission Fleet, finalized March 2017
- ARB monitors each transit agency’s progress toward fulfilling its ZEB deployment plan, and may impose an agency-level purchase mandate, under specified conditions beginning 2025, ensuring the 2040 ZEB deployment target is met

To reach these goals, each transit agency shall:

1. Beginning 2018, apply for funding to support the guaranteed deployment of approximately 350 ZEBs throughout the state from 2020 to 2023, consistent with the estimated deployment of ZEBs under the draft ICT’s proposed purchase mandate in this timeframe
   - Access to funding shall be made available first and foremost, and with equal consideration, to: transit agencies serving disadvantaged communities and/or state- or federally-designated non-attainment areas of the state, and/or, transit agencies with experience in the deployment of ZEBs and the potential to demonstrate the scalability of the technology
     - This preference for disadvantaged communities and/or state- or federally-designated non-attainment areas of the state, and transit agencies with experience in the deployment of ZEBs shall end in 2023
   - Wherein “funding” means: for the incremental additional cost of ZEB technology compared to available baseline non-ZEB technology
   - Wherein “funding” means: VW settlement funding or other new sources, and does not mean the redirection of, or the application of new requirements to, the Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project (HVIP), Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) or Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP)
2. By 2020, develop and submit an initial ZEB deployment plan to ARB that details its individualized strategy for reaching its 2030 ZEB deployment target, and, a fully zero-emission fleet by 2040
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- This plan shall be updated in 2022 and 2024, and as necessary, to incorporate lessons learned from the targeted early deployments supported by this proposal.

3. Beginning 2021, submit data annually to ARB on ZEB deployments and purchases, as well as ZEB cost and performance.
   - By 2019, transit agencies shall work with ARB to define the data and metrics necessary for reporting costs and performance, as well as the procedures for submitting the data to ARB, so ARB is able to measure agency performance against the benchmarks called for in number 5, below.

To ensure progress toward these goals, ARB shall:

4. In 2018, estimate the through-2023 incremental additional cost to transit agencies of the regulation, and develop and secure a 5-year funding plan (covering 2018-2023) necessary to deploy approximately 350 ZEBs plus charging infrastructure from 2020 to 2023.
   - Wherein “funding” means: for the *incremental additional cost* of ZEB technology compared to available baseline non-ZEB technology.
   - Wherein “funding” means: VW settlement funding or other new sources, but does not mean the redirection of, or the application of new requirements to, HVIP, TIRCP or LCTOP.

5. In 2018, establish, in coordination with transit agencies and manufacturers, benchmarks for future ZEB cost (including purchase costs for battery electric and hydrogen fuel cell, and electricity rates and hydrogen fuel), performance and weight, compared to future non-ZEB vehicle cost, performance and weight (i.e. so any remaining incremental additional cost increase of ZEBs above the baseline cost for non-ZEBs can be identified).

6. In 2018, adopt a commitment to require interoperability between the ZEBs and charging infrastructure offered by different manufacturers.
   - The specific standards and protocols for interoperability shall be developed by ARB, transit agencies and manufacturers, in coordination with academic experts.
   - Interoperability shall include depot charging infrastructure, including overhead charging, and in-ground inductive charging.

7. Beginning 2021, monitor the compliance of each transit agency with its ZEB deployment plan.

8. In 2023 and every two years thereafter, initiate an independent and/or peer-reviewed analysis of key measures, including, but not limited to:
   - The status of statewide ZEB deployment relative to statewide goals.
   - Bus technology, including upfront capital costs (i.e. ZEB, charging and refueling infrastructure and necessary utility upgrades), total cost of ownership (i.e. upfront capital costs, operational costs and maintenance costs), battery density (BEB)/range, battery degradation, operational performance, weight, relevant advances and market availability.
     - These measures will be compared against benchmarks established in the initial rulemaking process (see number 5, above).
   - Barriers to electrification, including funding, infrastructure and utility rates.
     - These measures will be compared against benchmarks established in the initial rulemaking process (see number 5, above).
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9. In 2023 and every two years thereafter, report to the Board on the findings of the report, as part of a public hearing
   - The Board may alter the regulation based on report findings

10. Subject to the independent/peer-reviewed findings, in 2025 and every two years thereafter, if ARB finds that expected costs, performance and weight benchmarks are being met, adequate funding is available statewide (and to the transit agency, specifically), but, an agency has nonetheless not yet made appropriate progress to reach its 2030 ZEB deployment target and/or a fully zero-emission fleet by 2040, as outlined in accordance with its ZEB deployment plan, ARB shall institute a purchase mandate for that agency to ensure these targets are met

Other provisions:

**Funding**
- All current funding programs shall continue, pending appropriation, to provide financial support to transit agencies for ZEB purchases
- Utilities shall be wholly responsible for upgrading and providing sufficient electricity to transit agencies to begin deployments in 2020 and to achieve 100% deployment in 2040; where practical, transit agencies may explore private sector solutions to address infrastructure needs
  - Electric companies shall not charge transit agencies for such upgraded services

**Vehicle Specifications**
- The regulation shall apply only to standard transit buses above 26,000 lbs. gross vehicle weight (GVW), and shall defer its applicability to cutaways and over-the-road coaches
  - Applicability to cutaways and over-the-road coaches shall be revisited in 2030
- The regulation shall not require turnover of electric trolley buses to battery-electric or hydrogen fuel cell
- A ZEB shall be considered commercially available only if it meets the curb weight schedule established by current law
- All transit agencies operating in state- or federally-designated non-attainment areas shall purchase low NOx engines, if available, at the time of otherwise-allowable conventional standard bus purchase
- For otherwise-allowable conventional bus purchases, all transit agencies must purchase renewable fuels when diesel or natural gas contracts are renewed, pending availability

**Compliance**
- Maintains the ability for transit agencies to submit a joint-compliance plan (i.e. as in the draft ICT)
- Maintains credit for innovative mobility options, which must be approved the ARB Executive Officer (i.e. as in the draft ICT)
- Maintains the ability for the ARB Executive Officer to provide flexibility to a transit agency encountering an agency-specific challenge (i.e. as in in the draft ICT)
cc: Kim Craig, Deputy Cabinet Secretary, Office of Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
    Alice Reynolds, Senior Advisor, Office of Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
    Richard Corey, Executive Officer, California Air Resources Board
    Steve Cliff, Deputy Executive Office, California Air Resources Board
    Jack Kitowski, Chief, Mobile Source Control Division, California Air Resources Board
    Tony Brasil, Branch Chief, Heavy Duty Diesel Implementation Branch, California Air Resources Board
    Shirin Barfjani, Air Pollution Specialist, Mobile Source Control Division, California Air Resources Board
    Yachun Chow, Manager, Zero Emission Bus Truck and Bus Section, California Air Resources Board
    Jennifer Lee, Mobile Source Control Division, California Air Resources Board
    Members, Executive Committee, California Transit Association
    Members, Zero Emission Bus Task Force, California Transit Association
More Poorer Residents Are Driving Cars, Presenting New Issues for Transit Agencies

More lower-income households have access to cars now than they did before the Great Recession. That’s good news for their access to jobs, but it may cause transit agencies to rethink their assumptions.

BY: Daniel C. Vock | April 9, 2018

The good news is that more low-income Americans report they have access to vehicles than they did a decade ago, before the Great Recession.

Only 20 percent of adults living in poverty in 2016 reported that they had no access to a vehicle. That’s down from 22 percent in 2006, according to a Governing analysis of U.S. Census data. Meanwhile, the access rates among all Americans was virtually the same (6.6 percent) between those two years.

The bad — or at least, unsettling — news is that even a subtle shift in car usage could have big impacts on transit ridership and other transportation policies, and public officials are still trying to determine how to respond.

“What it does is it reduces our productivity,” says Joe Calabrese, the CEO and general manager of the Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority. “If we have 40 people waiting at a bus stop and one of them gets a car, we still have to send a bus. But [the reduction] impacts public perception. Everyone likes to see full buses.”

Calabrese says transit agencies around the country have started seeing noticeable ridership drops in both rail and bus services. In Cleveland, they’ve considered a number of factors that could be causing those decreases, including lower gas prices, the rising number of people living downtown (instead of commuting), and the growing number of people telecommuting instead of driving to work. But the shift in auto ownership could also be a factor, he says.

In February, researchers at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) said increasing car ownership, particularly among lower-income residents, was likely the biggest factor in declining transit ridership in southern California.

“We focused on the larger L.A. region,” says Evelyn Blumenberg, one of the authors of that study and a UCLA urban planning professor, “but it’s clearly true for the U.S. as well. Even for households with incomes less than 50 percent of the federal poverty level, the number of no-vehicle households is down.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living in Poverty</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
<td>19.96%</td>
<td>22.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200% above poverty line</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>10.57%</td>
<td>11.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-500% above</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
<td>3.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 500% above</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Adults</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>6.63%</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represent percentages of persons age 18+ without access to any vehicles.
SOURCE: Governing calculations of 2016, 2006 U.S. Census American Community Survey microdata from IPUMS-USA, University of Minnesota.
There are a number of factors that are likely contributing to the upswing in vehicle ownership and access. And each of those could present different challenges for policymakers to address.

First, a brief increase in the number of zero-vehicle households after the Great Recession disappeared by 2016, as the economy improved.

"There was a big debate when [the rise of zero-car households] first started happening: Is this the economy or is this a fundamental shift?" says Sarah Jo Peterson, an urban planner and transportation consultant in Washington, D.C. "With what’s happened in the last two years, it’s pretty clear it was the economy. The collapse in car-free living is literally across the board throughout the country."

The only three states where the gain in zero-car households did not disappear (or the data isn’t conclusive) are Illinois, Nevada and Washington.

And Americans are finally driving more. It took U.S. drivers six years to drive the same amount of miles per year as they had at the beginning of the recession in December 2007. But the number of vehicles miles traveled has been steadily increasing for five years now.

That means the U.S. is “reverting to the norm,” when it comes to car use, says Peterson.

"The country is becoming more car-oriented, because the country is moving south. If you’re moving from transit-oriented cities in the Northeast and moving to Texas, you’re going to become more car-oriented," she says.

Urban planners who want to push for walkable neighborhoods and transit-oriented development can still make a compelling case for certain areas, particularly urban centers, she says. "What they don’t have is wind at their backs."

The rise in car ownership also demonstrates how important it is for planners to consider the needs of suburban residents and others who live or work in areas that aren’t well-served by transit, Peterson adds.

Another big factor in the increased access to cars for lower-income residents appears to be easy access to car loans.

The amount of auto loans has increased for six and a half years, “thanks to record-high levels of newly originated loans,” according to the Federal Reserve Board of New York.

Auto sales hit record highs in 2016 and remained high last year despite a small drop-off. Those sales also put more used cars on the market, which made them more affordable.

Car dealers have been trying to move those off their lots, often by lowering prices or offering loans with longer pay-off periods. That’s led to an increasing number of sub-prime loans, particularly from auto financing companies (rather than banks).

New loans from auto lenders made up a quarter of new auto loans as recently as 2015, the highest they’d been since the recession. That’s leveled off since then, but delinquency rates (9.7 percent) for those subprime loans are at their highest levels since the recession.

The flurry of activity around subprime auto loans has grown so much that representatives from the major credit bureaus had to reassure lenders at an industry conference last year that there was no “bubble” in the market, and that auto loans don’t pose the same threat to the economy as subprime mortgages did.

But cars are also easier to get than a house, loans or not. "Most low-income households are not taking out loans to buy a car. They’ll pick up a car from a friend or get one from Craigslist when they get an influx of money, like a tax refund," says Blumenberg from UCLA.

Getting a car can be an economic boon for poor residents, she adds, which is why advocates have tried for years to develop programs that would give poor families access to vehicles.

"Research shows there’s a very strong relationship of having a car and likelihood of getting a job. For lower-income households, it’s really beneficial to have access to a car," Blumenberg says, "The question is: Do the benefits of having a vehicle outweigh the costs? It’s expensive to own and operate a vehicle. Transit for riders is relatively cheap.”
Peterson, the urban planner from Washington, D.C., also cautions that policy makers often look at how expensive it is to own and operate a vehicle, when, in many cases, it can be quite cheap.

Family members pass around cars to other family members, even in well-off households, she says. So a person's income may not be the most important factor in whether they can get a car; their household income may matter more. A middle-age parent might buy a new car early, so that they can give their old car to a child who just got a new job. And that kid may only put enough money into repairs to "keep it from blowing up," Peterson says.

Another factor that is likely leading to higher car ownership rates by low-income residents is the migration of poor families to the suburbs, where housing is cheaper but transit service is spotty or nonexistent.

"It's definitely much more challenging to rely on transit in suburban environments. Whether you're low-income or not, you're more likely to have cars, because it's the only way to survive," says Blumenberg.

She says that's one reason urban planners, who tend to promote transit, need to think differently about how to approach suburbs than dense urban centers. In the suburbs and in car-friendly cities, it may make sense to encourage families to only have one car, rather than two or three, to reduce air pollution and traffic. But encouraging them to become a zero-car household would be unreasonable.

At the same time, the fluctuating ridership numbers of transit agencies shows how they are subject to outside forces, some of which have to be addressed by other agencies. Cities, for example, can encourage transit ridership to job centers downtown by cutting down on cheap or free parking.

"Transit ought to be focused on areas where transit works best," she says. "We have to do something about our policies related to driving. The burden can't only be on transit agencies."

Governing Data Editor Mike Maciag contributed to this story.

This appears in the infrastructure newsletter. Subscribe for free.

This article was printed from: http://www.governing.com/topics/transportation-infrastructure/gov-car-ownership-poverty.html
March 22nd, 2018

To: Carl Sedoryk, General Manager/CEO; MST Board of Directors
From: Mike LeBarre, Vice Chair MST Board of Directors/City of King
Subject: Trip Report APTA 2018 Legislative Conference, Washington D.C.

I attended the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) annual legislative conference in Washington D.C. from March 17th thru the 20th.

We met with Congressman Jimmy Panetta and his staff. It was a good meeting providing a great opportunity to update the congressman on MST’s projects and successes.

Additionally, we met with Senator Diane Feinstein’s staff as well as with Senator Mike Crapo’s Majority Professional Staff Member Jen Deci along with Senator Sherrod Brown’s Minority Professional Staff Member Homer Carlisle from the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs to talk about issues important to MST and the residents we serve.

I attended the following meetings and sessions:

- Federal Procedures & Regulations AND Funding, Finance & Tax Policy Legislative Subcommittees Joint Meeting
- Legislative Committee Meeting
- Diversity and Inclusion Council Meeting
- Access Committee Meeting
- Transit Board Members Legislative Subcommittee Meeting
- Transit Board Members Committee Meeting
- General Session: Welcome to D.C. with WAPO journalists Paul Kane and Ashley Parker
- General Session: The National Perspective on Infrastructure Investment with Ed Rendell
- Opening General Session: What’s Ahead for Transit - Department of Transportation
- General Session: View from the Hill with Senate Staff members Jen Deci, Homer Carlisle
- General Session: with Rep Rodney Davis, Sen Jack Reed, Rep Earl Blumenauer, Rep Peter DeFazio, And Rep Sam Graves

The conference updated attendees on current federal legislation and policy initiatives, gave us an opportunity to interact with policy makers and staff, and provide direction on the industry’s current legislative strategy and advocacy efforts.

Submitted by: Mike LeBarre
April 26, 2018

To: MST Board of Directors
From: Tony Barrera, Chair

Subject: Washington D.C. Legislative Conference March 18-19, 2018

I attended the following sessions:

1. The National Perspective on Infrastructure Investment
2. Update from the Federal Railroad Administration
3. General Session- Listened to Washington Post Reporters Ashley Parker and Paul Kane on their perspective of the Trump Administration
4. Former Pennsylvania Governor Ed Rendell spoke about the future of Infrastructure Funding

Overall, the Conference motivated and encouraged participants to meet with their members of Congress to put Public Transportation on the forefront in these uncertain times where there is talk of possible reduced funding to Public Transportation.
To: Board of Directors

From: Hunter Harvath – Assistant General Manager

Subject: Contingency budget revision for Monterey Bay Operations & Maintenance Facility construction project.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Approve revision of contingency budgets from 8% to the Federal Transit Administration’s recommended 10% for the Monterey Bay Operations & Maintenance Facility construction project.

FISCAL IMPACT:

$426,453. These expenditures would be drawn from MST’s capital reserves and well as Proposition 1B bond funds.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Your Board authorizes expenditures in excess of $25,000.

DISCUSSION:

The MST Board approved a total project budget of $22,542,617, which included an 8.0% contingency budget of $1,661,594. 2016 Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Project and Construction Management Guidelines recommend a 10% contingency, but staff recommended a lower contingency due to the belief that the pre-engineered construction materials utilized provided a lower risk than traditional construction methods. The difference between the 8% contingency budget originally recommended by staff in 2016 and the 10% contingency recommended by FTA guidelines equals $426,453.

Staff recommends adjusting the contingency budget by 2% ($426,453) to conform with published FTA project and construction management guidelines.

PREPARED BY: Hunter Harvath       REVIEWED BY: Carl G. Sedoryk