Board of Directors Regular Meeting

Monday, May 14, 2012

MST Conference Room
One Ryan Ranch Road, Monterey

10:00 a.m.

TRANSPORTATION: Ride Line “Special” from Monterey Transit Plaza (9:30 a.m.) and Sand City Station (9:45 a.m.) to Monterey-Salinas Transit

1. CALL TO ORDER
   1-1. Roll call.
   1-2. Pledge of Allegiance.

2. CONSENT AGENDA
   2-1. Review highlights of Agenda. (Carl Sedoryk)

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


   2-3. Disposal of property left aboard buses. (Sonia Bannister) (pg. 3)

   2-4. Minutes of the regular meeting of April 9, 2012. (Deanna Smith) (pg. 5)


   2-6. Review Current Committee Assignments and Receive Proposed Committee Meeting Schedule. (Carl Sedoryk) (pg. 19)

   2-7. Receive updated 2012 State Legislative Program. (Hunter Harvath) (pg. 23)

   2-8. Receive Draft FY 2013 Budget. (Hunter Harvath) (pg. 39)
3. **SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS**

3-1. May Employee of the Month – Randy Ascencio, Intermediate Mechanic. (Roger Vandewater)

3-2. 25 Years of Service – Dave Duckworth, Coach Operator. (Robert Weber)

3-3. 20 Years of Service – Grace Casey, Coach Operator. (Robert Weber)

3-4. 20 Years of Service – Pawel Ziolkowski, Coach Operator. (Robert Weber)

3-5. Receive APTA Bus Safety Gold Award. (Carl Sedoryk)

4. **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.*

5. **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

*No action required unless specifically noted.*

| 5-1 | Human Resources Committee Minutes from April 9, 2012. (Kelly Halcon) (pg. 41) |

6. **BIDS/PROPOSALS**

| 6-1 | Award Contract for the Construction of BRT Bus Stops. (Michael Hernandez) (pg. 43) |

| 6-2 | Award a Security Gate Contract to Fence Corporation. (Carl Wulf) (pg. 49) |

7. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

| 7-1 | Proposed spring 2012 Fare Increase. (Hunter Harvath) (pg. 51) |

8. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

| 8-1 | Approve revised line of credit in the amount of $1 million from Rabobank. (Hunter Harvath) (pg. 89) |
8-2. Receive presentation on the preliminary results of the Salinas Area Service Analysis – II and authorize staff to conduct public hearings on proposed route and schedule changes. (Hunter Harvath) (pg. 93)

9. **NEW BUSINESS**

10. **REPORTS & INFORMATION ITEMS**

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

   10-1. General Manager/CEO Report. (pg. 95)

   10-2. TAMC Highlights – April, 2012. (pg. 143)


   10-5. Staff trip reports. (pg. 155)

   10-6. Correspondence. (pg. 157)

11. **COMMENTS BY BOARD MEMBERS**

   11-1. Reports on meetings attended by Board members at MST expense (AB1234).

12. **ATTACHMENTS**

   12-1 Disbursement Journal for March, 2012. (pg. 177)

13. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

14. **CLOSED SESSION**

   *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.*

   14-3 Conference with Labor Negotiators, Gov. Code § 54957.6: (Agency Negotiator; Kelly Halcon, Carl Sedoryk. Negotiating Parties; MSTEA/ATU, non-represented employees)

15. **RETURN TO OPEN SESSION**

   15-1. Report on Closed Session and possible action.
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 office at 1 Ryan Ranch Road, Monterey, CA during normal business hours.

Upon request, MST will provide written agenda materials in appropriate alternative formats, or disability-related modification or accommodation, including 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 and brief description of the requested materials and preferred alternative format or auxiliary aid or service at least 5 days before the meeting. Requests should be sent to Deanna Smith, MST, One Ryan Ranch Road, Monterey, CA 93940 or dsmith@mst.org.
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, Randy Ascencio began his career as a Mechanic Assistant with Monterey-Salinas Transit in January of 2005. As his skills developed, Randy was promoted to an Entry Level Mechanic and later to an Intermediate Mechanic in December of 2007; and

WHEREAS, Randy Ascencio is known for his dedication, high energy level, excellent work ethic and superior technical skills. He has been recognized several years for an excellent attendance and on the job safety records; and

WHEREAS, Randy Ascencio recently promptly repaired several buses at the Wright Division thereby insuring sufficient vehicles were available for early morning service; and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of Monterey-Salinas Transit recognizes Randy Ascencio as Employee of the Month for May 2012; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Randy Ascencio is to be congratulated for his excellent work at Monterey-Salinas Transit.

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF MONTEREY-SALINAS TRANSIT
PASSED AND ADOPTED RESOLUTION 2012-24 this 14th day of May 2012.
To: Board of Directors

From: Sonia Bannister, Office Administrator

Subject: Disposal of unclaimed property left on bus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St. Vincent De Paul (P.G.)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 sunglasses</td>
<td>1 thermos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 coin purse</td>
<td>2 water bottles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lunch bag</td>
<td>1 shirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 cell phones</td>
<td>2 back packs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 jacket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To be disposed</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 backpack</td>
<td>3 ID’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 containers</td>
<td>2 note books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 key</td>
<td>2 jackets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hats</td>
<td>2 wallets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 baby blanket</td>
<td>1 water bottle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MST makes an attempt to contact the owners of Lost and Found items. If the items are unclaimed after 30 days, they are added to the above list.
Chair Armenta called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. in the MST Conference Room. Roll call was taken and the Pledge of Allegiance followed.

Present:  Fernando Armenta  County of Monterey  
Jerry Edelen (alt)  City of Del Rey Oaks  
Alan Cohen  City of Pacific Grove  
Libby Downey  City of Monterey  
Alvin Edwards  City of Seaside  
Susan Kleber  City of King  
Frank O’Connell  City of Marina  
David Pendergrass  City of Sand City  
Karen Sharp  City of Carmel-by-the-Sea  
Patricia Stephens  City of Soledad  

Absent:  John Huerta, Jr.  City of Greenfield  
Sergio Sanchez  City of Salinas  

Staff:  Carl Sedoryk  General Manager/CEO  
Mike Gallant  Planning Manager  
Kelly Halcon  Director of Human Resources & Risk Management  
Hunter Harvath  Asst. General Manager/Finance & Administration  
Michael Hernandez  Asst. General Manager/COO  
Tom Hicks  Mobility Manager  
Deanna Smith  Executive Assistant to the GM/CEO  
Robert Weber  Director of Transportation Services  
Sonia Bannister  Office Administrator  
Dave Laredo  General Counsel/De Lay & Laredo  

Others:  Lance Atencio  MV Transportation  
Jim Fink  Citizen, MST Customer  
Eric Petersen  Monterey County Green Party  
Jon Cappella  MST  
Ms. Cappella  Spouse of Jon Cappella  

*Apology is made for any misspelling of a name.*
2. CONSENT AGENDA

2-1. Review highlights of Agenda. (Carl Sedoryk)

Mr. Sedoryk read the highlights of the agenda.

2-2 Adopt Resolution 2012-20 recognizing Jon Cappella, Operations Supervisor, as Employee of the Month for April, 2012.

2-3 Disposal of property left aboard buses.

2-4 Minutes of the regular meeting of March 19, 2012.


2-6 Adopt Resolution 2012-21 recognizing Jim Conrad, Coach Operator, for 24 years of service.

2-7 Adopt Resolution 2012-22 recognizing Alfred Valdez, Coach Operator, for 11 Years of Service.

2-8 Adopt Resolution of Appreciation 2012-23 recognizing Karen Sharp.

2-9 Appoint Kathleen Murray-Phillips to the CTSA Advisory Committee.

Public Comment – None

**Director Edelen made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda and was seconded by Director Orozco. The motion carried unanimously.**

3. SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

3-1 April Employee of the Month – Jon Cappella, Operations Supervisor.

Mr. Weber recognized Jon Cappella, Operations Supervisor, as the April Employee of the Month for his positive contribution to MST and the entire community; for helping to establish two new DMV test routes used for the testing and hiring of MST Coach Operators; and for his numerous safety, attendance, and project awards including his assistance in handling an incident where an MST Coach Operator was a victim of a gang related shooting.

Mr. Sedoryk commended Mr. Cappella for operating “by the book” and representing MST with the highest standards of conduct.

3-2 11 Years of Service – Alfred Valdez, Coach Operator.

Mr. Valdez was not present to receive his award.

3-3 Resolution of Appreciation – Karen Sharp.
Ms. Sharp’s presentation was moved to Agenda # 13.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Mr. Jim Fink stated that he is opposed to the elimination of Line 43 on weekends and Line 8 mid-day and weekend service. He requests the lines be restored to current schedule. He stated for the record that he supports all proposed fare increases. He requested that the bus schedule be changed to guarantee connections rather than focusing on on-time performance.

5. COMMITTEE REPORTS

5-1 Marketing Committee Minutes from March 19, 2012.

6. BIDS/PROPOSALS

No business.

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS

No business.

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

8-1 Adopt MST Bylaw changes re: election of officers, Article VI (b).

Mr. Sedoryk stated that staff had taken the Board’s requests from the meeting of March 19, 2012, and recommended the following changes to the bylaws:

ARTICLE VI. OFFICERS

a. The Board shall appoint annually members to a Nominating Committee responsible for recommending officer appointments to the full Board. The Nominating Committee will meet prior to the month of July of each calendar year and make their recommendations for Board approval at the July Board meeting.

To ensure a diversity of representation, the Board Chair and Vice Chair shall be nominated in a manner that rotates leadership roles according to the following designations:

1. The Salinas Urbanized Area, to include a representative from the City of Salinas;
2. The Seaside-Marina-Monterey Urbanized Area, to include a representative from among the cities of Carmel, Monterey, Pacific Grove, Seaside, Del Rey Oaks, Sand City, and Marina;
3. The Non-Urbanized Areas, to include a representative from among the cities of Gonzales, Greenfield, Soledad, and King City; and
4. The County of Monterey, to include a representative from the Monterey County Board of Supervisors.
The Board shall elect a Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Treasurer, and Deputy Treasurer at the first regular meeting in July of each calendar year to serve until the first regular meeting in July of the next succeeding calendar year. If the positions of Chair and Vice-Chair are both vacated at any time, the elections for the remainder of the terms shall be held at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

Elected Officers shall serve one (1) non-consecutive, two-year (2 year) term.

Director Downey requested population information for the above-mentioned designations. Mr. Harvath provided population estimates.

Director Downey requested clarification on officer rotation and expressed concern that the City of Salinas and County of Monterey representatives would rotate into an officer position too frequently to reflect the desired Board diversity. Mr. Laredo clarified that the intent of the language encouraged a fair rotation and did not require the rotation to follow any specific order. Nominations could be recommended so that no one jurisdiction was given more preference than another.

Mr. Laredo suggested rephrasing Article VI (a), second paragraph, to read:

To ensure diversity of representation, the Board Chair and Vice Chair shall be nominated from among the following designations:

Public Comment

Mr. Fink encouraged full rotation from among all thirteen (13) jurisdiction representatives. He also requested that Board members be elected rather than appointed.

Close Public Comment

**Director Stephens made a motion to adopt the recommended changes to the Bylaws, with David Laredo’s suggested modifications, and was seconded by Director Pendergrass. The motion carried unanimously.**

9. **NEW BUSINESS**

9-1 Appoint Ad Hoc Nominating Committee.

Chair Armenta requested volunteers to serve on the Ad Hoc Nominating Committee. The following Directors volunteered: Directors: Edwards (Chair), Kleber, Cohen, Clark (by Director Edelen), Sanchez (by Director Armenta).
10. REPORTS & INFORMATION ITEMS


10-4 Staff trip reports.

10-5 Correspondence.

Mr. Sedoryk stated that February ridership was up, although February had an extra day of service because of Leap Year. Overall ridership was still higher than usual with ridership especially strong on military routes.

Director Downey asked if Mr. Fink’s recommendations regarding the importance of connections rather than on-time performance would be a consideration. Mr. Sedoryk stated that in May of 1999 it was determined that the highest benefit to riders would be to minimize the number of buses running late rather than compounding the problem by making all buses wait for late connections.

Mr. Sedoryk stated that a Salinas Area Study would soon be released and he was hopeful that there would be route recommendations that would help improve on-time compliance, particularly in the Salinas area.

Public Comment

Mr. Fink stated that he preferred the scheduling prior to May 1999.

Close Public Comment

11. COMMENTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

None.

12. ATTACHMENTS


13. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Sedoryk announced that MST will hold a series of four (4) Public Hearings on proposed fare increases over the next two (2) months.

Mr. Sedoryk announced that Kelly Halcon, Director of Human Resources & Risk Management, was this year’s recipient of the Frank J. Lichtanksi Scholarship awarding her $2,500 in tuition support to attend the Eno Center for Transportation Leadership’s Transit Executive Seminar.
Mr. Sedoryk presented Director Karen Sharp with an award and Resolution thanking her for her years of service to the MST Board of Directors and for being instrumental in bringing the Trolley service to downtown Carmel.

14. CLOSED SESSION


14-2 General Manager Performance Evaluation, Gov. Code § 54957 (b)

Public Comment

None.

Close Public Comment

Chair Armenta moved to Closed Session at 10:51 a.m.

15. RETURN TO OPEN SESSION

15-1 Report on Closed Session and possible action.

No reportable action taken.

16. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Armenta adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m.
To:    Board of Directors  

From:  Kathy Williams, General Accounting & Budget Manager  

Subject: Financial Reports – March 2012  

RECOMMENDATION:  

1. Accept report of March 2012 cash flow presented in Attachment #1  

2. Approve March 2012 disbursements listed in Attachment #2  

3. Accept report of March 2012 treasury transactions listed in Attachment #3  

4. Accept financial statements for the month of March 2012 in Attachment #4  

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, 2012</td>
<td>$ 6,103,943.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>4,999,163.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbursements</td>
<td>&lt;5,380,030.18&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending balance March 31, 2012</td>
<td>$ 5,723,076.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:  

Disbursements are approved by your Board each month and are shown in Attachment #2. Detail of the disbursements is attached as Agenda Item 12-1. Treasury transactions are reported to your Board each month, and are shown in Attachment #3. Financial statement are provided for your review in Attachment #4.

Prepared by: Kathy Williams  Reviewed by: Carl Sedoryk
This page left intentionally blank
## CASH FLOW

**Beginning balance March 1, 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Revenue</td>
<td>490,269.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD Revenue</td>
<td>176,215.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTF / STA / 5307</td>
<td>4,250,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>63,892.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Transit Revenue</td>
<td>18,412.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,999,163.53</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disbursements</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations (See Attachment #2)</td>
<td>5,801,605.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>(421,575.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Disbursements</strong></td>
<td><strong>(5,380,030.18)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ending balance March 31, 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 5,723,076.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## COMPOSITION OF ENDING BALANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Checking - First National Bank</td>
<td>$ 4,879.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking - Rabo Bank</td>
<td>(1,530,398.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking(s) - Wells Fargo Bank</td>
<td>39,601.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF)</td>
<td>42,359.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Market - Homeland Security</td>
<td>608,088.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Market - Rabo MM</td>
<td>4,587,877.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Market - Rabo Prop. 1 B</td>
<td>1,890,871.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America - Escrow</td>
<td>23,034.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty cash fund, STC Coin Machine, and 2 change funds</td>
<td>10,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabobank-RTA</td>
<td>46,513.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 5,723,076.80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PAYROLL ACCOUNT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 24 taxes</td>
<td>25,405.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9 Payroll &amp; Related Expenses</td>
<td>477,663.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23 Payroll &amp; Related Expenses</td>
<td>515,049.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garnishments</td>
<td>3,352.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,021,471.64</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL ACCOUNT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disbursements on Attached Summary</td>
<td>4,323,728.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Comp. Disbursements</td>
<td>28,655.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Service Charge/Armored Car</td>
<td>6,174.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Disbursements</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,358,558.54</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less Capital Disbursements &amp; Transfers</strong></td>
<td><strong>421,575.49</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Disbursements</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,801,605.67</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISBURSEMENTS SUMMARY:
GENERAL ACCOUNT DISBURSEMENTS FOR Mar 1, 2012 - Mar 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VENDOR / DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CHECKS</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable 03/02/12</td>
<td>28003 - 28139</td>
<td>601,754.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable 03/06/12</td>
<td>28140 - 28141</td>
<td>497.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable 03/13/12</td>
<td>28142</td>
<td>240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable 03/15/12</td>
<td>28143 - 28144</td>
<td>32,539.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable 03/16/12</td>
<td>28145 - 28288</td>
<td>1,135,496.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable 03/20/12</td>
<td>28269 - 28269</td>
<td>13,054.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable 03/26/12</td>
<td>28290</td>
<td>14,920.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable 03/30/12</td>
<td>28291 - 28405</td>
<td>2,525,226.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,323,728.49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>Coast Oil</td>
<td>Recurring Expense</td>
<td>28062</td>
<td>03/02/12</td>
<td>137,442.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers-Health</td>
<td>Recurring Expense</td>
<td>28098</td>
<td>03/02/12</td>
<td>213,904.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Oil</td>
<td>Recurring Expense</td>
<td>28172</td>
<td>03/16/12</td>
<td>145,330.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Bus Sales</td>
<td>03/07/11 &amp; 10/10/11</td>
<td>28184</td>
<td>03/16/12</td>
<td>188,147.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV Transportation</td>
<td>Recurring Expense</td>
<td>28224</td>
<td>03/16/12</td>
<td>456,194.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Oil</td>
<td>Recurring Expense</td>
<td>28315</td>
<td>03/30/12</td>
<td>117,868.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV Transportation</td>
<td>Recurring Expense</td>
<td>28366</td>
<td>03/30/12</td>
<td>456,532.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers-Health</td>
<td>Recurring Expense</td>
<td>28373</td>
<td>03/30/12</td>
<td>214,407.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMC</td>
<td>Repay loan</td>
<td>28389</td>
<td>03/30/12</td>
<td>1,500,000.00</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></td>
<td>Balance Forward at 03/01/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42,319.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer to checking for payroll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Agency Investment Fund: Interest earned - .383%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAIF Treasury Balance at 03/31/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42,359.79</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></td>
<td>Balance Forward at 03/01/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,573,762.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/06/12</td>
<td>To A/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,073,762.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/09/12</td>
<td>To P/R</td>
<td></td>
<td>478,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,595,762.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/13/12</td>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td></td>
<td>164,750.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,760,512.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/14/12</td>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td></td>
<td>89,376.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,849,889.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/16/12</td>
<td>Fed 5307</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,249,128.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,099,017.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/19/12</td>
<td>To A/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,999,017.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/20/12</td>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td></td>
<td>86,231.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,085,249.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/23/12</td>
<td>To P/R</td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,585,249.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/30/12</td>
<td>LTF</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,001,247.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,586,496.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/31/12</td>
<td>Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,586,466.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/31/12</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,410.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,587,877.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RABO MM Balance at 03/31/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,587,877.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MONTEREY - SALINAS TRANSIT
### Revenue & Expense - Consolidated
#### Budget vs Actual
For the Period from March 1, 2012 to March 31, 2012
(Amounts are in USD)
(Includes Fund: 001)
(Includes G/L Budget Name: BUDFY12)

<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>
<th>Total Year Budget</th>
<th>YTD Actual Var to Bud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Fares</td>
<td>(411,152)</td>
<td>(421,250)</td>
<td>10,998</td>
<td>(3,667,582)</td>
<td>(3,791,250)</td>
<td>123,668</td>
<td>(5,055,000)</td>
<td>1,387,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Transit</td>
<td>(227,658)</td>
<td>(244,346)</td>
<td>16,688</td>
<td>(1,904,785)</td>
<td>(2,199,113)</td>
<td>294,329</td>
<td>(2,932,151)</td>
<td>1,027,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Revenue</td>
<td>(21,847)</td>
<td>(20,946)</td>
<td>(901)</td>
<td>(183,079)</td>
<td>(188,512)</td>
<td>5,433</td>
<td>(251,350)</td>
<td>68,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Grants &amp; Reimbursement</td>
<td>(1,657,429)</td>
<td>(1,637,578)</td>
<td>(19,851)</td>
<td>(15,570,424)</td>
<td>(14,738,203)</td>
<td>(832,221)</td>
<td>(19,650,637)</td>
<td>4,080,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>(2,318,086)</td>
<td>(2,324,120)</td>
<td>6,033</td>
<td>(21,325,870)</td>
<td>(20,917,078)</td>
<td>(408,792)</td>
<td>(27,889,438)</td>
<td>6,563,668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Expenses**           |                |                |                  |            |            |              |                   |                        |
| Labor                  | 900,050        | 954,362        | (54,312)         | 8,537,820  | 8,589,261  | (51,442)     | 11,452,348        | (2,914,529)            |
| Benefits               | 588,399        | 553,811        | 34,578           | 5,070,613  | 4,984,299  | 89,314       | 6,645,732         | (1,575,119)            |
| Advertising & Marketing| 1,231          | 3,333          | (2,102)          | 55,220     | 30,000     | 25,220       | 40,000            | 15,220                |
| Professional & Technical| 17,444        | 24,175         | (6,731)          | 350,136    | 217,575    | 132,561      | 290,100           | 60,036                |
| Outside Services       | 17,772         | 17,115         | 657              | 177,360    | 154,035    | 23,345       | 205,380           | (28,000)              |
| Outside Labor          | 48,027         | 46,310         | 1,716            | 487,408    | 416,794    | 70,613       | 555,726           | (68,318)              |
| Fuel & Lubricants      | 384,151        | 343,628        | 40,524           | 3,069,608  | 3,092,648  | (23,040)     | 4,123,530         | (1,053,922)           |
| Supplies               | 35,961         | 43,325         | (7,364)          | 494,955    | 389,925    | 105,030      | 519,900           | (24,945)              |
| Vehicle Maintenance    | 56,500         | 46,299         | 10,211           | 574,207    | 416,599    | 157,608      | 555,466           | 18,742                |
| Marketing Supplies     | 833            | (833)          | 13,565           | 7,500      | 6,085      | 0,000        | 3,585             | 3,585                 |
| Utilities              | 24,727         | 20,833         | 3,893            | 223,102    | 187,500    | 35,602       | 250,000           | (26,898)              |
| Insurance              | 29,649         | 22,340         | 7,308            | 274,558    | 201,062    | 73,496       | 268,083           | 6,475                 |
| Taxes                  | 15,763         | 14,000         | 1,763            | 168,103    | 126,000    | 42,103       | 160,000           | 103                   |
| Purchased Transportation| 269,571       | 219,427        | 70,144           | 2,640,843  | 1,974,841  | 666,002      | 2,633,122         | 7,221                 |
| Miscellaneous Expenses | 32,366         | 12,417         | 19,949           | 198,006    | 111,750    | 27,256       | 149,000           | (9,965)               |
| Pass Thru/Behalf of Others | 393,423       | 393,423        | 0,000            | 393,423    | 393,423    | 0,000        | 393,423           | 0,000                 |
| Interest Expense       | 55             | 55             | 0,000            | 55         | 55         | 0,000        | 55                | 0,000                 |
| Leases & Rentals       | 5,906          | 6,782          | (876)            | 60,234     | 61,037     | (803)        | 61,362            | (21,148)              |
| **Total Operating Expenses** | 2,447,505     | 2,328,981      | 118,525          | 22,730,256 | 20,960,227 | 7,769,429    | 27,947,770        | (5,217,513)           |
| Operating (Income) Loss| 128,419        | 4,851          | 124,558          | 1,404,316  | 43,748     | 1,360,637    | 58,312            | 1,346,055             |
## MONTEREY - SALINAS TRANSIT
Revenue & Expense - Consolidated
Budget vs Actual
For the Period from March 1, 2012 to March 31, 2012
(Amounts are in USD)
(Includes Fund: 002)
(Includes G/L Budget Name: BUDFY12)

<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>
<th>Total Year Budget</th>
<th>YTD Actual Var to Bud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Fares</td>
<td>(30,611)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(5,611)</td>
<td>(240,978)</td>
<td>(225,000)</td>
<td>(21,978)</td>
<td>(299,996)</td>
<td>53,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Grants &amp; Reimbursement</td>
<td>(2,819,525)</td>
<td>(2,414,004)</td>
<td>(405,521)</td>
<td>(2,414,004)</td>
<td>(405,521)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>(30,611)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(5,611)</td>
<td>(3,066,503)</td>
<td>(2,639,004)</td>
<td>(427,499)</td>
<td>(2,714,000)</td>
<td>(352,503)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>2,925</td>
<td>3,721</td>
<td>(796)</td>
<td>26,485</td>
<td>33,489</td>
<td>(7,004)</td>
<td>44,652</td>
<td>(18,167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>17,021</td>
<td>13,392</td>
<td>3,629</td>
<td>17,856</td>
<td>(835)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>3,614</td>
<td>(2,917)</td>
<td>4,877</td>
<td>32,526</td>
<td>(27,649)</td>
<td>43,368</td>
<td>(38,491)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Technical</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>5,336</td>
<td>(4,181)</td>
<td>6,719</td>
<td>48,024</td>
<td>(38,305)</td>
<td>84,032</td>
<td>(54,313)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Labor</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>(858)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,035</td>
<td>7,722</td>
<td>(3,687)</td>
<td>10,296</td>
<td>(6,261)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel &amp; Lubricants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased Transportation</td>
<td>223,252</td>
<td>210,692</td>
<td>12,560</td>
<td>1,923,828</td>
<td>1,896,228</td>
<td>27,548</td>
<td>2,528,304</td>
<td>(504,722)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>(458)</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>4,122</td>
<td>(1,916)</td>
<td>5,498</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass Thru/Behalf of Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases &amp; Rentals</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>230,044</td>
<td>228,167</td>
<td>3,877</td>
<td>1,988,625</td>
<td>2,035,503</td>
<td>(46,878)</td>
<td>2,714,004</td>
<td>(725,378)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating (Income) Loss</strong></td>
<td>199,433</td>
<td>201,167</td>
<td>(1,734)</td>
<td>(1,077,878)</td>
<td>(603,501)</td>
<td>(474,377)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1,077,882)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Board of Directors

From: C. Sedoryk, General Manager/CEO

Subject: Board Committees

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Review current MST Committee Assignments.
2. Receive proposed Committee Meeting Schedule.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

The Monterey-Salinas District By-laws allow the Board to form committees to provide advice and recommendation to the Board of Directors on policy matters relative, but not limited to transportation services, facilities, compensation and benefit programs, legislation, marketing and finances affecting the District. These committees shall be members of the Board of Directors as selected by the Chair and such other persons, including District staff and public members as selected by the Board. The Board has established six standing committees with each Board member serving on at least two committees and the Chair and Vice-Chair serving on three committees.

DISCUSSION:

Attached are the current MST Committee Assignments and a proposed Committee Meeting Schedule. Committee meetings and dates are tentative and dependent upon need and availability. Board members may request assignment to specific committees through the Board Chair.
## Current MST Committee Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Legislative</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Human Resources</th>
<th>Planning/Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenta</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Connell</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchez</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orozco</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huerta, Jr.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleber</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendergrass</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chair and Vice-Chair are each assigned to 3 committees. All other Board members are assigned to 2 committees.
## MST Committee Schedule – FY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Mission Statements</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Meeting Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Recommends to the Board policies which best allows utilization of facilities and other tangible assets to meet organizational growth and development needs.</td>
<td>Orozco, Cohen, Huerta, Jr., Pendergrass</td>
<td>July 9, 2012 9:00am MST Boardroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Oversees and recommends policies to the Board regarding public information, marketing plans and bus advertising policies.</td>
<td>Downey, O’Connell Sanchez, Edwards, Huerta, Armenta</td>
<td>August 13, 2012 9:00am MST Boardroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Policy</td>
<td>Recommends to the Board strategies and actions regarding legislative initiative.</td>
<td>Armenta, Clark, Sanchez, Downey, Pendergrass</td>
<td>Sept. 10, 2012 9:00am MST Boardroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Recommends policies to the Board concerning the effective use of human resources and compensation/benefits/recognition systems.</td>
<td>Clark, Sharp, Cohen, Stephens</td>
<td>Oct. 8, 2012 9:00am MBUAPCD RTA Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Oversees MST financial matters and recommends to the Board policies, practices, and efficiencies, which maximize service and ensure a financially solvent organization.</td>
<td>Armenta, O’Connell, Sharp, Kleber, Stephens</td>
<td>Nov. 5, 2012 9:00am MST Boardroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Policy</td>
<td>Recommends to the Board strategies and actions regarding legislative initiative.</td>
<td>Armenta, Clark, Sanchez, Downey, Pendergrass</td>
<td>Dec. 10, 2012 9:00am MST Boardroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Operations</td>
<td>Recommends policy to the Board to improve transit services and better meet the transportation needs of Monterey County.</td>
<td>Edwards, Clark, Orozco, Kleber</td>
<td>Jan. 14, 2013 9:00am MST Boardroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Oversees MST financial matters and recommends to the Board policies, practices, and efficiencies, which maximize service and ensure a financially solvent organization.</td>
<td>Armenta, O’Connell, Sharp, Kleber, Stephens</td>
<td>Feb. 11, 2013 9:00am MST Boardroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Oversees and recommends policies to the Board regarding public information, marketing plans and bus advertising policies.</td>
<td>Armenta, Orozco, Cohen, Huerta, Jr., Pendergrass</td>
<td>March 18, 2013 9:00am MST Boardroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Recommends policies to the Board concerning the effective use of human resources and compensation/benefits/recognition systems.</td>
<td>Clark, Sharp, Cohen, Stephens</td>
<td>April 8, 2013 9:00am MST Boardroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Oversees MST financial matters and recommends to the Board policies, practices, and efficiencies, which maximize service and ensure a financially solvent organization.</td>
<td>Armenta, O’Connell, Sharp, Kleber, Stephens</td>
<td>May 13, 2013 9:00am MST Boardroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Operations</td>
<td>Recommends policy to the Board to improve transit services and better meet the transportation needs of Monterey County.</td>
<td>Edwards, Clark, Orozco, Kleber</td>
<td>June 10, 2013 9:00am MST Boardroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Board of Directors

From: Hunter Harvath, Assistant General Manager – Finance & Administration

Subject: 2012 State Legislative Program Update

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Receive update on the 2012 State Legislative Program and MST Legislative Track.

FISCAL IMPACT:

MST’s 2012 State Legislative Program advocates preservation of existing transportation funding and increased funding for priority projects.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

At the December 12, 2011, meeting of your Board, MST’s annual State Legislative Program was adopted (Attachment 1) and is consistent with our mission of advocating and delivering quality public transportation as a leader within our industry.

DISCUSSION:

MST’s 2012 Legislative Program is presented regularly to state and federal legislators and their respective staff members and guides MST positions on legislative matters throughout the year. The Legislative Program is also used as a guideline for supporting, opposing, or watching legislation when time does not permit official MST Board action on specific legislation.

To monitor and guide transit-related legislation in Sacramento, MST participates in the California Transit Association (CTA) and the California Association of Coordinated Transit (Cal-ACT). In addition, MST is represented by JEA & Associates and Capital Representation Group in Sacramento. These firms provide analysis, advice, staff support, and advocacy on our behalf and have assisted MST in seeking additional funding for ongoing capital and operating needs.

With the 2012 legislative season well underway, a series of transportation-related bills are currently being considered in the California Assembly and Senate. With input from CTA and Cal-ACT, MST staff has worked with its legislative advocacy firms to develop positions on many of these bills (Attachment 2) in concert with the agency’s State Legislative Program. Staff will continue to monitor these bills as they work their
respective ways through the legislative committee process and onto the floors of the Assembly and Senate for votes.

Attachment 1: MST 2012 State Legislative Program (Adopted 12/12/2011)
Attachment 2: Monterey-Salinas Transit Legislative Track (Updated 4/20/2012)
MST 2012 Legislative Program

State Issues

1S. Engage in cooperative support among partner organizations.
   a. Support the 2012 California Transit Association (CTA) Legislative Program and California Association of Coordinated Transportation (CalACT).
   b. Support the 2012 State Legislative Programs for the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC), the Fort Ord Reuse Authority, and MST member-jurisdictions.
   c. Support other partner agency legislative efforts where common interests exist.
   d. Ensure state legislative efforts are consistent with and coordinated with the MST federal legislative program.

2S. Support transit-related legislation.
   a. Introduce legislation that would amend the Public Utilities Code Section 106061 and 106062 under Part 17 – Monterey Salinas Transit District to enable MST to use all forms of revenues and other income, receipts, or amounts made available to the district are considered revenues of the enterprise for purposes of paying revenue bonds issued by the district with the approval of a 2/3 vote of the MST board.
   b. Support legislation and polices that enable transit supportive development.
   c. Introduce and/or support legislation creating pilot programs to fund public transit buses and support vehicles with bio-fuel-powered and other alternative-powered engines, including hybrids.
   d. Support legislation that increases safety for transit employees and customers by increasing penalties against those that commit crimes against an operator of a transit vehicle, against the transit riding public, or against property of transit agencies.

3S. Encourage the state to restore, preserve and augment transportation and transit funding.
   a. Oppose any transfer or expenditure of Transportation Development Act, Public Transportation Account, Traffic Congestion Relief Fund, and other transit funds to state and local agencies for purposes other than those specified in the Act and existing transit funding law. Monitor the effects of 2010 Proposition 22 and Proposition 26 on transit funding.
b. Support and advocate for the development of legislation that provides fair and equitable transportation program funding and project criteria and allocation formulas for funds from transportation and housing bond measures that were passed on the 2006 General Election Ballot. Ensure that such legislation maximizes funds for MST and retains the region’s authority to decide how to program any new funds. Work with the Governor’s Administration, the Legislature, the California Transportation Commission, Caltrans and others in key decision-making processes. Seek bond funding for bus operations, maintenance and administration facilities; new bus purchases; transit stations; security improvements to property and buses; Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS); Bus Rapid Transit (BRT); and mixed-use transit oriented developments (TODs).

c. Seek state funding for critical transit capital projects, including but not limited to bus operations, maintenance and administration facilities; new bus purchases; transit stations; security improvements to property and buses; Bus Rapid Transit (BRT); mixed-use transit oriented developments (TODs); and other transit facilities.

d. Support enactment of comprehensive long-term transit funding programs to: increase operating revenue; create new transit capital funding programs; enact transit-supportive development funding; add revenue needed to comply with air quality requirements.

4S. Support reductions in burdensome legal and/or regulatory requirements.

a. Support exemptions for small operators from financially burdensome new legal or regulatory requirements or minimize their impact on small operators.

b. Oppose efforts to mandate benefits or other specific working conditions that should more appropriately be addressed through the local collective bargaining process.

c. Monitor ongoing rule-making discussions at the California Air Resources Board including AB 32 and SB 375 and oppose additional regulatory requirements that do not have a new, dedicated funding source provided for their implementation.

d. Support efforts to streamline state administered federal grant programs to allow funds to be administered directly by small urban transit operators who already receive and manage federal transit grants.

5S. Raise MST’s profile and role in state legislative issues.

a. Continue to bring legislators, key Governor Brown staff and others to MST for a facilities tour and presentation.

b. Establish and maintain positive working relationships with newly elected state representatives including Governor Brown, Assemblymembers Alejo and Monning, and Senators Blakeslee and Canella.
c. Continue having MST Board and staff participate in transit-related meetings with elected representative, key transportation and budget committee members and other officials.

Adopted December 12, 2011
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AB 41 (Hill D) High-Speed Rail Authority: conflicts of interest: disqualification.
Introduced: 12/6/2010
Last Amended: 3/29/2012
Status: 4/9/2012-Read second time. Ordered to third reading.
Location: 4/9/2012-S. THIRD READING
Calendar:
4/23/2012 #43 SENATE ASSEMBLY BILLS-THIRD READING FILE
Summary:
Existing provisions of the Political Reform Act of 1974 prohibit a public official at any level of state or local government from making, participating in making, or attempting to use his or her official position to influence a governmental decision in which he or she knows or has reason to know that he or she has a financial interest, as defined. Existing law also requires specified elected and appointed officers at the state and local levels of government to disclose specified financial interests by filing periodic statements of economic interests. Existing law further requires public officials who hold specified offices and who have a financial interest in a decision within the meaning of the Political Reform Act of 1974 to publicly identify the financial interest giving rise to the conflict of interest or potential conflict of interest, recuse themselves from discussing and voting on the matter, and leave the room until after the discussion, vote, and other disposition of the matter is concluded, except as specified. This bill would add members of the High-Speed Rail Authority to those specified officers who must publicly identify a financial interest giving rise to a conflict of interest or potential conflict of interest, and recuse themselves accordingly. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.
Position: Support

AB 441 (Monning D) State planning.
Introduced: 2/14/2011
Last Amended: 1/23/2012
Status: 2/16/2012-Referred to Com. on T. & H.
Location: 2/16/2012-S. T. & H.
Summary:
Existing law requires certain transportation planning activities by the Department of Transportation and by designated regional transportation planning agencies, including development of a regional transportation plan. Existing law authorizes the California Transportation Commission, in cooperation with regional agencies, to prescribe study areas for analysis and evaluation and guidelines for the preparation of a regional transportation plan. This bill would require that the commission, by no later than 2014, include voluntary health and health equity factors, strategies, goals, and objectives in the guidelines promulgated by the commission for the preparation of regional transportation plans.
Position: Monitor

AB 719 (Skinner D) Local planning: infill and transit-oriented development.
Introduced: 2/17/2011
Last Amended: 8/18/2011
Location: 9/9/2011-S. THIRD READING
Summary:
The Planning and Zoning Law requires specified regional transportation planning agencies to prepare and adopt a regional transportation plan directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system, and requires the regional transportation plan to include, among other things, a sustainable communities strategy, for the purpose of using local planning to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This bill would state the findings and declarations of the Legislature with respect to parking requirements and infill and transit-oriented development, and would state the intent of the Legislature to reduce unnecessary government regulation and to reduce the cost of development by eliminating excessive minimum parking requirements for infill and transit-oriented development. This bill would also express a legislative finding and declaration that its provisions shall apply to all cities, including charter cities. This bill contains other related provisions.
**AB 890**  (Olsen R) Environment: CEQA exemption: roadway improvement.
Introduced: 2/17/2011
Last Amended: 1/13/2012
Status: 2/16/2012-Referred to Com. on E.Q.
Location: 2/16/2012-S. E.Q.
Summary:
The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report (EIR) on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. This bill would, until January 1, 2026, exempt a project or an activity to repair, maintain, or make minor alterations to an existing roadway if the project or activity is initiated by a city or county to improve public safety, does not cross a waterway, and involves negligible or no expansion of existing use. This bill contains other existing laws.

Position: Support

**AB 1444**  (Feuer D) Environmental quality: record of proceedings.
Introduced: 1/4/2012
Last Amended: 3/29/2012
Status: 4/9/2012-Re-referred to Com. on NAT. RES.
Location: 4/9/2012-A. NAT. RES.
Calendar:
4/23/2012  1:30 p.m. - State Capitol, Room 447  ASSEMBLY NATURAL RESOURCES, CHESBRO, Chair
Summary:
The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report (EIR) on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. CEQA establishes a procedure for the preparation and certification of the record of proceedings upon the filing of an action or proceeding challenging a lead agency's action on the grounds of noncompliance with CEQA. This bill would require the lead agency, at the request of a project applicant and the agreement of the project applicant to bear the costs incurred by the lead agency, to, among other things, prepare a record of proceedings concurrently with the preparation, and adoption or certification, of an environmental document. Because the bill would require a lead agency to prepare the record of proceedings as provided, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program. In an action or proceeding filed challenging the lead agency's action pursuant to CEQA, the bill would require the court to schedule a hearing within 30 days of the filing of the statement of issues regarding the record of proceedings. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Position: Support

**AB 1448**  (Furutani D) Home-to-school transportation: funding.
Introduced: 1/4/2012
Last Amended: 3/19/2012
Status: 4/19/2012-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 11. Noes 0.) (April 18). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
Location: 4/19/2012-A. APPR.
Summary:
Existing law authorizes school district governing boards to provide for the transportation of pupils to and from school whenever, in the judgment of the governing board, the transportation is advisable and reasons exist therefor. Existing law also authorizes school district governing boards to purchase or rent and provide for the upkeep, care, and operation of vehicles, or contract and pay for the transportation of pupils to and from school by common carrier or municipally owned transit system, or
contract with and pay responsible private parties for the transportation. This bill would, commencing
with the 2012-13 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, prohibit the Legislature from reducing
funding for home-to-school transportation below the amount established in the Budget Act of 2011.
The bill would also express legislative findings and declarations relating to the provision of home-to-
school transportation by school districts, and would express legislative intent to fund home-to-school
transportation at the level approved in the Budget Act of 2011.

Position: Monitor

AB 1606 (Perea D) Local public employee organizations: impasse procedures.
Introduced: 2/7/2012
Status: 4/19/2012-Read second time. Ordered to third reading.
Location: 4/19/2012-A. THIRD READING
Calendar:
4/23/2012 #58 ASSEMBLY ASSEMBLY THIRD READING FILE
Summary:
The Meyers-Millas-Brown Act contains various provisions that govern collective bargaining of local
represented employees, and delegates jurisdiction to the Public Employment Relations Board to
resolve disputes and enforce the statutory duties and rights of local public agency employers and
employees. The act requires the governing body of a public agency to meet and confer in good faith
regarding wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment with representatives of
recognized employee organizations. This bill would instead authorize the employee organization, if the
parties are unable to effect settlement of the controversy within 30 days after the appointment of a
mediator, or if the dispute was not submitted to mediation within 30 days after the date that either
party provided the other with written notice of a declaration of impasse, to request that the parties' differences be submitted to a factfinding panel. The bill would also specify that its provisions are intended to be technical and clarifying of existing law. This bill contains other existing laws.

Position: Monitor

AB 1706 (Eng D) Vehicles: transit bus weight.
Introduced: 2/15/2012
Last Amended: 4/17/2012
Status: 4/18/2012-Re-referred to Com. on TRANS.
Location: 4/18/2012-A. TRANS.
Calendar:
4/23/2012 1:30 p.m. - State Capitol, Room 4202 ASSEMBLY TRANSPORTATION, LOWENTHAL, Chair
Summary:
Under existing law, the gross weight imposed upon the highway by the wheels on any one axle of a
vehicle is prohibited from exceeding 18,000 pounds, except the gross weight on any one axle of a bus
is prohibited from exceeding 20,500 pounds. A violation of these requirements is a crime. This bill
would repeal that weight exception for buses on January 1, 2016. The bill would instead exempt a
transit bus from the limits on the weight that may be imposed upon the highway by the wheel of any
one axle, until January 1, 2016, and as of that date, the bill would repeal that exemption for transit
buses and reinstate the existing prohibition of 20,500 pounds for any one axle of a bus. The bill would
prohibit a publicly owned or operated transit system or an operator of a transit system under contract
with a publicly owned or operated transit system from procuring a new transit bus whose gross
weight exceeds the gross weight of the heaviest transit bus in the system's existing bus inventory, for
that transit bus' fleet class as of December 31, 2012, except as specified. The bill would repeal this
prohibition on January 1, 2016. The bill would impose a state-mandated local program by imposing
new requirements upon buses that are not transit buses. This bill contains other related provisions
and other existing laws.

Position: Support

AB 1722 (Alejo D) Department of Transportation: changeable message signs.
Introduced: 2/16/2012
Last Amended: 4/9/2012
Status: 4/16/2012-In committee: Set, second hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.
Location: 4/9/2012-A. TRANS.
Calendar:
4/23/2012 1:30 p.m. - State Capitol, Room 4202 ASSEMBLY TRANSPORTATION, LOWENTHAL, Chair
Summary:
Existing law provides that the Department of Transportation has full possession and control of all state highways. Existing law, the Outdoor Advertising Act, provides for the regulation by the department of advertising displays, as defined, within view of public highways. Existing law also authorizes the department to install and maintain information signs along state highways. This bill would require the department to, by June 30, 2013, update it policies to permit displays of specified messages on changeable roadside message signs.

Position: Monitor

**AB 1770**  *(Lowenthal, Bonnie D)*  California Transportation Financing Authority.

Introduced: 2/17/2012
Status: 4/19/2012-Read second time. Ordered to third reading.
Location: 4/19/2012-A. THIRD READING

Summary:
Existing law creates the California Transportation Financing Authority, with specified powers and duties relative to issuance of bonds to fund transportation projects to be backed, in whole or in part, by various revenue streams of transportation funds, and toll revenues under certain conditions, in order to increase the construction of new capacity or improvements for the state transportation system consistent with specified goals. Existing law defines "project" for these purposes to include, among other things, a rail project. This bill would provide that a rail project may consist of, or include, rolling stock. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Position: Monitor

**AB 1778**  *(Williams D)*  Local transportation funds.

Introduced: 2/21/2012
Last Amended: 4/17/2012
Status: 4/18/2012-Re-referred to Com. on TRANS.
Location: 4/18/2012-A. TRANS.

Summary:
Existing law requires that revenues from 1/4% of the local sales and use tax rate be transferred to the local transportation fund of each county for allocation, as directed by the transportation planning agency, to various transportation purposes, under what is commonly known as the Transportation Development Act. Existing law specifies the allowable uses for local transportation funds, and generally requires, after certain deductions, that the funds attributed to the area of apportionment of each transit operator be used solely for transit purposes in counties with a population of 500,000 or more as of the 1970 census. However, in counties with a population under 500,000 as of the 1970 census and in certain other counties, these funds may also be used for local streets and roads, if the transportation planning agency finds that there are no unmet transit needs or no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, and for other specified purposes. Existing law, effective July 1, 2014, generally requires a county with a population under 500,000 as of the 1970 census that has a population of 500,000 or more as of the 2000 census or a future census to use funds attributable to the urbanized area of the county solely for transit purposes, except that a city with a population of 100,000 or fewer in an urbanized area in that county would not be so restricted. Existing law provides that the July 1, 2014, requirements and exemptions do not apply to Ventura County, and instead generally requires all local transportation funds in that county to be used for transit purposes as of that date unless a specified report is submitted by the Ventura County Transportation Commission to the transportation committees of the Legislature by December 31, 2011, and a recommended legislative proposal in that report relative to reorganization of transit services and expenditure of these funds is enacted by the end of the 2011-12 legislative session. This bill would provide that local transportation funds in Ventura County shall be available solely for transit purposes beginning July 1, 2014, as specified. The bill would also provide that any of those funds that remain unencumbered for more than one year, or unexpended for more than 2 years, be returned to the Ventura County Transportation Commission for reapportionment to other transit operators or transit service in proportional amounts based on population, contingent upon specified criteria.

Position: Monitor
**AB 1780**  (Bonilla D)  Department of Transportation: project studies reports.  
*Introduced: 2/21/2012  
*Last Amended: 3/29/2012  
*Status: 4/9/2012-Referred to Com. on TRANS.  
*Location: 4/9/2012-A. TRANS.  
*Calendar:  
4/23/2012  1:30  p.m.  - State Capitol, Room 4202  ASSEMBLY TRANSPORTATION, LOWENTHAL, Chair  
*Summary:  
Existing law requires the Department of Transportation, in consultation with transportation planning agencies, county transportation commissions, counties, and cities, to carry out long-term state highway planning. Existing law authorizes the department, to the extent that it does not jeopardize the delivery of projects in the adopted state transportation improvement program, to prepare a project studies report for capacity-increasing state highway projects. Existing law requires the department to review and approve project studies reports performed by an entity other than the department. Existing law authorizes a local entity to request the department to prepare a project studies report for a capacity-increasing state highway project that is being proposed for inclusion in a future state transportation improvement program. If the department determines that it cannot complete the report in a timely fashion, existing law authorizes the requesting entity to prepare the report. Existing law makes specified guidelines adopted by the California Transportation Commission applicable to project studies reports commenced after October 1, 1991. This bill would revise these provisions to authorize the department to prepare project study reports or equivalent planning documents for any projects on the state highway system, limited by the resources available to the department. The bill would require the department to pay for the costs of its review and approval of project study reports or equivalent planning documents that are prepared by other entities for projects that are in an adopted regional transportation plan, a voter-approved county sales tax measure expenditure plan, or other voter-approved transportation program. In other cases, the bill would require the cost of the department’s review and approval to be paid by the entity preparing the project study report or equivalent planning document. The bill would delete the provisions relating to the guidelines adopted by the California Transportation Commission and would instead require open and continuous communications between the parties during the development of project study reports or equivalent planning documents. The bill would make other related changes.  
*Position:  Monitor  

**AB 1794**  (Weber D)  Theft: junk, metals, and secondhand materials.  
*Introduced: 2/23/2012  
*Last Amended: 3/29/2012  
*Status: 4/9/2012-Referred to Com. on PUB. S.  
*Location: 4/9/2012-A. PUB. S.  
*Summary:  
Existing law provides that every dealer in or collector of junk, metals, or secondhand materials, or the agent, employee, or representative of that dealer or collector, who buys or receives any wire, cable, copper, lead, solder, mercury, iron, or brass which he or she knows or reasonably should know is ordinarily used by or ordinarily belongs to a railroad or other transportation, telephone, telegraph, gas, water, or electric light company or county, city, city and county, or other political subdivision of this state engaged in furnishing public utility service without using due diligence to ascertain that the person selling or delivering the same has a legal right to do so, is guilty of criminally receiving that property, and shall be punished by imprisonment as specified, by a fine of not more than $250, or by both that fine and imprisonment. This bill would increase that maximum fine to an amount not to exceed $1,000. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.  
*Position: Support  

**AB 2405**  (Blumenfield D)  Vehicles: high-occupancy toll lanes.  
*Introduced: 2/24/2012  
*Last Amended: 4/10/2012  
*Status: 4/18/2012-Read second time. Ordered to third reading.  
*Location: 4/18/2012-A. THIRD READING  
*Calendar:  
4/23/2012  #47  ASSEMBLY ASSEMBLY THIRD READING FILE  
*Summary:  

Existing law authorizes the Department of Transportation to designate certain lanes for the exclusive use of high-occupancy vehicles (HOV), which lanes may also be used, until January 1, 2015, by certain eligible low-emission and hybrid vehicles not carrying the requisite number of passengers otherwise required for the use of an HOV lanes if the vehicle displays a valid identifier issued by the Department of Motor Vehicles. Existing law provides that a vehicle, eligible under these provisions to use HOV lanes, that meets the California's enhanced advanced technology partial zero-emission vehicle (enhanced AT PZEV) standard is not exempt from toll charges imposed on single-occupant vehicles in lanes designated for tolls pursuant to a federally supported value-pricing and transit development program involving high-occupancy toll lanes conducted by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. This bill would instead exempt all of the low emission and hybrid vehicles eligible to use HOV lanes under these provisions, including vehicles that meet the enhanced AT PZEV standards, from toll charges imposed on single-occupant vehicles in lanes designated for tolls unless prohibited by federal law. The bill would exclude a toll imposed for passage on a toll road, toll highway, or toll bridge from this exemption. The bill would provide that these changes shall be known as the Choose Clean Cars Act of 2012.

**Position:** Oppose

**AB 2488 (Williams D) Vehicles: buses: length limitations.**

**Introduced:** 2/24/2012  
**Last Amended:** 4/12/2012  
**Status:** 4/16/2012-Referred to Com. on TRANS.  
**Location:** 4/16/2012-A. TRANS.  
**Calendar:** 4/23/2012 1:30 p.m. - State Capitol, Room 4202  
**ASSEMBLY TRANSPORTATION, LOWENTHAL, Chair**

**Summary:**  
Existing law imposes a 40-foot limitation on the length of vehicles that may be operated on the highways, with specified exemptions. Existing law exempts from this limitation an articulated bus or trolley and a bus, except a schoolbus, that is operated by a public agency or passenger stage corporation that is used in a transit system if it is equipped with a folding device attached to the front of the vehicle that is designed and used exclusively for transporting bicycles, does not materially affect efficiency or visibility of vehicle safety equipment, and does not extend more than 36 inches from the front of the body of the bus or trolley when fully deployed. In addition, existing law prohibits a bicycle that is transported on the above-described device from having the bicycle handlebars extend more than 42 inches from the front of the vehicle. This bill would authorize Gold Coast Transit (GCT) to install folding devices attached to the front of its buses that are designed and used exclusively for transporting bicycles if the use of the device meets certain requirements, including, but not limited to, that the device does not extend more than 40 inches from the front of the bus when fully deployed, and that the handlebars of the bicycles being transported do not extend more than 46 inches from the front of the bus. The bill would require GCT, if it installs the bicycle racks, to report to the Assembly Committee on Transportation and the Senate Committee on Transportation and Housing on or before December 31, 2017, regarding safety issues and mobility improvements. This bill contains other related provisions.

**Position:** Monitor

**AB 2679 (Committee on Transportation) Transportation: omnibus bill.**

**Introduced:** 3/6/2012  
**Last Amended:** 3/27/2012  
**Status:** 4/17/2012-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on REV. & TAX. with recommendation: to consent calendar. (Ayes 14. Noes 0.) (April 16). Re-referred to Com. on REV. & TAX.  
**Location:** 4/17/2012-A. REV. & TAX  
**Calendar:** 4/23/2012 1:30 p.m. - State Capitol, Room 126  
**ASSEMBLY REVENUE AND TAXATION, PEREA, Chair**

**Summary:**  
Existing law authorizes the Department of Transportation (department) to pay claims or damages up to a maximum of $5,000 without the approval of the California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board. This bill would adjust the claim limit that may be paid by the department under these provisions to equal the maximum amount of a claim that can be brought in small claims court. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.
ACA 23 (Perea D) Local government transportation projects: special taxes: voter approval.
Introduced: 2/23/2012
Status: 2/24/2012-From printer. May be heard in committee March 25.
Location: 2/23/2012-A. PRINT
Summary:
The California Constitution conditions the imposition of a special tax by a city, county, or special district upon the approval of 2/3 of the voters of the city, county, or special district voting on that tax, except that certain school entities may levy an ad valorem property tax for specified purposes with the approval of 55% of the voters within the jurisdiction of these entities. This measure would provide that the imposition, extension, or increase of a special tax by a local government for the purpose of providing funding for local transportation projects requires the approval of 55% of its voters voting on the proposition. The measure would also make conforming and technical, nonsubstantive changes.

Position: Support

SB 749 (Steinberg D) California Transportation Commission: guidelines.
Introduced: 2/18/2011
Last Amended: 1/4/2012
Status: 1/23/2012-In Assembly. Read first time. Held at Desk.
Location: 1/23/2012-A. DESK
Summary:
Existing law generally provides for programming and allocation of state and federal funds available for transportation capital improvement projects by the California Transportation Commission, pursuant to various requirements. Existing law authorizes the commission, in certain cases, to adopt guidelines relative to its programming and allocation policies and procedures. This bill would establish specified procedures that the commission would be required to utilize when it adopts guidelines, except as specified, and would exempt the adoption of those guidelines from the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act. This bill contains other existing laws.

Position: Monitor

SB 985 (La Malfa R) Transportation bonds.
Introduced: 1/30/2012
Location: 4/17/2012-S. T. & H.
Summary:
Article XVI of the California Constitution requires a general obligation bond act to specify the single object or work to be funded by the bonds, and further requires a bond act to be approved by a 2/3 vote of each house of the Legislature and by a majority of the voters. Article XVI authorizes the Legislature, at any time after the approval of a general obligation bond act by the voters, to reduce the amount of the indebtedness authorized by the act to an amount not less than the amount contracted at the time of the reduction or to repeal the act if no debt has been contracted. Existing law, pursuant to the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, approved by the voters as Proposition 1A at the November 4, 2008, statewide general election, provides for the issuance of $9.95 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed rail and related rail purposes. Existing law creates the High-Speed Rail Authority with specified powers and duties related to the development and implementation of a high-speed train system. This bill would provide that no further bonds shall be sold for high-speed rail and related rail purposes pursuant to the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century. The bill would amend the bond act to authorize redirection of the net proceeds received from outstanding bonds issued and sold prior to the effective date of this act, upon appropriation by the Legislature, from those high-speed rail purposes to retiring the debt incurred from the issuance and sale of those outstanding bonds. This bill contains other related provisions.

Position: Oppose

SB 1068 (Rubio D) Local Agency Public Construction Act: Golden Empire Transit District: Sacramento Regional Transit District.
Introduced: 2/13/2012
Last Amended: 4/9/2012
Status: 4/18/2012—From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 8. Noes 0.) (April 17). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
Location: 4/18/2012—S. APPR.
Calendar:
4/30/2012 11 a.m. - John L. Burton Hearing Room (4203) SENATE APPROPRIATIONS, KEHOE, Chair
Summary:
Existing law, the Local Agency Public Construction Act, with respect to the purchase by the Golden Empire Transit District of supplies, equipment, and materials that exceed $10,000 or any single purchase of fuels exceeding $15,000, requires the contract to be let to the lowest responsible bidder. Existing law requires the Golden Empire Transit District to publish a notice requesting bids to be published in a newspaper of general circulation, as provided. This bill instead would require contracts of the Golden Empire Transit District and the Sacramento Regional Transit District for the purchase of supplies, equipment, and materials that exceed $100,000 to be let to the lowest responsible bidder or, in the district's discretion, to the responsible bidder that submits a proposal that provides the best value, as defined. This bill would, with regard to the Golden Empire Transit District, remove the requirement that a single purchase of fuels exceeding $15,000 be let to the lowest responsible bidder and would revise the notice requirement to require that notice requesting bids be published at least once in a newspaper of general circulation and on the district's procurement Internet Web site, as provided. This bill also would require both districts to the extent practicable, to obtain a minimum of 3 quotations, either written or oral, that permit prices and terms to be compared, whenever the expected expenditure required for the purchase of supplies, equipment, or materials exceeds a specified minimum amount but does not exceed $100,000. By expanding the duties of a local agency, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Position: Support

SB 1094 (Kehoe D) Land use: mitigation lands: nonprofit organizations.
Introduced: 2/16/2012
Last Amended: 4/19/2012
Status: 4/19/2012—From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on GOV. & F.
Location: 4/19/2012—S. G. & F.
Calendar:
4/25/2012 9:30 a.m. - Room 112 SENATE GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE, WOLK, Chair
Summary:
The Planning and Zoning Law provides that if a state or local agency requires a person to transfer to that agency an interest in real property to mitigate the environmental impact of a project or facility, that agency may authorize specified entities to hold title to, and manage that interest in, real property, as well as any accompanying funds, provided those entities meet specified requirements. Existing law requires that if accompanying funds, as defined, are conveyed at the time the property is protected, then the holder of those accompanying funds must meet specified requirements. Existing law requires a state or local agency to exercise due diligence in reviewing the qualifications of a special district or nonprofit organization to effectively manage and steward land, water, or natural resources, as well as the accompanying funds. This bill would use the term "endowment" instead of "accompanying funds." This bill would authorize an agency, in connection with the provisions described above, to also permit a governmental entity to hold title to, and manage that interest in, real property, as well as any endowment. This bill would remove the requirement that a state or local agency exercise due diligence in reviewing the qualifications of a special district or nonprofit organization to effectively manage the endowment. This bill would also modify the requirements that the holder of an endowment must meet, and would provide that those requirements also apply to endowments that are secured at the time the property is protected. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Position: Monitor

SB 1102 (DeSaulnier D) State transportation improvement program.
Introduced: 2/16/2012
Status: 3/28/2012—From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 7. Noes 0. Page 3034.) (March 27). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
Location: 3/28/2012—S. APPR.
Calendar:
Existing law establishes the state transportation improvement program process, pursuant to which the California Transportation Commission generally programs and allocates available funds for transportation capital improvement projects over a multiyear period. Existing law provides that the Department of Transportation is responsible for the state highway system. Existing law requires the department to annually prepare a project delivery report that identifies milestone dates for state highway projects costing $1,000,000 or more for which the department is the responsible agency for project development work. This bill would require the department, as part of the annual project delivery report, to report on the difference between the original allocation made by the commission and the actual construction capital and support costs at project close for all state transportation improvement program projects completed during the previous fiscal year. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**SB 1189** (Hancock D) The Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century: project funding.

- Introduced: 2/22/2012
- Last Amended: 3/26/2012
- Status: 4/18/2012-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 6. Noes 3.) (April 17). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
- Location: 4/18/2012-S. APPR.
- Calendar:

Existing law, pursuant to the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, approved by the voters as Proposition 1A at the November 4, 2008, general election, provides for the issuance of $9.95 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed train capital projects and other associated purposes. Existing law makes $950 million of the proceeds of those bonds available for capital improvements to intercity and commuter rail lines and urban rail systems that provide direct connectivity to the high-speed train system and its facilities, or that are part of the construction of the high-speed train system, as specified, or that provide capacity enhancements and safety improvements. Existing law requires the California Transportation Commission to allocate those funds to eligible recipients, as defined, and to develop guidelines to implement those provisions. This bill would appropriate $523,400,000 from the High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Fund to the Department of Transportation for allocation by the California Transportation Commission as provided for in specified guidelines adopted by the commission.

**SB 1257** (Hernandez D) Utility user tax: public transit vehicles.

- Introduced: 2/23/2012
- Last Amended: 4/16/2012
- Status: 4/19/2012-Hearing postponed by committee. (Refers to 4/18/2012 hearing)
- Location: 4/16/2012-S. G. & F.
- Calendar:

Existing law provides that the board of supervisors of any county may levy a utility user tax on the consumption of, among other things, electricity, in the unincorporated area of the county. This bill would provide that no utility user tax shall be imposed under these provisions upon the consumption of electricity used to charge electric bus propulsion batteries, within a local jurisdiction, that is separately metered and is dedicated to providing electricity as fuel for an electric public transit bus.

**SB 1339** (Yee D) Commute benefit policies.

- Introduced: 2/24/2012
- Status: 4/17/2012-Set for hearing April 30.
- Location: 4/11/2012-S. E.Q.
- Calendar:
Summary:
Existing law creates the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, with various transportation planning and programming responsibilities in the 9-county San Francisco Bay Area. Existing law creates the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, with various responsibilities relative to the reduction of air pollution in the area of its jurisdiction, which incorporates a specified portion of the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. This bill would authorize the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District to jointly adopt a commute benefit ordinance that requires covered employers operating within the common area of the 2 agencies with a specified number of covered employees to offer those employees certain commute benefits. The bill would require that the ordinance specify certain matters, including any consequences for noncompliance, and would impose a specified reporting requirement. The bill would make its provisions inoperative on January 1, 2017.

Position: Monitor

Introduced: 2/24/2012
Status: 4/11/2012-Set for hearing April 23.
Location: 3/22/2012-S. E.Q.
Calendar:
4/23/2012 1:30 p.m. - Room 112 SENATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY, SIMITIAN, Chairman

Summary:
The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 designates the State Air Resources Board as the state agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of emissions of greenhouse gases. The state board is required to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions level in 1990 to be achieved by 2020, and to adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum, technologically feasible, and cost-effective greenhouse gas emission reductions. The act authorizes the state board to include use of market-based compliance mechanisms. The act authorizes the state board to adopt a schedule of fees to be paid by the sources of greenhouse gas emissions regulated pursuant to the act, and requires the revenues collected pursuant to that fee schedule be deposited into the Air Pollution Control Fund and be available, upon appropriation by the Legislature, for the purposes of carrying out the act. This bill would create the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Account within the Air Pollution Control Fund. The bill would require moneys, as specified, collected pursuant to a market-based compliance mechanism be deposited in this account. The bill also would require those moneys, upon appropriation by the Legislature, be used for purposes of carrying out the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. The bill would declare the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would establish criteria for the development and implementation of an expenditure plan, as specified, for moneys appropriated from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Account.

Position: Monitor

Total Measures: 26
Total Tracking Forms: 26
To: Board of Directors

From: H. Harvath, Assistant General Manager – Finance & Administration

Subject: Draft FY 2013 Budget

RECOMMENDATION:

Refer the Draft FY 2013 Budget to the Finance Committee for review and recommendation.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Referring the draft budget to the Finance Committee for review has no fiscal impact.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Your Board approves the agency’s annual operating and capital budgets.

DISCUSSION:

Staff is currently in the process of developing MST’s budget for FY 2013. Given the continued state budget deficits, the slow recovery from the prolonged world-wide economic downturn, and the inability of the federal government to adopt either a multi-year transportation bill or a full fiscal year budget for 2012, this budget will most likely require significant cost reductions in the face of reduced revenues. Among the fiscal realities facing MST are:

- **Reduced and uncertain State Transit Assistance (STA) funding** – For FY 2011, MST received nearly $2.7 million in STA funding. MST is currently on track to receive approximately $2.5 million in STA for FY 2012. Given the ongoing state budget deficits, some or all of the already reduced $2.5 million in budgeted STA could be vulnerable for FY 2013. In the past, STA funds have covered most of the costs of MST RIDES paratransit services (an unfunded federal mandate), which could approach $3 million for FY 2013. Given the uncertainty with the STA program, staff is currently budgeting only $2.5 Million from this funding source for FY 2013.

- **Increase in costs for MST RIDES** – Since 2008, MST RIDES ADA Paratransit services have seen an increase in boardings from 88,000 per year to over
105,000 boardings for FY 2011. Current trends for FY 2012 year to date show a further 7.86% increase in RIDES boardings over the same period in FY 2011. MST is seeking ways to help offset the cost of those increased number of RIDES trips, each of which are subsidized by nearly $25 from the MST general fund. MST must provide these ADA paratransit services as an unfunded federal mandate.

- **Frozen or Reduced Federal Operating funds** – The current multi-year transportation authorization bill (SAFETEA) expired at the end of FY 2009. The next authorization bill has still not been adopted and is nearly 1,000 days overdue. During this period, federal transit funding levels, which normally increase each year, have been virtually frozen for the last three years. According to MST’s legislative contacts in Washington, DC, some proposals from the House of Representatives call for reductions in federal transit funding back to levels of FY 2006 – a 30% cut from current funding levels. And, the potential for a federal government shutdown exists if the Congress and the President cannot come to an agreement on a spending plan for the remainder of FY 2012 by June 30, 2012.

- **Increase in the cost of fuel** – With the unrest in the Middle East and the gradual economic recovery, the cost of diesel fuel has escalated significantly in recent months. While fuel prices dipped slightly at the end of the summer to $3.25 for Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel Fuel, by the spring of 2012, prices had spiked as high as $3.83 this spring and have remained above MST’s FY 2012 budgeted fuel cost of $3.50 per gallon.

Over the last several weeks, staff has been reviewing potential cost savings and revenue generating measures in order to provide your Board with a plan to balance the FY 2013 budget. These measures will be presented to the Finance Committee, which is scheduled to meet prior to the May 14, 2012, Board meeting. The Finance Committee reviews this budget in detail and makes appropriate recommendations to your Board. The final draft budget would then be submitted for Board approval at the June 11, 2012, meeting.
Human Resources Committee  
April 9, 2012  
Minutes

Present: Chair Karen Sharp, Director Alan Cohen, Director Patricia Stephens, Carl Sedoryk, GM/CEO, Dave Laredo, General Counsel, Kelly Halcon, Director of Human Resources/Risk Management

Absent: Director Kristen Clark

1. Call to order

Director Sharp called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

2. Public Comments-None

3. Recommendation to Reaffirm MST’s Compensation Policy

Kelly Halcon briefed the HR Committee on MST’s current Compensation Policy and that from time to time; MST staff will review and recommend possible updates or modifications to District policies. Staff is not recommending any changes or modifications to the policy at this time.

Director Cohen asked if MST conducted a benefits survey. Ms. Halcon confirmed that MST participates in many salary and benefit surveys. When MST participates, a completed survey is sent back with the compiled data. This information is very helpful in determining the market values of positions.

4. Closed Session

4-1. Conference with Labor Negotiators – Monterey-Salinas Transit Employee Association (MSTEA) and Amalgamite Transit Union Local 1225 (ATU).

4-2. Conference with Legal Counsel-Litigation-Dominga Aguisanda.

4-3. Conference with Legal Counsel-Litigation-Frank McClure and Janie Bryant.


4-5. Conference with Legal Counsel-Litigation-Perfecta Wolf.
5. **Return to Open Session**

   No action taken.

6. **Director Sharp adjourned the meeting at 9:38 a.m.**

   
   
   SUBMITTED BY: _____________________________

   Kelly Halcon
To: Board of Directors

From: Michael Hernandez, Assistant General Manager/COO

Subject: Award a Contract for the Construction of BRT Bus Stops

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Authorize staff to enter into a contract with Pavex Construction for the construction of bus stops, installation of passenger shelters, and installation of other bus stop amenities for MST’s Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service.

FISCAL IMPACT:

$3,157,000. This construction phase of the BRT project is funded through the Federal Transit Administration’s Section 5309 Capital Investment Grants Program in the amount of $2,040,000, $510,000 funded through the State of California's Proposition 1B, and $607,000 from the City of Monterey’s Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Fund.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Your Board approves all purchases that exceed $25,000.

DISCUSSION:

MST was awarded a grant for the BRT project through the Federal Transit Administration’s Section 5309 Capital Investment Grants category called “Very Small Starts.” Projects under the “Very Small Starts” program include features such as: special transit stations, branded service, low floor or level boarding, frequent 10 minute peak service, traffic signal priority. The BRT service will span a 6.7 mile one-way route between Sand City, Seaside, then continuing through Monterey to Cannery Row. The service will be provided using existing special branded low-floor buses serving 27 designated bus stops.

MST’s total BRT project budget is $4.8 million. Some of the project phases that have been completed, or are in process of completion, include project design and engineering, the purchase of bus stop shelters, kiosks, and real-time electronic signs for the shelters. Construction is the largest phase of the BRT project and involves significant sidewalk and roadway improvements at 27 locations. In addition, the City of Monterey is funding $607,000 worth of intersection signalization improvements along the BRT corridors. Pavex Construction will be responsible for work to include, but not limited to the following:
- Construction of distinctive new concrete sidewalks within the bus stop zone
- Installation of new reinforced concreted bus pads directly in front of bus stops
- Installation of new BRT passenger shelters
- Traffic signalization improvements
- Roadway/other infrastructure improvements as required by local jurisdictions

In order to meet the timetable for completing the construction at key BRT stops prior to the Jazz Festival in September, 2012, MST proceeded with issuing “bid documents” in late March with the goal to award a contract immediately after the May 14 Board meeting. An Invitation to Bid (IFB) was sent to 35 different firms and Building Exchanges. MST provided “bid documents” for contractors to use as the basis for costing out their quotes, as 100% “construction ready documents” were not yet available. Additionally, plan check and design comments/input was still required from the City of Monterey and Seaside. The following three firms provided quotes as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Name</th>
<th>MST Funded</th>
<th>City of Monterey Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavex Construction, Watsonville CA</td>
<td>$2,733,324</td>
<td>$1,137,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite Construction Company, Watsonville</td>
<td>$2,893,326</td>
<td>$1,587,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Chapin Company, Salinas, CA</td>
<td>$2,944,312</td>
<td>$1,667,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the results of the IFB, MST has a requirement to reduce construction costs for this portion of the BRT project cost by $183,324 – about 7%, the difference between the Pavex quote of $2,733,324 and the project budget of $2,550,000. In addition, the City of Monterey will be reducing its scope of work to fit within its $607,000 project budget. To help realize a reduction in construction costs several changes to the project scope have been identified which may help reduce project costs. The most notable reduction is the elimination of a major trenching line across the Fremont at Aguajito intersection. Additionally, MST staff and our design/engineering consultant will conduct “value engineering,” essentially identifying alternatives to reduce project costs and eliminate any unnecessary expenses. As a last resort it may become necessary to eliminate one shelter or a specific bus stop to meet the budget cap of $2,550,000.

Pavex Construction is the paving division of Granite Rock, which has been in business for more than 100 years. MST has successfully conducted business with Pavex for various construction projects. Approval of this item at your May 14 Board meeting will authorize MST staff to enter into a construction contract with Pavex not to exceed $3,157,000 for the construction and installation of BRT bus stops and amenities and the intersection signalization improvements for the City of Monterey. The approval of this construction contract is critical to maintain the BRT project timeline.

PREPARED BY: ____________________ REVIEWED BY: ____________________
Michael Hernandez Carl Sedoryk
May 1, 2012

Carl Sedoryk  
CEO/General Manager  
Monterey-Salinas Transit  
1 Ryan Ranch Road  
Monterey, CA 93940  
(831) 393.8127

Re: MST Bid for Monterey Bay Bus Rapid Transit Project Cities of Monterey, Seaside, Sand City Bus Stop Improvements

Mr. Sedoryk,

In its latest addendum #2 issued just 7 days ago, MST eliminated a mandatory pre-bid requirement and clarified that A licensed contractors should bid the work rather than B licensed contractors as implied in the specifications. Prior to addendum #2 issued on April 23rd, our firm was under the impression that we were not properly licensed to bid the subject project and had not attended a mandatory pre-bid conference.

We contend that this latest addendum short circuited the required public notification period and our time to make the necessary good faith efforts to solicit minority vendors. At this point we would be at a disadvantage compared to the bidders who have been working on their proposal and good faith efforts since the time of the original bid advertisement. This sort of last minute qualification change is a bad precedent creating an unlevel playing field for the bidders and inviting an opportunity for unscrupulous bid letting practices.

To amend the situation we request the bid date be postponed until 30 days after the issuance of addendum #2.

Please provide a suitable response to address this protest.

Thank You,

Peter Taormina  
Principal  
(831)384-4081 office  
(831)277-6112 cell
May 2, 2012

Mr. Peter Taormina
Principal
Monterey Peninsula Engineering
P.O. Box 2317
Monterey, CA 93940

RE: Protest

Dear Mr. Taormina:

This letter is in response to your letter dated May 1, 2012, regarding Monterey Salinas Transit’s (MST) Monterey Bus Rapid Transit Project’s bid requirements.

Pursuant to Section 5 of the Invitation to Bid:

“MST reserves the right to revise the IFB prior to the bid opening via publication of Addenda. In any event, the last addendum will be issued no later than five (5) calendar days prior to the bid opening.”

The addendum referenced in your letter was issued on April 23, 2012, nine days before the bid opening. The timing of the addendum was clearly within the time allowed by Section 5 of the Invitation to Bid.

MST was first contacted by your firm on April 27, 2012, requesting access to the bid documents. That same day, MST forwarded instructions on how to download and view the documents to the e-mail address provided (bart@mpe2000.com). Based on this request, it appears your firm was unaware of the project as of April 27, 2012.

Though MST received numerous inquiries and questions from various firms, MST did not receive any prior communication from your firm expressing concerns about licensing requirements, or if a new pre-bid meeting had been set.

MST has made every attempt to communicate effectively with those who have expressed interest in this procurement and has addressed concerns as they were identified by potential suppliers.

Your request that the bid deadline be extended is denied.
Should you wish to protest this determination, please consult the Protest Procedures contained in the e-mail sent to you by Sandra Amorim on May 1, 2012.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Carl Sedoryk
CEO/General Manager
Monterey Salinas Transit District
To: Board of Directors
From: Carl Wulf, Facilities / Capital Projects Manager
Subject: Award a Security Gate Contract to Fence Corporation

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Award a contract to Fence Corporation of Sacramento for the purchase & installation of three (3) each, Speed Bi-fold Gates at CJW.

FISCAL IMPACT:

$169,161.40. This project is 100% funded through the California Transit Security Grant Program (Proposition 1B).

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Your Board approves all purchases that exceed $25,000.

DISCUSSION:

The need has been identified to improve security & access along the front of CJW Facility including the Employee parking lot. In November, 2011, your Board authorized the replacement of a security fence at MST’s CJW facility. These gates will complete the final security upgrades for CJW and offer a more controlled entrance and exit to the property. In the past, MST has had some instances of theft and vandalism to MST property and employee vehicles at that site.

MST receives an annual disbursement from the State of California Proposition 1B Transportation Bonds. The annual disbursement is approximately $402,000 and funds must be spent within 3 years. The funds have been programmed specifically to implement security improvements at our Salinas facilities.

This upgrade is critical to the operations at CJW and will provide a safer, secure environment for MST employees and equipment.

MST went out to bid with an IFB for the Bi-fold Gates. MST received sealed bids from the following vendors. The low bidder, A&D Automatic Gates & Access, was disqualified due to their lack of a required bid bond, as well as that their gate substitution did not meet specifications. Fence Corp was the second lowest responsive bidder.
### Gate Purchase & Installation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIDDER</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>SPEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; D Automatic Gate &amp; Access</td>
<td>$159,269.00</td>
<td>W/FOOTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$151,619.00</td>
<td>W/O FOOTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence Corp</td>
<td>$169,161.40</td>
<td>W/FOOTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$159,161.40</td>
<td>W/O FOOTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Innovations, Inc.</td>
<td>$187,315.00</td>
<td>W/FOOTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$167,315.00</td>
<td>W/O FOOTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door System Design, Inc.</td>
<td>$218,327.00</td>
<td>W/FOOTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$199,084.00</td>
<td>W/O FOOTING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MST staff recommends awarding the contract to Fence Corp as the lowest responsive and responsible bidder.
To:    Board of Directors  
From:  H. Harvath, Assistant General Manager – Finance & Administration  
Subject: Public hearings for proposed fare increases for MST services  

RECOMMENDATION:  

1. Hold a public hearing to solicit public input on proposed fare increases for MST fixed-route, OnCall and RIDES services.  

2. Approve fare increases.  

FISCAL IMPACT:  

Between $750,000 and $1 million of additional revenue per fiscal year.  

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:  

Your Board approves changes to fares.  

DISCUSSION:  

The last time MST's fares were raised was in January of 2009. In coordination with the replacement of MST's nearly 20 year-old fareboxes with new high-tech “smart card” fareboxes in April of 2011, a system-wide fare re-structuring was also implemented. As the new fare structure was not designed to increase overall fare revenue collected by MST, an initial analysis indicated that the average fare collected from fare-paying passengers (excluding free MST trolleys, military partnership lines, etc.) had actually decreased from $1.45 (May, June, July of 2009) to $1.39 (May, June, July of 2011). During the same period, the average subsidy per fare had increased from $4.54 per trip to $5.37 per trip. Concurrently, fuel prices have skyrocketed by 143% from just under $1.50 at the time of the January 2009 fare increase to $3.65 just last week. As with other transit agencies, MST’s budget is extremely susceptible to swings in fuel prices, as approximately 70,000 gallons of ultra low sulfur clean diesel and unleaded gasoline are used every month.  

For fiscal years 2011 and 2012, MST has been using reserves to help offset these fuel increases so as to not adversely impact our customers; however, after FY 2012, MST’s reserves will have been depleted. In that regard, staff is recommending an increase in fares to all categories to help balance the FY 2013 budget. An
approximate 25% increase to the base fares, passes, and other payment media is estimated to increase revenue by $750,000 to $1 million. As a part of the FY 2013 budget process, staff will be coming to your Board with additional cost-reduction and revenue-enhancing proposals to augment the following proposed fare increases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed-Route/OnCall Fare Classification</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Routes &amp; OnCall</td>
<td>$1 / $0.50 Discount</td>
<td>$1.50 / $0.75 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (Base) Routes</td>
<td>$2 / $1 Discount</td>
<td>$2.50 / $1.25 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Routes</td>
<td>$3 / $1.50 Discount</td>
<td>$3.50 / $1.75 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Routes</td>
<td>$10 / $5.00 Discount</td>
<td>$12 / $6.00 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Day Super GoPass</td>
<td>$150 / $75 Discount</td>
<td>$190 / $95 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Day Basic GoPass</td>
<td>$75 / $37 Discount</td>
<td>$95 / $47 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Day Super GoPass</td>
<td>$40 / $20 Discount</td>
<td>$50 / $25 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Day Pass (Not valid on Commuter Routes)</td>
<td>$8 / $4 Discount</td>
<td>$10 / $5 Discount</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MST Rides Fare Classification</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-way, 2.7 miles or less</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way, more than 2.7 miles or less</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way, more than 19.7 miles</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST RIDES customers on MST fixed-route and OnCall services</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td>Pay half-price discount fares at all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi reimbursement program</td>
<td>50% of taxi fares, up to $45 per month</td>
<td>Discontinued – use new taxi voucher program with $3 co-pay per trip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regards to MST RIDES paratransit services for persons with physical and/or mental disabilities so severe that they cannot use MST’s regular fixed-route and OnCall services, California state law requires that paratransit fares cover at least 10% of the cost of providing this service, which is an unfunded mandate under the federal Americans with Disabilities Act. During FY 2011, MST’s audited cost recovery for RIDES was 10.7%, just barely over the state-enforced minimum. Because fuel prices have increased 30% since the beginning of FY 2011, a fare increase is required for
RIDES to ensure that MST’s cost recovery rate does not drop below 10%, thereby maintaining MST’s eligibility for state transit funding.

Another fare change is currently being proposed regarding one of MST’s Military Partnership bus routes that serve the Presidio of Monterey. Currently, those boarding any bus line within the gates of the Presidio of Monterey facility board for free. Prior to 2012, federal-employee transit benefit funds fully covered the costs of these military partnership lines. Since the beginning of 2012, Congress has allowed federal funding that supports the military programs to be reduced. In that regard, staff is negotiating with the Presidio of Monterey to discuss cost reductions and/or revenue enhancements to bridge an estimated $360,000 funding gap for our local military partnership program. One of the concepts being proposed is to institute a charge for fares on Line 69 Presidio-The Dunes, which primarily serves enlisted personnel during their off-duty periods for recreational purposes on Friday evenings and weekends. Because this proposal would change fares, your Board would need to give its approval before it could be officially implemented.

To solicit input on these proposed fare increases, staff has conducted a series of three public hearings:

**April 24, 2012**
Salinas -- 6:00 PM
Hebron Heights Community Center
683 Fremont Street

**April 26, 2012**
Seaside -- 6:00 PM
Boys & Girls Club of Monterey County
1332 La Salle Avenue

**May 1, 2012**
Soledad -- 6:00 PM
City Council Chambers
248 Main Street

The minutes of each of these meetings are included as attachments to this memo (Attachments 1, 2 and 3). A fourth public hearing is being conducted at the May 14, 2012, meeting of your Board. Bi-lingual notices advertising these meetings were posted aboard MST buses and appeared in the Monterey Herald, the Salinas Californian, and El Sol. Press releases were sent out to local media and posted on the MST website. The public was also invited to send in their comments via phone, fax, email or U.S. Mail. Copies of all correspondence received to date will be included at your dais on the morning of the May 14th Board meeting. In addition, Attachment 4 contains the presentation that was given at the public hearings.

Attachment 1: Salinas Public Hearing Minutes – 4/24/2012
Attachment 2: Seaside Public Hearing Minutes – 4/26/2012
Attachment 3: Soledad Public Hearing Minutes – 5/1/2012
Attachment 4: Public Hearing Power Point Presentation
Attachment 5: Proof of Publication
1. CALL TO ORDER

Hunter Harvath called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. in the Hebron Family Center Community Room.

Staff: Hunter Harvath Asst. General Manager/Finance & Administration
       Deanna Smith Executive Assistant to the GM/CEO
       Miriam Gutierrez Customer Service Representative
       Carl Sedoryk General Manager/CEO

Public: Maria Gutierrez Salinas Resident, MST Rider
        Paula Sandoval Salinas Resident, MST Rider
        Gwen Foote Salinas Resident, MST Rider
        Melantha Jamieson Salinas Resident, MST Rider
        Glenn Davis Salinas Resident, MST Rider
        Laura Cabrera Office of Assembly member Luis Alejo
        Alicia Jimenez Salinas Resident, MST Rider
        Tony Paredes Salinas Resident, MST Rider
        Rosa Izquiera Salinas Resident, MST Rider

Apology is made for any misspelling of a name.

2. PRESENTATION OF PROPOSED FARE INCREASES

Mr. Harvath introduced himself and MST staff, welcoming all members of the public. Mr. Harvath gave a PowerPoint presentation and explained that the proposed fare increases apply to all MST Transit services: regular, discount, and MST RIDES. He stated that fuel costs are the primary reason necessitating the fare increases and that MST uses approximately 70,000 gallons of fuel per month. MST’s last fare increase was in January of 2009 when gasoline was $1.50 per gallon and the average fare was $1.39. He presented the proposed table of fare increases and opened the meeting for public comment.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Maria Gutierrez stated that she lives on a fixed income and uses public transportation exclusively, purchasing the 31-Day Basic Go Pass. She stated that the fare increases will make it very difficult for her to pay her bills. She later asked that her comment be amended to request that if fares must be raised, that they not be raised as much as proposed.
Paula Sandoval stated that she is on a fixed income and her check is not enough to cover her monthly expenses.

Gwen Foote stated that she is also on a fixed income and has not had a cost of living increase in 3 years. She asked if fares would be lowered when gas goes down. She believes that gasoline prices are going down. She is a 31-Day pass holder.

Melantha Jamieson understands that the fare box revenue for RIDES customers must cover 10% of fare, but asked what would happen if MST simply did not raise fares. She stated that Line 45 is often late or does not show up and that she expects better service if she will be required to pay a higher fare. Mr. Harvath stated that service would have to be cut as an alternative to raising fares. He stated that MST is currently studying Line 45 as well as other routes in Salinas and will be making changes to improve the schedule and on-time performance. Ms. Jamieson asked if she was eligible for the discounted fare since recently receiving a note from her doctor saying she was disabled. Mr. Harvath offered to assist her with getting the forms to fill out to obtain an MST Courtesy Card, which would entitle her to the 50% discounted fares.

Laura Cabrera asked how often the fares and related data were reviewed. Mr. Sedoryk explained that all data is reviewed annually as a part of the budget process, but that fares do not necessarily change annually. MST staff attempts to strike a balance between fare increases and service reductions when necessary, as both impact riders.

Alicia Jimenez lives in Salinas and works in Carmel Valley. She must take up to 4 buses at times to make it to work, and her commute is 2 hours each way, with an additional hour to pick up her young son from daycare. Her 15 year old son attends school in Seaside and also takes the bus. She stated that if the fares are raised, it will not be worth it to continue to work and pay for a babysitter. Mr. Harvath told her that her comments would be provided to the Board of Directors and also suggested that since she works with more than 4 other employees, a group discount could be obtained to offset the proposed fare increases. He also informed her of the $38 Summer Youth Pass for her son.

Gwen Foote stated that she is upset that she must pay .50 cents more to ride just 4 blocks on Line 29 in Salinas simply because it provides service to Watsonville. Mr. Harvath stated that the new schedule, which starts April 28th, places more Line 49 buses in Salinas than Line 29, so it should be easier to ride at a lower fare.

Mr. Sedoryk asked the public how they heard about the Public Hearings. Most stated that they were informed by the car cards on the buses and by other passengers. Some also stated that information was passed out at the transit centers.

Mr. Sedoryk asked if there was anything MST could do to encourage more participation at the Public Hearings. Ms. Foote suggested holding the hearings at Sherwood Hall, a more central and easily identified location.
Tony Paredes stated that the proposed fares were too high for him. His address and email address were obtained, and staff will confirm that he obtains the appropriate discounted fare.

Rosa Izquiera arrived after the meeting was adjourned. She explained that she rides MST exclusively and that the proposed fare increases will be difficult for her. She also stated that she had not received a COLA for three years and her income is not keeping up with inflation.

4. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mr. Harvath adjourned the meeting at 6:45p.m.
1. CALL TO ORDER

Hunter Harvath called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. in the Boys & Girls Club Community Room.

Staff: Hunter Harvath Asst. General Manager/Finance & Administration
Deanna Smith Executive Assistant to the GM/CEO
Jacqueline Bernal Customer Service Representative
Carl Sedoryk General Manager/CEO

Public: Alicia Jimenez Salinas Resident, MST Rider
Jose Jimenez Salinas Resident, MST Rider
Francisco Javier Lopez Salinas Resident, MST Rider
Carmen Vasquez Seaside Resident, MST Rider
Miranda Rios Seaside Resident, MST Rider
Emily Schnars Seaside Resident, MST Rider
Inez Canel MST Rider
Jim Fink MST Rider
Alvin Edwards Seaside City Councilmember, MST Board Member
Jose MST Rider

Apology is made for any misspelling of a name.

2. PRESENTATION OF PROPOSED FARE INCREASES

Mr. Harvath introduced himself and MST staff, welcoming all members of the public. He presented Jacqueline Bernal, who provided translation for the presentation and public comments. Mr. Harvath gave a PowerPoint presentation and explained that the proposed fare increases apply to all MST Transit services: regular, discount, and MST RIDES. He stated that fuel costs are the primary reason necessitating the fare increases and that MST uses approximately 70,000 gallons of fuel per month. MST’s last fare increase was in January of 2009 when gasoline was $1.50 per gallon and the average fare was $1.39. He presented the proposed table of fare increases and opened the meeting for public comment.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Alicia Jimenez asked why the Line 11 late evening service from Carmel to Seaside was cut. Mr. Harvath stated that in the last service reduction, this service was
cut, but that as of this weekend, 1 additional late evening stop from Carmel will be added to Line 5. Ms. Jimenez stated that she preferred a direct route.

Inez Canel asked what happened to Line 7. Mr. Harvath explained that this service was also reduced during the last service reduction. He suggested that Lines 5 and 24 now serve Monterey to Carmel 7 days a week. He also stated that Lines 3 and 4 now provide service from Monterey to CHOMP.

Jose (last name unknown) stated that the proposed fares are too high for those on fixed incomes or who have not had their pay increased for the last several years. He stated that he tried to get his friends to come to protest, but he is the only one speaking for them.

Carmen Vasquez stated that she is unhappy that service from Del Rey Oaks to Edgewater after 1:00pm has been eliminated. She stated that it is not safe for pedestrians to walk this area. Mr. Sedoryk stated that if fuel prices reduce significantly or tax revenue increases, some cut services may be reinstated. Ms. Vasquez stated that she has been using public transit for a long time and may not be able to continue working if the fares are raised.

Inez Canel is worried that the fare increases will keep her from being able to make it to work.

Jim Fink stated that he is concerned that the 5:50am service from CHOMP has been eliminated. Line 3 does not operate early enough. He stated that he prefers an even dollar amount for fares. Mr. Harvath stated that all of his comments are appreciated and have been received via email and will be presented to the Board.

Mr. Sedoryk asked Jacqueline to assure everyone that all comments will be considered by the MST Board of Directors on Monday, May 14, 2012.

Carmen Vasquez stated that she used to be able to call the driver of Line 9 connecting with Line 20, to request that he/she waits just 2 minutes if the bus was running late. She stated that the driver no longer will wait for the late buses. Mr. Harvath asked her to please call customer service with details the next time this happens so that staff can follow up with the driver. MST policy requires the drivers to wait for a maximum of 2 minutes for late buses.

Inez Canel stated that Line 1 from Asilomar to Monterey at 2:15pm either leaves early or is late. She stated that when it ran 27 minutes after the hour, it was more accurate.

Emily Schnas requested more service on Lines 16 and 17 in the former Ft. Ord residential area. Mr. Harvath stated that there has not been enough demand to support increasing service.
Mr. Fink asked what was the current fare box recovery rate and if MST has considered proposing a tax measure. Mr. Harvath stated that it is approximately 25% - 30% and that MST has had to dip into its reserves over the past 2 years to cover costs. Service cannot be raised until the budget is balanced and reserves are replaced. The tax measure is being considered by the MST Board and Staff.

Seaside Councilmember Alvin Edwards asked members of the public how they heard about the Public Hearing. Jacqueline interpreted for the public, and most stated that they read the car cards in the buses.

4. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mr. Harvath adjourned the meeting at 6:45p.m.

Prepared by: Deanna Smith, Deputy Secretary
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PUBLIC HEARING
Soledad City Hall
248 Main Street, Soledad, CA
May 1 2012
6:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

There being no members of the public present, Mr. Harvath did not call the meeting to order.

Staff: Hunter Harvath Asst. General Manager/Finance & Administration
Deanna Smith Executive Assistant to the GM/CEO
Sally Cota Customer Service Representative

Public: Patricia Stephens Soledad City Councilmember, MST Board Member

Apology is made for any misspelling of a name.

2. PRESENTATION OF PROPOSED FARE INCREASES

There being no members of the public present, Mr. Harvath did not conduct the presentation.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

4. ADJOURNMENT

There being no members of the public present, Mr. Harvath adjourned the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Prepared by: Deanna Smith, Deputy Secretary
This page left intentionally blank
To whom it may concern,

I'm writing about the rise in bus fare. It's ridiculous. Some people barely can afford the bus passes, and a big income like me, I too need the buses a lot. Where two or three a shopping, or the fare raises more the passes should be 4 at least a couple of months.

Thank you

Lisa Garcia
Para Monterey-Salinas Transit.

Quiero decir que estoy en contra de el aumento de precio en los pasajes del día. Yo recibo dinero del seguro social, estoy en forma y no puedo trabajar. Esto quitaría dinero de mi presupuesto para la comida y medicinas. Quiero que no suban la tarifa porque no puedo pagar más.

Yo les quedo agradecida por la ayuda a los que no tienen dinero. Yo soy sola y no tengo quien me alude.

Alma Hernandez
1052 Sanborn Rd #6
Salinas, CA 93905

No puedo pagar más porque no tengo para comer.

Alma Hernandez
Alma Hernandez  
1052 Sanborn Rd Apt # 6  
Salinas, CA 93905

To Monterey-Salinas Transit:

I'm against the fare increase, I'm a senior and I received benefits from the social services. The fare increase will take away money from my food and medicines. I'm alone and I don't have anybody to help me. I will not be able to afford it. Please consider my situation.

Alma Hernandez
From: Sara Jen [mailto:sjen@dons.usfca.edu] Posted At: Sunday, April 29, 2012 4:20 PM
Posted To: Customer Service
Conversation: Attn: Hunter Harvath, regarding fare meetings
Subject: Attn: Hunter Harvath, regarding fare meetings

Dear Mr. Harvath,

I take the 45 bus to and from work, which is across from Northridge Mall, nearly every weekday and also on weekends. I met you last year when MST had a public meeting at North Salinas High School about route changes to the 45 bus. I saw that there upcoming meetings regarding bus fare increases. I will not be able to attend the meetings, but I wanted to let you know that when I ride the 45 bus in the morning, fellow passengers for my segment of the trip include students and staff of Everett Alvarez High school and employees of El Super supermarket. When I need to arrive at work earlier or stay later, I take the 41 bus and walk from Natividad Medical Center to my home in Creekbridge. On the 41 bus, there are also students, and I recognize an employee of Target who is a regular rider. I have also seen a woman wearing a Motel 6 uniform while riding to work.

I understand that fare increases will help to keep the bus service running, and even with the fare increases, I consider the service to be worth paying for. I buy a 31 day GO Pass. However, the proposed increase of $20 a month for the adult fare is hard on many who use the regular fare bus pass. People who buy passes make a monthly commitment to ride MST. They prepay. The increase in the pass price may lead to fewer people willing to prepay. They will walk if they can, or take fewer trips and pay as they go. My recommendation is to have a smaller increase of no more than $10.

Encouraging people to ride the bus will increase revenue for MST, but until there is a cultural change and non bus riders decide that they will take the bus as a choice rather than transportation of last resort, transit providers and the community will need to press their elected officials and remind them of the value of bus service for local residents and visitors alike. I volunteered with the Sierra Club on Lobby Day last year and met with Luis Alejo at his office in Sacramento. Although bus service was not on the list of Sierra Club's Lobby Day topics, I reminded Mr. Alejo that the bus cutbacks were a hardship to people in Salinas. At that time, August 2011, the 45 line did not run on Sundays. I am glad Sunday service is back.

Sincerely,
Sara Jen
831-214-1733
Hunter,

Unfortunately, time and circumstances have prevented me from getting this to you in time for tonight’s Hebbron meeting.

However, please make copies of this counter-proposal available to everyone at the remaining hearings and to everyone on the Board.

With a three percent per year inflation rate, last year’s $10 is this year’s $9.70 in value. A $10 bill is worth less than $10.

Therefore I am resolved that MST MUST RAISE FARES IMMEDIATELY!!!

I do not like having to deal with coinage. Therefore, my counter-proposal is to make ALL FARES in EVEN DOLLAR AMOUNTS.

I propose as follows:

Local Routes and "On Call  $2-/$1-
Primary Basic AND Regional $4-/$2-
Commuter $12-/$6-
Day Pass (Valid everywhere) $12-/$6-

PASSES
31 Day Super $200-/$100-
31 Day Basic $100-/$50-
7 Day Super $50-/$25-
7 Day Basic $30-/$15-

MST RIDES as proposed by your staff.

Thank you.

--Jim Fink
jimindelreyoaks@gmail.com
831 794-0708
From: Jim Fink [mailto:jimdelreyoaks@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2012 4:34 PM
To: Hunter Harvath
Subject: Saturday 28 April Service changes

Hunter,

As I pointed out in my February 2012 emails, you absolutely need to add the following run to the line #3 timetable to make up for the deletion of the line #7. Otherwise overnight discharges from the CHOMP ER are in serious problems. To wit:

Jules Simoneau Monterey Transit Plaza  0548
CHOMP arrive and depart                       0555
Jules Simoneau Monterey Transit Plaza  0608

This should be done IMMEDIATELY to protect all CHOMP discharge patients from being unwitting strandees

Secondly, the 0925 trip from Sand City to Ryan Ranch needs to be restored to the line #8 as this is the trip serving the MST Offices @ 0951 on Board meeting days.

Third, based on input from frequent line #55 passengers, the line #22 needs to be available year round.

To pay for that, if a service cut has to be made, cut the frequency of line #20 midday (Or maybe even entire day) weekdays to hourly. Consider making 19 Monterey - Marina and 20 Marina - Salinas only.

Fourth, please restore the fourth weekend line #55 trip leaving San Jose for Monterey @ 2000 (8 pm)

Fifth, the line #23 substitute service on Saturday/Sunday must be available with an 0815 departure for South Main. Sunday services at Saint Ansgar's are @ 0815 and Saturday morning men's Bible studies are @ 0800. Saint Paul's Episcopal has similar service times to those of Saint Ansgar's. We cannot afford $7.50 every Sunday cab fare to church.

Cuts, when they must be made, should always be made to the heaviest ridership lines as they can put together consensus groups to provide themselves with alternatives. The lower ridership lines are those where EVERY customer is ABSOLUTELY dependent on that SPECIFIC service, generally in a "make-or-break" scenario.

Sixth, as to the line #43, the 1815 and 1845 departures from Salinas Transit Center must be restored. Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday evening "small groups" and AA meetings at Saint Ansgar's are adversely impacted here.
Hopefully, the new fare increases will pass as I am counter-proposing an even larger fare hike than you are. When they are implemented, the moneys should be coming in to allow the complete restoration of service to Summer 2011 levels. I will also say that I would like to see MST recover AT LEAST 50% at the fare box and through pass sales and possible charters.

Please "carbon copy" this to Carl Sedoryk and to all members of the Board.

Thank you.

--Jim Fink

From: joseph acosta [mailto:joseph_guku57@yahoo.com]
Posted At: Wednesday, April 18, 2012 10:59 AM
Posted To: Customer Service
Conversation: fare changes
Subject: fare changes

im just wondering about the changes for the fare to ride the bus and buss passes i have to pay $37 a month for a basic monthly pass now its going to be $42 not sure if thats a good price maybe just have the discount basic at $40 its a even price or $39 that my option but its just $5 more now to buy the basic bus pass but the other prices to ride the bus might work just have to increase the fare to ride the bus every so offten to keep the busses running and find a new spot to store the busses thank you for your time

JOSEPH MARIO ACOSTA
Dear Hunter Harvath,

I am very, very disappointed that the proposed MST fare increase may go into effect. I am 68 years old, I am under the care of doctor Perry, psychiatrist at outpatient mental health unit at Nathanbed Hospital. I use the bus as most people like me (on meds or low income, $880 month) cannot drive a car.

Before the current fare system I used to pay $37 month for a "salinas pass" and used it to go to AA meetings in Salinas. Now I have to pay $75! I go to AA 6 or 7 times a week and you can see $380 is for rent, food, transportation etc.; the proposed $95 bus card would make it very difficult for me to get through the month.

It would help low income and disabled people if you could issue a one zone pass for $37 increase so they just want to go let's say from Marina to either Salinas or Monterey. Some of us go to mental health meetings and/or AA, NA etc. I hope you consider this request.

Thank you,

Hugh Kerr

(831) 384-0729
MST

The price from $45.00 to $95.00
For one pass pass
IS NOT RIGHT
It is very big price I still have
To pay $x on the L0 bus
I am not happy.
People you ride the bus
do not have a lot of money.
And you cut a lot of the bus.
NOT RIGHT, I AM VERY
mad at you.

RECEIVED
MAY 03 2012
MONTEREY-SALINAS TRANSIT
Public Hearings
Proposed Fare Increase
Effective Saturday, May 26, 2012

• MST Fixed-Route Buses
• MST On-Call Dial-a-Ride
• MST RIDES Paratransit Services & Programs
Public Hearings

April 24, 2012
Salinas -- 6:00 PM
Hebron Heights Community Center
683 Fremont Street

April 26, 2012
Seaside -- 6:00 PM
Boys & Girls Club of Monterey County
1332 La Salle Avenue

May 1, 2012
Soledad -- 6:00 PM
City Council Chambers
248 Main Street

May 14, 2012
Monterey -- 10:00 am
Monterey-Salinas Transit
Administrative Headquarters
One Ryan Ranch Rd.
MST Fuel Prices – 2009 vs 2012

Fare Increase January 2009

January 2009
January 2012
April 2012

Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel
Gasoline
Average Fare Per Passenger
3-Month Study Period (May, June, July)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Subsidy (State, Federal taxes)</th>
<th>Fare-Paying Passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$4.54</td>
<td>$1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$4.60</td>
<td>$1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$5.37</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Proposed Fare Increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed-Route/OnCall Fare Classification</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Routes &amp; OnCall</td>
<td>$1 / $0.50 Discount</td>
<td>$1.50 / $0.75 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (Base) Routes</td>
<td>$2 / $1 Discount</td>
<td>$2.50 / $1.25 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Routes</td>
<td>$3 / $1.50 Discount</td>
<td>$3.50 / $1.75 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Routes</td>
<td>$10 / $5.00 Discount</td>
<td>$12 / $6.00 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Day Super GoPass</td>
<td>$150 / $75 Discount</td>
<td>$190 / $95 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Day Basic GoPass</td>
<td>$75 / $37 Discount</td>
<td>$95 / $47 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Day Super GoPass</td>
<td>$40 / $20 Discount</td>
<td>$50 / $25 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Day Pass (Not valid on Commuter Routes)</td>
<td>$8 / $4 Discount</td>
<td>$10 / $5 Discount</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed Fare Increase - RIDES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MST RIDES Fare Classification</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-way, 2.7 miles or less</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way, more than 2.7 miles or less than 19.7 miles</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way, more than 19.7 miles</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST RIDES customers on MST fixed-route and OnCall services</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td>Pay half-price discount fares at all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi reimbursement program</td>
<td>50% of taxi fares, up to $45 per month</td>
<td>Discontinued – use new taxi voucher program with $3 co-pay per trip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Fare Increase - RIDES

• California State Law requires paratransit fares to cover at least 10% of the cost of providing the service.

• During FY 2011, MST’s audited cost recovery for RIDES was 10.7%.

• Because fuel prices have increased 30% since the beginning of FY 2011, a fare increase is required to ensure cost recovery rate does not drop below 10%.
Nationwide, communities are considering fare increases and/or cuts to transit service

- Seattle, Washington
- Portland, Oregon
- Las Vegas, Nevada
- Springfield, Massachusetts
- Boston, Massachusetts
- St. Louis, Missouri
- Palm Beach, Florida
- And many more.......
Proposed Fare Increases
Effective Saturday, May 26, 2012

Submit Comments by May 9th to:
Hunter Harvath
Assistant General Manager- Finance & Administration
One Ryan Ranch Road
Monterey, CA 93940
via email at hharvath@mst.org
or via fax at (831) 899-3954
or via phone at 1-888-MST-BUS1 (1-888-678-2871)
Salinas Newspapers, Inc.
123 W. Alisal St.
Salinas, CA 93901
831-754-4138/Fax: 831-754-7156

State Of California ss:
County of Monterey

Advertiser: MONTEREY SALINAS TRANSIT
1 RYAN RANCH RD
MONTEREY, CA 93940

Deanna Smith

RE: PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE In response to th
Increased Fares

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the
County aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years,
and not a party to or interested in the above-entitled
matter. I hereby certify that the attached advertisement
appeared in said newspaper on the following dates:

Newspaper: Salinas Californian

4/7/2012

I acknowledge that I am a principal clerk of the printer of
said paper, which is published in the City of Salinas,
County of Monterey, State of California. The Salinas
Californian is printed and published daily, except Sunday
and has been adjudged a newspaper of general
circulation by the Superior Court of the County of
Monterey, State of California. El Sol is printed and
published weekly on Saturday and has been adjudged a
newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court
of Monterey, State of California.

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the
foregoing is true and correct. Executed on this day of April 2012 at Salinas, California.

C. Clark

Declarant

---

Proof of Publication
(2015.5 C.C.P.)

MST MONTEREY-SALINAS TRANSIT

PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

In response to the high cost of fuel and federal funding difficulties, Monterey-Salinas
Transit (MST) is proposing to increase fares for its fixed-route, "On Call" general public
dail-y-ride, and RIDES paratransit services. The proposed fare increases would affect
all forms of fare media, including per-trip cash fares, GoPasses (single day, 7-day and
31-day), and RIDES paratransit trips. If approved by the MST Board of Directors, the
following fare changes would take effect Saturday, May 26, 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed-Route/OnCall Fare Classification</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Routes &amp; OnCall</td>
<td>$1 / $.60 Discount</td>
<td>$1.50 / $.75 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (Base) Routes</td>
<td>$2 / 1 Discount</td>
<td>$2.50 / 1.25 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Routes</td>
<td>3 / 1.50 Discount</td>
<td>$3.50 / 1.75 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Routes</td>
<td>$10 / $5.00 Discount</td>
<td>$12 / $6.00 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Day Super GoPass</td>
<td>$150 / $75 Discount</td>
<td>$100 / $50 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Day Basic GoPass</td>
<td>$75 / $37 Discount</td>
<td>$50 / $25 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Day Pass (Not valid on Commuter Routes)</td>
<td>$8 / $4 Discount</td>
<td>$10 / $5 Discount</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MST RIDES Fare Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-way, 2.7 miles or less</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way, more than 2.7 miles or less than 19.7 miles</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way, more than 19.7 miles</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST RIDES customers on MST fixed-route and OnCall services</td>
<td>FREE Pay half-price discount fares at all times Discontinued - use new voucher program with $3 co-pay per trip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tax reimbursement program 50% of tax fares, up to $50 per month

MST will hold four public hearings to receive comments on the proposed fare increases:

April 24, 2012
Salinas -- 6:00 PM
Hebron Heights Community Center
683 Fremont Street

May 1, 2012
Soledad -- 6:00 PM
City Council Chambers
249 Main Street

April 26, 2012
Seaside -- 6:00 PM
Boys & Girls Club of Monterey County
1532 La Salle Avenue

May 14, 2012
Monterey -- 10:00 am
Monterey-Salinas Transit
Administrative Headquarters
One Ryan Ranch Rd.
Monterey, CA 93940

Interested persons wishing to comment, but who are unable to attend the public
hearings, may submit written comments to: Hunter Harvath, Assistant General Manager
for Finance & Administration, 1 Ryan Ranch Road, Monterey, CA 93940, via email at
mst@mst.org, or via fax at (831) 896-3060.

The deadline to receive written comments is Wednesday, May 9, 2012.
April 7, 2012 (219316)
MONTEREY/SALINAS TRANSIT
Account No. 3559234
ACCOUNTS PAYABLE
1 RYAN RANCH ROAD
Monterey, CA 93940

Legal No. 0004393243
Fare Charges- Legal Notice

Ordered by: dsmith@mst.org

PROOF OF PUBLICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

County of Monterey

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County aforesaid. I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above-entitled matter. I am the principal clerk of the printer of The Herald, a newspaper of general circulation, printed and published daily and Sunday in the City of Monterey, County of Monterey, and which newspaper has been adjudged a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of Monterey, State of California; that the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy (set in type not smaller than 7 point), has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to wit:

04/17/12

I certify (or declare), under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct

Executed on 04/17/2012 at Monterey, California,

[Signature]
MONTEREY-SALINAS TRANSIT

PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

In response to the high cost of fuel and federal funding difficulties, Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) is proposing to increase fares for its fixed-route, "On Call" general public dial-a-ride, and RIDES paratransit services. The proposed fare increases would affect all forms of fare media, including per-trip cash fares, GoPasses (single day, 7-day and 31-day), and RIDES paratransit trips. If approved by the MST Board of Directors, the following fare changes would take effect Saturday, May 26, 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed-Route/OnCall Fare Classification</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Routes &amp; OnCall</td>
<td>$1 / $0.50 Discount</td>
<td>$1.50 / $0.75 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (Base) Routes</td>
<td>$2 / $1 Discount</td>
<td>$2.50 / $1.25 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Routes</td>
<td>$3 / $1.50 Discount</td>
<td>$3.50 / $1.75 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Routes</td>
<td>$10 / $5.00 Discount</td>
<td>$12 / $6.00 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Day Super GoPass</td>
<td>$150 / $75 Discount</td>
<td>$190 / $95 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Day Basic GoPass</td>
<td>$75 / $37 Discount</td>
<td>$95 / $43 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Day Super GoPass</td>
<td>$40 / $20 Discount</td>
<td>$50 / $25 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Day Pass (Not valid on Commuter Routes)</td>
<td>$8 / $4 Discount</td>
<td>$10 / $5 Discount</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MST RIDES Fare Classification</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-way, 2.7 miles or less</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way, more than 2.7 miles or less 19.7 miles</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way, more than 19.7 miles</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% of taxi fares, up to $45 per month</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td>Pay half-price discount fares all times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taxi reimbursement program Discontinued - use new taxi voucher program with $3 co-pay per trip

MST will hold four public hearings to receive comments on the proposed fare increases:

April 24, 2012
Salinas -- 6:00 PM
Hebron Heights Community Center
683 Fremont Street

April 26, 2012
Seaside -- 6:00 PM
Boys & Girls Club of Monterey County
1332 La Salie Avenue

May 1, 2012
Soledad -- 6:00 PM
City Council Chambers
246 Main Street

May 14, 2012
Monterey -- 10:00 am
Monterey-Salinas Transit
Administrative Headquarters
One Ryan Ranch Rd.
Monterey, CA 93940

Interested persons wishing to comment, but who are unable to attend the public hearings, may submit written comments to: Hunter Harvath, Assistant General Manager for Finance & Administration, 1 Ryan Ranch Road, Monterey, CA 93940, via email at mst@mst.org, or via fax at (831) 899-3954.

The deadline to receive written comments is Wednesday, May 9, 2012.

Published April 17, 2012
MST MONTEREY-SALINAS TRANSIT 
PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

In response to the high cost of fuel and federal funding difficulties, Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) is proposing to increase fares for its fixed-route, "On Call" general public dial-a-ride, and RIDES paratransit services. The proposed fare increases would affect all forms of fare media, including per-trip cash fares, GoPasses (single day, 7-day and 31-day), and RIDES paratransit trips. It approved by the MST Board of Directors, the following fare changes would take effect Saturday, May 26, 2012:

**Fixed-Route/OnCall Fare Classification**  **Current Proposed**
Local Routes & OnCall $1 / $0.50 Discount $1.50 / $0.75 Discount
Primary (Base) Routes $2 / $1 Discount $2.50 / $1.25 Discount
Regional Routes $3 / $1.50 Discount $3.50 / $1.75 Discount
Commuter Routes $10 / $5.00 Discount $12 / $6.00 Discount
31-Day Super GoPass $150 / $75 Discount $190 / $95 Discount
31-Day Basic GoPass $75 / $37 Discount $95 / $42 Discount
7-Day Super GoPass $40 / $20 Discount $50 / $25 Discount
1-Day Pass (Not valid on Commuter Routes) $8 / $4 Discount $10 / $5 Discount

**MST RIDES Fare Classification**  **Current Proposed**
One-way, 2.7 miles or less $2.00 $3.00
One-way, more than 2.7 miles or less than 19.7 miles $4.00 $5.00
One-way, more than 19.7 miles $6.00 $7.00

**MST RIDES customers on MST fixed-route and OnCall services**
FREE Pay half-price discount fares at all times
Taxi reimbursement program 50% of taxi fares, up to $45 per month Discontinued – use new taxi voucher program with $3 co-pay per trip

MST will hold four public hearings to receive comments on the proposed fare increases:

**April 24, 2012**
Salinas -- 6:00 PM
Hebron Heights Community Center
683 Fremont Street

**April 26, 2012**
Seaside -- 6:00 PM
Boys & Girls Club of Monterey County
1332 La Salle Avenue

**May 1, 2012**
Soledad -- 6:30 PM
City Council Chambers
249 Main Street

**May 14, 2012**
Monterey -- 10:00 am
Monterey-Salinas Transit Administrative Headquarters
One Ryan Ranch Rd.
Monterey, CA 93940

Interested persons wishing to comment, but who are unable to attend the public hearings, may submit written comments to: Hunter Harvath, Assistant General Manager for Finance & Administration, 1 Ryan Ranch Road, Monterey, CA 93940, via email at mst@mst.org, or via fax at (831) 899-3954.

The deadline to receive written comments is Wednesday, May 9, 2012.

---

MST MONTEREY-SALINAS TRANSIT 
AVISOS DE AUDIENCIA PÚBLICA

En respuesta a los altos costos del combustible y las dificultades de fondos federales, Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) se propone incrementar las tarifas para su ruta fija, "de guardia" al público en general de Dial-A-Ride, y servicios de transportación RIDES. Los aumentos de tarifas propuestos afectarán a todas las formas de los medios de tarifas, incluyendo tarifas en efectivo por viaje, GoPasses (un día, 7 días y 31 días), y viajes RIDES paratransito. Si es aprobado por la Junta de Directores MST, los cambios en las tarifas entrarán en vigor el Sábado, 26 de mayo 2012:

**Clasificación Ruta Fija/OnCall Tarifa Actual Propuesta**
Rutas locales y OnCall de $1 / $0.50 $1.50 / $0.75 de descuento
Primarias (básicas) Rutas de $2 / $1 de descuento a $2.50 / $1.25 de descuento
Rutas Regionales de $3 / $1.50 de descuento a $3.50 / $1.75 de descuento
Rutas Commuter de $10 / $5.00 de descuento a $12 / $6.00 de descuento
31 Días de Super GoPass $150 / $75 de descuento a $190 / $95 de descuento
31 Días GoPass básicos de $75 / $37 de descuento a $95 / $42 de descuento
7 Días de Super GoPass de $40 / $20 de descuento a $50 / $25 de descuento
Pase de 1 Día (No es válido en Rutas Commuter) de $8 / $4 de descuento a $10 / $5 de descuento

**Clasificación Ruta Fija Tarifa Actual Propuesta**
De una vía, 2.7 millas o menos $2.00 a $3.00
De una vía, más de 2.7 millas o menos de 19.7 millas $4.00 a $5.00
De una sola vía, más de 19.7 millas $6.00 a $7.00
Clientes de MST RIDES en MST de ruta fija y servicios OnCall Gratisa Paga tarifas a mitad de precio todo el tiempo

Programa de reembolso del 50% de las tarifas de los taxis, hasta $45 por mes
Discontinuado - utilizar el nuevo programa de vales de taxi por $3 co-pago por viaje

MST llevará a cabo cuatro audiencias públicas para recibir comentarios sobre los aumentos de tarifas propuestas:

**24 de abril 2012**
Salinas -- 6:00 PM
Hebron Heights Community Center
683 Fremont Street

**26 de abril 2012**
Seaside -- 6:00 PM
Boys & Girls Club of Monterey County
1332 La Salle Avenue

**1 de mayo 2012**
Soledad -- 6:30 PM
City Council Chambers
249 Main Street

**14 de mayo 2012**
Monterey -- 10:00 am
Monterey-Salinas Transit Administrative Headquarters
One Ryan Ranch Rd.
Monterey, CA 93940

Las personas interesadas que deseen comentar, pero que no puedan asistir a las audiencias públicas, pueden presentar comentarios escritos a: Hunter Harvath, Subgerente General de Finanzas y Administración, 1 Ryan Ranch Road, Monterey, CA 93940, por correo electrónico a mst@mst.org, o vía fax al (831) 899 a 3954.

La fecha límite para recibir comentarios por escrito es el Miércoles, 9 de mayo 2012.
MONTEREY-SALINAS TRANSIT

PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

In response to the high cost of fuel and federal funding difficulties, Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) is proposing to increase fares for its fixed-route, “On Call” general public dial-a-ride, and RIDES paratransit services. The proposed fare increases would affect all forms of fare media, including per-trip cash fares, GoPasses (single day, 7-day and 31-day), and RIDES paratransit trips. If approved by the MST Board of Directors, the following fare changes would take effect Saturday, May 26, 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed-Route/OnCall Fare Classification</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Routes &amp; OnCall</td>
<td>$1 / $0.50 Discount</td>
<td>$1.50 / $0.75 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (Base) Routes</td>
<td>$2 / $1 Discount</td>
<td>$2.50 / $1.25 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Routes</td>
<td>$3 / $1.50 Discount</td>
<td>$3.50 / $1.75 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Routes</td>
<td>$10 / $5.00 Discount</td>
<td>$12 / $6.00 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Day Super GoPass</td>
<td>$150 / $75 Discount</td>
<td>$190 / $95 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Day Basic GoPass</td>
<td>$75 / $37 Discount</td>
<td>$95 / $42 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Day Super GoPass</td>
<td>$40 / $20 Discount</td>
<td>$50 / $25 Discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Day Pass (Not valid on Commuter Routes)</td>
<td>$8 / $4 Discount</td>
<td>$10 / $5 Discount</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MST RIDES Fare Classification</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-way, 2.7 miles or less</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way, more than 2.7 miles or less than 19.7 miles</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way, more than 19.7 miles</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST RIDES customers on MST fixed-route and OnCall services</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td>Pay half-price discount fares all times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taxi reimbursement program: 50% of taxi fares, up to $45 per month
Discontinued - use new taxi voucher program with $3 co-pay per trip

MST will hold four public hearings to receive comments on the proposed fare increases:

**April 24, 2012**
Salinas -- 6:00 PM
Hebron Heights Community Center
683 Fremont Street

**April 26, 2012**
Seaside -- 6:00 PM
Boys & Girls Club of Monterey County
1332 La Salle Avenue

**May 1, 2012**
Soledad --6:00 PM
City Council Chambers
248 Main Street

**May 14, 2012**
Monterey --10:00 am
Monterey-Salinas Transit
Administrative Headquarters
One Ryan Ranch Rd.
Monterey, CA 93940

Interested persons wishing to comment, but who are unable to attend the public hearings, may submit written comments to: Hunter Harvath, Assistant General Manager for Finance & Administration, 1 Ryan Ranch Road, Monterey, CA 93940, via email at mst@mst.org, or via fax at (831) 899-3554.

The deadline to receive written comments is Wednesday, May 9, 2012.

Published April 17, 2012
La fecha lunes 14 de mayo 2012
City Council Chambers
Monterey, CA 93940

Clasificación Ruta Fija
O/n Call Tarifa Actual Propuesta
Rutas Iniciales y O/n de $1 a $3 de descuento a $3 50 a $7 50 de descuento
Rutas: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 (100 o más de descuento)
Rutas Regionales de $3 a $5 de descuento a $3 50 a $7 50 de descuento
31 Días de Super GoPas de $150 a $175 de descuento a $190 a $215 de descuento
31 Días de Super GoPas de $40 a $50 de descuento a $60 a $70 de descuento

Clasificación Tarifa MÍDIDEOS Actual Propuesta
De una vía, 2 millas o menos $ 1 25 a $ 2 25 de descuento
De una vía, más de 2 2 2 millas a 10 millas de descuento a $ 3 25 a $ 4 25 de descuento
De una vía, más de 2 2 2 millas a 10 millas de descuento a $ 5 25 a $ 6 25 de descuento

Clientes de MÍDIEDOS puede programar el tiempo de arribo a la casa del taxista seleccionado, pero el taxista puede arribar en cualquier momento del día.

Nanni, Sara, D. M. Sc. Ph. D.

La comparación de la eficacia de la terapia de luz en el ritmo circadiano de los pacientes con enfermedad de Alzheimer

Inglés 
Sandra Gell

En el año 2000, la Sociedad Americana de Médicos de la Diabetes (ADA) estableció el Panel de Trabajo para el Control de la Diabetes. El resultado fue un documento de trabajo con guías y recomendaciones para el manejo de la diabetes de tipo 2. Este documento de trabajo está en constante actualización y actualmente se encuentra en su sexta edición. El panel de trabajo es una organización multidisciplinaria formada por expertos en diabetes de todo el mundo, incluyendo médicos, enfermeras, dietéticos, farmacéuticos y otros profesionales de la salud que trabajan en el cuidado de pacientes con diabetes.

El objetivo principal del documento de trabajo de la ADA es proporcionar recomendaciones claras y basadas en la evidencia para los profesionales de la salud que trabajan con pacientes con diabetes. El documento de trabajo establece guías para el manejo de la diabetes de tipo 2 en diferentes grupos de población, incluyendo los pacientes con diabetes que están gestantes, los pacientes con diabetes de tipo 1 y los pacientes con diabetes de tipo 2 que están closados.

El documento de trabajo de la ADA establece que los objetivos principales del manejo de la diabetes de tipo 2 son el control de la glucosa, el control del peso, la prevención de complicaciones de larga duración y la mejora de la calidad de vida del paciente. Las recomendaciones del documento de trabajo incluyen el uso de medicamentos, la dieta, el ejercicio físico y la educación del paciente en el manejo de la diabetes.

Las recomendaciones del documento de trabajo de la ADA se basan en la evidencia científica disponible y se actualizan regularmente para reflejar los avances en el conocimiento de la diabetes y las mejores prácticas en el manejo de la enfermedad. El documento de trabajo de la ADA es un recurso valioso para los profesionales de la salud que trabajan con pacientes con diabetes y se utiliza como guía para la toma de decisiones en el manejo de la diabetes de tipo 2.

Potasio ayuda a la regulación de los procesos fisiológicos y metabólicos, y a la función muscular, entre otros aspectos. Alimentos ricos en potasio incluyen verduras, frutas, granos integrales y carnes magras.

Hidratación adecuada es esencial para el buen funcionamiento del cuerpo. La importancia de beber suficiente agua ha sido destacada en numerosos estudios y recomendaciones de expertos en nutrición y salud.

El consumo de alcohol es una fuente importante de energía para el cuerpo, y puede ayudar a calentar el cuerpo en frío. Sin embargo, beber alcohol en exceso puede ser dañino para la salud.

Los estudios han demostrado que la reducción de sueño puede llevar a una serie de problemas de salud, incluyendo aumento del riesgo de enfermedades crónicas, deterioro cognitivo, y disminución de la calidad de vida.

Es importante recordar que el sueño es una necesidad esencial para el funcionamiento adecuado del cuerpo y la salud general. La importancia de dormir bien no se subestima.

¿Cómo puedo promover un sueño saludable y seguro para mí y mi familia?

Promover un sueño saludable y seguro para la familia implica un enfoque multidisciplinario que involucre a médicos, enfermeras, dietéticos, farmacéuticos y otros profesionales de la salud que trabajan en el cuidado de pacientes con diabetes.

El control de la diabetes de tipo 2 requiere una enfoque global que involucre a los pacientes y sus familias, los profesionales de la salud y la comunidad en general. La educación del paciente sobre la diabetes de tipo 2 es crucial para su mejoría y control de la enfermedad.

El control de la diabetes de tipo 2 requiere una enfoque global que involucre a los pacientes y sus familias, los profesionales de la salud y la comunidad en general. La educación del paciente sobre la diabetes de tipo 2 es crucial para su mejoría y control de la enfermedad.

El control de la diabetes de tipo 2 requiere una enfoque global que involucre a los pacientes y sus familias, los profesionales de la salud y la comunidad en general. La educación del paciente sobre la diabetes de tipo 2 es crucial para su mejoría y control de la enfermedad.

El control de la diabetes de tipo 2 requiere una enfoque global que involucre a los pacientes y sus familias, los profesionales de la salud y la comunidad en general. La educación del paciente sobre la diabetes de tipo 2 es crucial para su mejoría y control de la enfermedad.

El control de la diabetes de tipo 2 requiere una enfoque global que involucre a los pacientes y sus familias, los profesionales de la salud y la comunidad en general. La educación del paciente sobre la diabetes de tipo 2 es crucial para su mejoría y control de la enfermedad.

El control de la diabetes de tipo 2 requiere una enfoque global que involucre a los pacientes y sus familias, los profesionales de la salud y la comunidad en general. La educación del paciente sobre la diabetes de tipo 2 es crucial para su mejoría y control de la enfermedad.

El control de la diabetes de tipo 2 requiere una enfoque global que involucre a los pacientes y sus familias, los profesionales de la salud y la comunidad en general. La educación del paciente sobre la diabetes de tipo 2 es crucial para su mejoría y control de la enfermedad.

El control de la diabetes de tipo 2 requiere una enfoque global que involucre a los pacientes y sus familias, los profesionales de la salud y la comunidad en general. La educación del paciente sobre la diabetes de tipo 2 es crucial para su mejoría y control de la enfermedad.

El control de la diabetes de tipo 2 requiere una enfoque global que involucre a los pacientes y sus familias, los profesionales de la salud y la comunidad en general. La educación del paciente sobre la diabetes de tipo 2 es crucial para su mejoría y control de la enfermedad.

El control de la diabetes de tipo 2 requiere una enfoque global que involucre a los pacientes y sus familias, los profesionales de la salud y la comunidad en general. La educación del paciente sobre la diabetes de tipo 2 es crucial para su mejoría y control de la enfermedad.

El control de la diabetes de tipo 2 requiere una enfoque global que involucre a los pacientes y sus familias, los profesionales de la salud y la comunidad en general. La educación del paciente sobre la diabetes de tipo 2 es crucial para su mejoría y control de la enfermedad.

El control de la diabetes de tipo 2 requiere una enfoque global que involucre a los pacientes y sus familias, los profesionales de la salud y la comunidad en general. La educación del paciente sobre la diabetes de tipo 2 es crucial para su mejoría y control de la enfermedad.
To: Board of Directors
From: H. Harvath, Assistant General Manager – Finance & Administration
Subject: Operating Line of Credit

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve a line of credit in the amount of $1,000,000 for operating expenditures to address short-term cash-flow difficulties.

FISCAL IMPACT:

$500 loan fee, with up to $1,000,000 available for a revolving line of credit.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Your Board approves expenditures exceeding $25,000.

DISCUSSION:

At the July 12, 2010, meeting of your Board, approval was given to accept a line of credit in the amount of $500,000 in order to cover operating expenses on a short-term basis. Given the uncertainties and delays that have occurred at the local, state and federal levels with regards to transit funding, there are times – usually near the end or beginning of the fiscal year – when short-term cash flow becomes problematic. Since the line of credit was established in 2010, funding predictability at the federal level has become even more uncertain and undependable over the previous year. For instance, the federal government owes MST approximately $3.2 million in funds it has already spent on bus service so far this fiscal year. Because of legislative gridlock in Congress, the Federal Transit Administration will not release these funds until either an agreement is reached between Republicans and Democrats on long-term transportation authorization issues or a short-term continuing resolution is passed through the end of the federal fiscal year (September 30, 2012).

While MST did not have to exercise its prior $500,000 line of credit from Rabobank, it did have to borrow as much as $1.5 million from the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) until overdue federal funds were received. To date, TAMC has had the money in its reserves to lend to MST for these short-term periods. However, it may not always have funds available to lend given the agency’s own capital program and expenditures. As such, in order to address these worsening cash-flow situations, staff is recommending that MST secure a new $1 million line of
credit with Rabobank to ensure that payroll continues to be met and essential bills paid. Terms for this line of credit are similar to those of the previous $500,000 line of credit and are detailed in the attached letter.

Attachment: Rabobank Line of Credit Expression of Interest
April 23, 2012

Monterey Salinas Transit
Hunter Harvath
One Ryan Ranch
Monterey, Ca. 93940

Dear Hunter:

Rabobank, N.A. ("Bank"), is pleased to present Monterey Salinas Transit ("Borrower") with a Commitment for a Revolving Line of Credit as outlined below.

The terms and conditions set forth in this letter are a commitment of the Bank to extend credit. The decision by the Bank to extend credit to the Company is contingent on no adverse change in the condition of the Company, and the execution of final documentation in form and substance satisfactory to the Bank, among other conditions.

Terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borrower(s):</td>
<td>Monterey-Salinas Transit District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Purpose:</td>
<td>Provide Support of Working Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Type:</td>
<td>Revolving Line of Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Amount:</td>
<td>$1,000,000 One Million Dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term:</td>
<td>18 months, maturity 12-31-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral:</td>
<td>UCC-1 – All Business Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Rate:</td>
<td>Variable Rate: Rabobank Prime +/- 0.0% adjustable monthly. Floor of 4.25%. Rabobank no longer uses Wall Street Journal Prime as a referenced index on commercial financing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment:</td>
<td>Interest due Monthly – Outstanding Balance plus accrued interest due in Full at Maturity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computations:</td>
<td>All interest rate and fee computations shall be based upon a 360-day year and the actual days elapsed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Payment:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Fee:</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fee(s):</td>
<td>All applicable fees including but not limited to the collateral audit, legal and other out of pocket expenses are the responsibility of the Borrower(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rabobank, N.A.

Address: Post Office Box 450
Salinas, CA 93902
Reporting Requirement(s):

Borrower: Annual Statements of Borrower – As soon as available, but in no event later than 120 days after the end of the fiscal year. Statements are to be CPA audited.

Interim Statements of Borrower - As soon as available, but in no event later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal half-year period. Profit and Loss Statements in a form acceptable to the Bank.

Covenant(s) / Condition(s):

Borrower: Maintain a Current Ratio in excess of 1.25:1:00. Requirement to be measured annually beginning June 30, 2012 FYE. Current Ratio calculated by dividing the Total Current Assets by Total Current Liabilities.

Maintain a Debt to tangible Net Worth not in excess of .50 to 1.0. Requirement to be measured annually, beginning FYE June 30, 2012. Debt to Tangible Net Worth calculated by dividing Total Liabilities by Tangible Net Worth.

Out of Debt Period – Maintain a period of 30 consecutive days out of debt annually beginning June 30, 2012.

A Rabobank N.A. deposit relationship is required throughout the life of the loan, if approved.

This commitment letter including the terms and conditions are not to be released to or discussed with any third party without the prior written consent of Rabobank. All figures, terms, and conditions may be subject to change or withdrawal at any time.

Rabobank is pleased to have been given the opportunity to assist Monterey-Salinas Transit in connection with this important financing. I will call you when the documentation is ready.

Very truly yours,

RABOBANK N.A.
Commercial Banking

By: [Signature]
Valerie Schlothauer
Vice President/Commercial Banking Officer
To: Board of Directors  

From: H. Harvath, Assistant General Manager – Finance & Administration  

Subject: Preliminary Findings – Salinas Area Service Analysis II (SASA-II)  

RECOMMENDATION:  

1. Receive presentation on the preliminary findings of the SASA-II.  

2. Authorize staff to hold public hearings soliciting input on proposed route and schedule changes recommended by the SASA-II study.  

FISCAL IMPACT:  

None, although funding for the study was provided through a $100,000 grant from the Monterey Unified Air Pollution Control District AB2766.  

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:  

Your Board exercises oversight on public hearings held in advance of any major route and schedule changes.  

DISCUSSION:  

The Salinas Area Service Analysis II (SASA-II) is designed to evaluate how well MST’s bus service in and around the city of Salinas is meeting passenger demand with regards to on-time performance, safety and convenience; to examine present and anticipated development and travel patterns; and to subsequently propose a series of new and adjusted bus routes that would better serve existing and future public transit customers as well as increase overall ridership.  

It is good planning practice to conduct transit studies every five to seven years, as the Salinas area has not been analyzed in depth since the first SASA project conducted in 2005. In that regard, a Request for Proposals was issued on September 7, 2011, soliciting qualified consulting firms to perform the SASA-II study. At the November 14, 2011, meeting of your Board, the contract for SASA-II was awarded to Nelson Nygaard consultants.
Over the course of the last six months, Nelson Nygaard has been diligently working with MST staff on the SASA-II effort, including:

- Land-use, demographic, mobility and socio-economic data analysis;
- A planning and policy review;
- MST fare policy, ridership and operations review;
- MST bus route and customer transfer pattern analysis;
- An on-board passenger survey;
- Community and agency stakeholder interviews;

Based on the above-mentioned activities, the consultant team, working with MST staff, has developed a series of suggested route and schedule changes and improvements to better serve the Salinas area. A representative of the consultant team will be at the May 14th meeting to present these proposals to your Board. Subsequently, staff would seek authorization from your Board to conduct public hearings to solicit input from customers on these proposed changes. Staff would then return to the MST Planning and Operations Committee and then to your Board at the June 11, 2012, meeting with a final recommendation for changes, which would then be scheduled for implementation in late summer/early fall of 2012.
To: Board of Directors
From: C. Sedoryk, General Manager/CEO
Subject: Monthly Report

Attached are the most recent monthly statistics and the reports from the Administration and Operations/Maintenance Departments.

Year to date passenger boardings remain virtually equal to last year to date. On time performance has improved most likely due to schedule changes that took place during January. It is also important to note that there were no preventable accidents reported for the entire month of March, a truly remarkable feat.

In March, I travelled to Washington, DC, with Hunter Harvath to discuss MST projects with federal regulators, legislators and their staff, and to attend the American Public Transit Association Legislative Conference. A schedule of meetings attended is attached (Attachment 8).

Also during the month I attended meetings with Federal Transit Administration staff in their regional offices in San Francisco. I attended a meeting of the California Transit Association Executive Committee to finalize the state public transit legislative program. I also met with staff from the City of Monterey to discuss planning and funding of bus rapid transit along Del Monte Boulevard.

A progress report on achievement of annual objectives may be found in Attachment 9.

Attachment #1 – Operations Department Report March 2012
Attachment #2 – Facilities & Maintenance Department Report March 2012
Attachment #3 – Administration Department Report March 2012
Attachment #4 - Washington DC itinerary, March 12 – 13, 2012
Attachment #5 - FY 2012 Annual Objectives - March Progress Report
ATTACHMENT 1

April 30, 2012

To: M. Hernandez, Assistant General Manager / C.O.O.
From: R. Weber, Director of Transportation Services
Cc: MST Board of Directors
Subject: Transportation Department Monthly Report – March 2012

FIXED ROUTE BUS OPERATIONS:

System Wide Service: (Fixed Route & DART Services):

Preliminary boarding statistics indicate that ridership decreased by 1.57% in March 2012, (352,760), as compared to March 2011, (358,403). Fiscal year-to-date, passenger boardings have decreased by only 0.28% from the same period last year.

Productivity decreased slightly from 16.13 passengers per hour (March 2011), to 15.80 PPH in March of this year.

Trolley Services:

MST Salinas Trolley: carried 2,115 passengers in March, which represents a 61.54% increase from March of 2011 (1,334).

MST CSUMB (Otter) Trolley: Carried 1,190 passengers in March, averaging 946 passenger boardings per month in its first year of operation.

Supplemental / Special Services:

None to report

System Wide Statistics:

- Ridership: 352,760
- Vehicle Revenue Hours: 22,324
- Vehicle Revenue Miles: 371,887
- System Productivity: 15.80 Passengers Per Vehicle Revenue Hour
- Scheduled One-Way Trips: 34,812

Time Point Adherence: Of 127,722 total time-point crossings sampled for the month of March, the TransitMaster™ system recorded 15,957 delayed arrivals to MST’s published time-points system-wide. This denotes that 87.51% of all scheduled arrivals at published time-points were on time. (See MST Fixed-Route Bus ~ On Time Compliance Chart FY 2012.)
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.

**Trips With 10 or More Standees:** There were fifty eight (58) reported trips with 10 or more standees for the month of March. *(See Operations Summary report for further information)*

**Cancelled Trips:** As listed below, there were a total of three (3) cancelled trips for the month of March for both directly operated and contracted services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>MST</th>
<th>MV Transportation</th>
<th>% Of All Missed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Pass Boarding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</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 2011 and 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence Type</th>
<th>March-11</th>
<th>March-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collision: MST Involved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Emergency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Hits Coach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Conflict</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Fall</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Injury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Injury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Miss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported Damage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel / Fluid Spill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Occurrences</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other:** March 13, 2012 – Staff attended a workshop presented by the County Office of Emergency Services on Tsunami preparedness. Presenters from the National Weather Service and the USGS provided information on the tsunami risk to Monterey County including plans for the identification of tsunami hazard zones, and pre-designated evacuation routes.

**CONTRACTED SERVICES:**

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

Preliminary boarding statistics for the MST RIDES program reflect that for the month of March there were 10,440 passenger boardings. This represents a 12.67% increase in passenger
boardings from March of 2011, (9,266). Fiscal year-to-date, passenger boardings for this program have increased by 8.43% over the same period last year.

- For the month of March, 83.00 % of all scheduled trips for the MST RIDES Program arrived on time, decreasing from 86.27 % in March of 2011. (See MST RIDES ~ On Time Compliance Chart FY 2012.)

- Productivity for March of this year was at 2.3 passengers per hour, increasing from 1.9 in March of 2011.

**Paratransit Certification Statistics:**

- For the month of March, 86 applications were reviewed, resulting in 82 approvals and 4 denials. Of the approvals, 51 were new program participants, and 31 were recertifications.

- 36 participants were deactivated in the database.

- A total of 96 applications were received – 6, (6%), did not complete the application process.

- As of March 2012, there are 3,096 registered / active program participants.

**COMMUNICATIONS CENTER:**

In March, the Communications Center summoned public safety agencies on eight (8) 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>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>Medical Emergency</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robert Weber

**ATTACHMENTS:**
MST Fixed-Route Bus ~ On Time Compliance FY 2012.
MST Trolley Service ~ Boarding Statistics FY 2012
MST RIDES ~ On Time Compliance FY 2012
MST RIDES ~ Boarding Statistics FY 2012
## MST FIXED ROUTE
### ON-TIME COMPLIANCE FY 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY 11 ON-TIME PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>FY12 TIME POINT COUNT</th>
<th>FY12 DELAYED ARRIVALS 5+ MINUTES</th>
<th>FY12 ON-TIME PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>84.86%</td>
<td>118,325</td>
<td>17,036</td>
<td>85.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>83.25%</td>
<td>139,320</td>
<td>24,060</td>
<td>82.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>83.31%</td>
<td>121,794</td>
<td>23,969</td>
<td>80.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>86.54%</td>
<td>116,442</td>
<td>21,649</td>
<td>81.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>86.62%</td>
<td>112,468</td>
<td>19,434</td>
<td>82.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>88.10%</td>
<td>120,189</td>
<td>18,810</td>
<td>84.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>89.30%</td>
<td>118,262</td>
<td>15,199</td>
<td>87.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>88.11%</td>
<td>116,402</td>
<td>16,628</td>
<td>85.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>89.79%</td>
<td>127,722</td>
<td>15,957</td>
<td>87.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>86.19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>87.87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>88.36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,090,924</td>
<td>172,742</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YTD Average**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 11 ON-TIME PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>FY12 TIME POINT COUNT</th>
<th>FY12 DELAYED ARRIVALS 5+ MINUTES</th>
<th>FY12 ON-TIME PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86.65%</td>
<td>121,214</td>
<td>19,194</td>
<td>84.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### On-Time Compliance FY 2012

Goal: 87%

[Graph showing on-time compliance for each month with FY 11 and FY 12 data, including months from July to June with on-time compliance values.]
## MST FIXED ROUTE BOARDINGS
### FY 2012 Monthly Boardings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>385,052</td>
<td>406,623</td>
<td>412,265</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>420,751</td>
<td>429,204</td>
<td>449,737</td>
<td>4.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>394,189</td>
<td>418,155</td>
<td>418,519</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>376,171</td>
<td>386,961</td>
<td>376,475</td>
<td>-2.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>333,974</td>
<td>343,922</td>
<td>336,982</td>
<td>-2.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>308,937</td>
<td>311,123</td>
<td>303,533</td>
<td>-2.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>280,327</td>
<td>319,097</td>
<td>300,008</td>
<td>-5.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>303,307</td>
<td>321,023</td>
<td>335,131</td>
<td>4.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>350,500</td>
<td>358,403</td>
<td>352,760</td>
<td>-1.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>350,469</td>
<td>337,070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>363,614</td>
<td>364,594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>382,331</td>
<td>375,977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | 4,249,622 | 4,372,152 | 3,285,410 |

**YTD Avg.** | 350,356 | 366,057 | 365,046 | **-0.28%** |

**YTD Comparison** | 3,153,208 | 3,294,511 | 3,285,410 | **-0.28%** |

*Boardings are inclusive of all On Call, Trolley, & Fixed Route Services*

### MONTHLY RIDERSHIP

- **FY 2010**
- **FY 2011**
- **FY 2012**

![MONTHLY RIDERSHIP GRAPH]
### MST FIXED ROUTE BUS Program

#### Comparative Statistics

**FY 2011 - FY 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUL</td>
<td>240.0</td>
<td>248.0</td>
<td>$1,927,614</td>
<td>$2,235,897</td>
<td>341,909</td>
<td>384,558</td>
<td>21,949</td>
<td>24,255</td>
<td>406,623</td>
<td>412,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG</td>
<td>237.0</td>
<td>247.0</td>
<td>$2,093,268</td>
<td>$2,468,451</td>
<td>338,511</td>
<td>398,293</td>
<td>21,764</td>
<td>25,072</td>
<td>418,155</td>
<td>418,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP</td>
<td>234.0</td>
<td>247.0</td>
<td>$2,545,265</td>
<td>$2,546,823</td>
<td>334,253</td>
<td>364,818</td>
<td>20,981</td>
<td>20,415</td>
<td>343,922</td>
<td>336,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT</td>
<td>235.0</td>
<td>246.0</td>
<td>$2,105,961</td>
<td>$2,699,738</td>
<td>341,855</td>
<td>348,283</td>
<td>21,322</td>
<td>21,791</td>
<td>386,961</td>
<td>363,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV</td>
<td>238.0</td>
<td>245.0</td>
<td>$2,177,880</td>
<td>$2,461,771</td>
<td>320,533</td>
<td>325,718</td>
<td>19,991</td>
<td>20,415</td>
<td>343,922</td>
<td>336,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>238.0</td>
<td>245.0</td>
<td>$2,848,523</td>
<td>$2,970,950</td>
<td>336,441</td>
<td>343,596</td>
<td>20,880</td>
<td>21,498</td>
<td>311,123</td>
<td>303,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL**

- $13,698,511
- $15,383,040
- 2,013,502
- 2,165,266
- 126,887
- 135,764
- 2,295,988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JAN</td>
<td>241.0</td>
<td>246.0</td>
<td>$2,243,787</td>
<td>$2,548,070</td>
<td>333,567</td>
<td>340,723</td>
<td>20,638</td>
<td>21,204</td>
<td>319,097</td>
<td>300,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB</td>
<td>245.0</td>
<td>245.0</td>
<td>$2,160,033</td>
<td>$2,365,990</td>
<td>315,750</td>
<td>341,628</td>
<td>19,446</td>
<td>20,589</td>
<td>321,023</td>
<td>335,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>253.0</td>
<td>243.0</td>
<td>$2,460,010</td>
<td>$2,447,505</td>
<td>361,376</td>
<td>371,888</td>
<td>22,211</td>
<td>22,324</td>
<td>358,403</td>
<td>352,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>243.0</td>
<td>$2,454,335</td>
<td>$2,666,921</td>
<td>366,221</td>
<td>371,888</td>
<td>22,211</td>
<td>22,324</td>
<td>358,403</td>
<td>352,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>247.0</td>
<td>245.0</td>
<td>$2,322,640</td>
<td>$2,461,771</td>
<td>374,013</td>
<td>371,888</td>
<td>22,211</td>
<td>22,324</td>
<td>358,403</td>
<td>352,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>248.0</td>
<td>245.0</td>
<td>$3,196,674</td>
<td>$3,719,812</td>
<td>371,981</td>
<td>371,888</td>
<td>22,211</td>
<td>22,324</td>
<td>358,403</td>
<td>352,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL**

- $28,535,990
- $22,744,605
- 4,136,410
- 3,219,505
- 258,057
- 199,881
- 4,372,152
- 3,271,978

**AVERAGE**

- 242.2
- 276.5
- $2,377,999
- $2,843,076
- 344,701
- 402,438
- $4.74
- $5.42

Note - All statistics include contracted-out service.

* - Preliminary data for current year.
### MST TROLLEY - SALINAS
**FY 2012 Monthly Boardings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>-8.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>30.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>39.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>21.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>43.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>1,951</td>
<td>75.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ridership</td>
<td>10,816</td>
<td>8,843</td>
<td>9,507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTD Average</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>39.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTD Comparison</td>
<td>8,164</td>
<td>6,799</td>
<td>9,507</td>
<td>39.83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SALINAS TROLLEY MONTHLY RIDERSHIP

![Chart showing monthly ridership from July 2010 to June 2012, with data points for each month's ridership labeled.]
### MST CSUMB TROLLEY

**FY 2012 Monthly Boardings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>368</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>940</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td></td>
<td>573</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,778</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,565</td>
<td>7,565</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Ridership**

- FY2010: 7,565
- FY2011: 946
- FY2012: 7,565

**YTD Comparison**

- FY2010: N/A
- FY2011: N/A
- FY2012: N/A

---

### CSUMB TROLLEY MONTHLY RIDERSHIP

![Graph showing monthly ridership for FY2010, FY2011, and FY2012]
## MST RIDES
### On Time Compliance FY - 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>85.85%</td>
<td>84.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>85.44%</td>
<td>84.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>86.06%</td>
<td>83.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>86.56%</td>
<td>83.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>86.56%</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>87.47%</td>
<td>86.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>86.34%</td>
<td>87.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>86.30%</td>
<td>83.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March</strong></td>
<td><strong>86.27%</strong></td>
<td><strong>83.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>86.47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>85.87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>86.12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YTD Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>86.32%</strong></td>
<td><strong>84.68%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MST RIDES
On-Time Compliance FY - 2012

Bar chart showing on-time compliance for each month of FY 2012, with a goal of 90%.

- FY11 bars for each month
- FY12 bars for each month

- **Goal 90%**
## MST RIDES Program
### Monthly Boardings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>8,939</td>
<td>8,663</td>
<td>8,665</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>8,514</td>
<td>8,794</td>
<td>9,638</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>9,386</td>
<td>9,354</td>
<td>9,718</td>
<td>3.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>9,335</td>
<td>9,189</td>
<td>9,807</td>
<td>6.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>8,275</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>9,485</td>
<td>6.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>8,147</td>
<td>8,626</td>
<td>8,874</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>7,454</td>
<td>8,253</td>
<td>9,225</td>
<td>11.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>8,112</td>
<td>8,155</td>
<td>10,022</td>
<td>22.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>9,406</td>
<td>9,266</td>
<td>10,440</td>
<td>12.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>9,219</td>
<td>8,739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>9,263</td>
<td>8,720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>8,837</td>
<td>8,793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ridership</td>
<td>104,887</td>
<td>105,452</td>
<td>85,874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTD Average</td>
<td>8,619</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>9,542</td>
<td>8.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTD Comparison</td>
<td>77,568</td>
<td>79,200</td>
<td>85,874</td>
<td>8.43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## MST RIDES MONTHLY RIDERSHIP

![Graph showing monthly ridership from July to June for FY 2010, FY 2011, and FY 2012.](image)
## MST RIDES Program
### Comparative Statistics
**FY 2011 - FY 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUT of Resources</th>
<th>OUTPUT</th>
<th>END PRODUCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EMPLOYEES</strong></td>
<td><strong>OPERATING COST</strong></td>
<td><strong>VEHICLE REVENUE MILES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUL</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAN</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>$253,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>$260,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>$259,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Effectiveness Measures</th>
<th>Cost Efficiency</th>
<th>Cost Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE REVENUE HR/EMPLOYEE</td>
<td>COST/REVENUE MILE</td>
<td>BOARDINGS/REVENUE MILE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUL</td>
<td>110.8</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG</td>
<td>109.9</td>
<td>113.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP</td>
<td>113.5</td>
<td>108.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT</td>
<td>112.3</td>
<td>112.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV</td>
<td>103.1</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>108.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAN</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note** - All statistics include contracted-out service.
* - Preliminary Data
Operations Summary Report

Fixed Route Services

March 2012
Fixed Route Operations Summary Report
March 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Delivered</th>
<th>Service Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>On-time Time Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers / Vehicle Revenue Hour</td>
<td>Delayed Time Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Miles</td>
<td>On-time Passenger Boardings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way Trips Scheduled</td>
<td>Percent On-time Boardings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Systemwide Service:
Ridership for March of this year decreased by 1.6% compared to last March, when there were 358,403 boardings. Revenue hours increased 0.5% over the same timeframe. The net result was a 2.1% decrease in productivity, measured in passengers per hour.

For the fiscal year-to-date (July - March), ridership is down 0.3%, compared to the last fiscal year, with revenue hours increasing 5.7% and productivity dropping by 5.6%

Seasonal Service:
During March of 2012 the Salinas Trolley carried 2,155 passengers, a 62% increase over last March, whereas line 22-Big Sur carried only 61 passengers, a decrease of 42%. The CSUMB Otter Trolley carried 1,190 passengers - it did not operate last March.

Supplemental Service:
None.

No supplemental or special event service operated this month.
Cancelled Trips by Month - Fiscal Year to Date

- Jul: 9
- Aug: 7
- Sep: 11
- Oct: 29
- Nov: 10
- Dec: 12
- Jan: 13
- Feb: 8
- Mar: 3
- Apr: 0
- May: 0
- Jun: 0

Total: 87

Cancelled Trips by Reason - Fiscal Year to Date

- Passenger Boarding - 40 Trips (39%)
- Mechanical Failure - 18 Trips (17%)
- Traffic - 16 Trips (16%)
- MST Accident - 12 Trips (12%)
- Other - 7 Trips (7%)
- Employee Error - 7 Trips (7%)
- Non-MST Accident - 2 Trips (2%)
**March 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systemwide Ridership:</th>
<th>352,760</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Revenue Hours:</td>
<td>22324:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Revenue Miles:</td>
<td>371,887.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Primary Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>VRHrs</th>
<th>VRMi</th>
<th>Pax/Hr</th>
<th>% Riders</th>
<th>% Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Monterey-Pacific Grove</td>
<td>9,589</td>
<td>680:18</td>
<td>6,580.9</td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Fremont-Hilby</td>
<td>23,043</td>
<td>853:53</td>
<td>8,922.0</td>
<td>26.99</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Fremont-Ord Grove</td>
<td>27,241</td>
<td>853:28</td>
<td>9,748.8</td>
<td>31.92</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-East Alisal-Northridge</td>
<td>45,682</td>
<td>1636:27</td>
<td>16,767.2</td>
<td>27.92</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-East Alisal-Westridge</td>
<td>4,782</td>
<td>446:21</td>
<td>4,635.8</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110,337</strong></td>
<td><strong>4470:27</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,654.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>VRHrs</th>
<th>VRMi</th>
<th>Pax/Hr</th>
<th>% Riders</th>
<th>% Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-Monterey-Pacific Grove</td>
<td>12,133</td>
<td>810:07</td>
<td>11,015.9</td>
<td>14.98</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Ryan Ranch-Monterey</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>151:54</td>
<td>1,838.3</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Carmel-Carmel Rancho</td>
<td>2,124</td>
<td>399:03</td>
<td>4,055.5</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Monterey-Carmel</td>
<td>7,037</td>
<td>387:02</td>
<td>4,669.3</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Monterey-Carmel</td>
<td>2,036</td>
<td>174:54</td>
<td>2,096.6</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Ryan Ranch-Edgewater</td>
<td>2,433</td>
<td>354:57</td>
<td>5,443.6</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Edgewater-Carmel</td>
<td>7,649</td>
<td>309:44</td>
<td>4,471.5</td>
<td>24.70</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Ryan Ranch-Monterey</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>220:06</td>
<td>3,556.8</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Ryan Ranch-Monterey</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>35:12</td>
<td>682.0</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Monterey-Monterey</td>
<td>15,201</td>
<td>1046:21</td>
<td>18,400.2</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>5,524</td>
<td>346:55</td>
<td>3,910.4</td>
<td>15.92</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-Northridge</td>
<td>3,389</td>
<td>322:56</td>
<td>2,800.5</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-East Market-Creekbridge</td>
<td>3,776</td>
<td>360:39</td>
<td>4,805.9</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-Natividad</td>
<td>4,606</td>
<td>173:44</td>
<td>1,990.2</td>
<td>26.51</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-East Salinas-Airport Business Center</td>
<td>2,792</td>
<td>522:52</td>
<td>6,800.2</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-Northridge</td>
<td>11,326</td>
<td>468:34</td>
<td>4,297.9</td>
<td>24.17</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-Pacific Meadows-Ryan Ranch</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>62:20</td>
<td>1,166.0</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-Pacific Meadows-CHOMP</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>47:40</td>
<td>778.8</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-Pacific Meadows-Monterey</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>38:51</td>
<td>462.6</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82,124</strong></td>
<td><strong>6233:51</strong></td>
<td><strong>83,242.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>VRHrs</th>
<th>VRMi</th>
<th>Pax/Hr</th>
<th>% Riders</th>
<th>% Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-Marina-Monterey</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>184:26</td>
<td>3,302.2</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Monterey-Salinas</td>
<td>39,499</td>
<td>1878:16</td>
<td>36,466.7</td>
<td>21.03</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Monterey-Salinas</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>70:24</td>
<td>1,410.2</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-Salinas-King City</td>
<td>17,830</td>
<td>1143:19</td>
<td>33,041.8</td>
<td>15.59</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Carmel Valley-Grapevine Express</td>
<td>6,267</td>
<td>734:06</td>
<td>15,005.1</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Marina-Salinas</td>
<td>3,338</td>
<td>684:56</td>
<td>12,870.0</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Watsonville-Marina</td>
<td>1,628</td>
<td>307:38</td>
<td>8,102.6</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Watsonville-Salinas</td>
<td>8,573</td>
<td>738:56</td>
<td>20,123.3</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Watsonville-Salinas</td>
<td>13,155</td>
<td>972:40</td>
<td>15,998.2</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-Monterey-San Jose Express</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>448:10</td>
<td>14,356.1</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>96,594</strong></td>
<td><strong>7162:51</strong></td>
<td><strong>160,676.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Military Express Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>VRHrs</th>
<th>VRMi</th>
<th>Pax/Hr</th>
<th>% Riders</th>
<th>% Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-Monterey-Dunes</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>126:52</td>
<td>2,296.8</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-NPS-Monterey</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>88:00</td>
<td>849.2</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-Presidio-Salinas Express</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>67:06</td>
<td>1,238.6</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-Presidio-Dunes</td>
<td>14,125</td>
<td>335:29</td>
<td>4,169.3</td>
<td>42.10</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-Presidio-La Mesa</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>72:58</td>
<td>807.4</td>
<td>22.06</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-Presidio-Marina Express</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>71:52</td>
<td>1,146.2</td>
<td>28.87</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-Presidio-N Salinas Express</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>57:56</td>
<td>1,161.6</td>
<td>27.74</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73-Presidio-Prunedale Express</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>56:50</td>
<td>1,225.4</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74-Presidio-Preston Park Express</td>
<td>4,955</td>
<td>173:48</td>
<td>2,897.4</td>
<td>28.51</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-Presidio-Marshall Park Express</td>
<td>4,839</td>
<td>277:34</td>
<td>4,144.8</td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-Presidio-Stilwell Park Express</td>
<td>15,637</td>
<td>282:20</td>
<td>3,520.0</td>
<td>55.39</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-Presidio-Seaside</td>
<td>2,420</td>
<td>90:34</td>
<td>1,135.2</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-Presidio-San Jose Express</td>
<td>2,415</td>
<td>203:52</td>
<td>6,925.6</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-Ft Hunter Liggett-Salinas Express</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>465:27</td>
<td>17,596.8</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-Ft Hunter Liggett-Paso Robles Express</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>346:33</td>
<td>11,635.0</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,727</strong></td>
<td><strong>2717:11</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,749.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MST On Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>VRHrs</th>
<th>VRMi</th>
<th>Pax/Hr</th>
<th>% Riders</th>
<th>% Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MST On Call Marina</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>340:05</td>
<td>4,720.0</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST On Call Gonzales</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>286:00</td>
<td>1,914.0</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST On Call Greenfield</td>
<td>2,311</td>
<td>198:00</td>
<td>2,236.0</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST On Call King City</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>198:00</td>
<td>2,187.0</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,572</strong></td>
<td><strong>1022:05</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,057.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Seasonal / Supplemental

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>VRHrs</th>
<th>VRMi</th>
<th>Pax/Hr</th>
<th>% Riders</th>
<th>% Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-Big Sur</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51:00</td>
<td>1,273.5</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST Trolley Salinas</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>160:36</td>
<td>1,091.2</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUMB Otter Trolley</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>506:00</td>
<td>7,143.4</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,407</strong></td>
<td><strong>717:36</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,508.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Carl G. Sedoryk, General Manager/CEO
From: Michael Hernandez, Assistant General Manager/COO
Subject: Monthly Maintenance Report for March 2012

This monthly report summarizes information about fuel prices and the activities of the Maintenance/Facilities Departments during the month of March. Detailed statistical information is also attached.

Fuel Prices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mar Low</th>
<th>Mar High</th>
<th>Feb Average</th>
<th>Mar Average</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td>$3.67</td>
<td>$3.83</td>
<td>$3.59</td>
<td>$3.76</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>$3.97</td>
<td>$4.05</td>
<td>$3.58</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fleet Status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Call Rate Goal: 7,000 Miles or More</th>
<th>Miles Between Road Calls:</th>
<th>Operating Cost Per Mile:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>11,478</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12 Year to Date:</td>
<td>15,548</td>
<td>FY12 Year To Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

In March there were a total of 28 road calls, all of which were maintenance related. The highest single road call category was due to electrical issues.

In March, the third of a total of six trolleys had exterior wood trim replaced. The wood trim project, specifically labor costs is being completed as an MV Inc. contract expense. MST acquired a “tug” as part of excess equipment from Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District. The tug is specially designed to move disabled buses and will be used in the TDA bus yard. PM compliance for the month of February is estimated after a multi month effort to upgrade the AssetWorks maintenance management system and configure fleet mileage. The upgrade process concluded in March.
Facilities staff expanded the storage area at TDA including improvements to the tire storage area. Additionally, several new shelters were installed in South Monterey County during the month.

Michael Hernandez
### March 2012
MST Operated Fixed Route Bus Fleet - Summary Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Fleet Series</th>
<th>Manufacturer Model/Year</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Fuel Type</th>
<th>Average Life To Date Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1101 - 1121</td>
<td>Gillig - 2000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cummins ISM 280 HP</td>
<td>Clean Diesel</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1122 - 1129</td>
<td>Gillig - 2003</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Detroit DC Series 50 ERG</td>
<td>Clean Diesel</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gillig Low-floor 2002</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cummins ISM 280 HP</td>
<td>Clean Diesel</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701 - 1712</td>
<td>Gillig Low-floor 2003</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Detroit DC Series 50 ERG</td>
<td>Clean Diesel</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725 - 1729</td>
<td>Gillig Suburban 2007</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cummins ISM 280 HP</td>
<td>Clean Diesel</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801 - 1804</td>
<td>Gillig Suburban 2003</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cummins ISM 280 HP</td>
<td>Clean Diesel</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805 - 1808</td>
<td>Gillig Suburban 2003</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Detroit DC Series 50 ERG</td>
<td>Clean Diesel</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 - 2010</td>
<td>Gillig Low-floor 2007</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cummins ISM 280 HP</td>
<td>Clean Diesel</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4501 - 4504</td>
<td>MCI D4500 2009/10/11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cummins ISM 480 HP</td>
<td>Clean Diesel</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Fleet</th>
<th>Manufacturer Model</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Fuel Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Fageol Twin Coach 1948 #80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel Used</th>
<th>Revenue Diesel Fleet</th>
<th>Non-Revenue Fleet</th>
<th>Inventory Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miles Traveled</td>
<td>321,395</td>
<td>49,442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Gallons/Equivalent</td>
<td>73,789</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>$126,222.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Miles/Gallon</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>26.60</td>
<td>Parts/Supplies  $258,043.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Value</strong>  $384,266.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Repeat Road Calls
0
MILES BETWEEN MECHANICAL ROAD CALLS
March 2012 - 11,478 Miles

Fleet Wide Miles Between Roadcalls
FY11 vs. FY12 Year to Date Comparison

Goal: 7,000 Miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>FY11 Miles</th>
<th>FY12 Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>15,068</td>
<td>16,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>9,884</td>
<td>14,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>10,679</td>
<td>13,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>9,195</td>
<td>20,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>8,714</td>
<td>17,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>10,679</td>
<td>18,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>9,263</td>
<td>13,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>9,453</td>
<td>13,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>9,707</td>
<td>11,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>12,790</td>
<td>15,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>15,227</td>
<td>11,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>24,334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTD</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

120
* "Other" category includes: Fluid leaks, Lights, Windshield Wipers other items.

March 2012
PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE INSPECTIONS
PAST TWELVE MONTHS

Total PM Inspections
% of PM Inspections On-Time

- Mar-11: Total PMs 89, % On Time 60%
- Apr-11: Total PMs 98, % On Time 77%
- May-11: Total PMs 109, % On Time 98%
- Jun-11: Total PMs 100, % On Time 98%
- Jul-11: Total PMs 119, % On Time 94%
- Aug-11: Total PMs 104, % On Time 90%
- Sep-11: Total PMs 104, % On Time 91%
- Oct-11: Total PMs 104, % On Time 94%
- Nov-11: Total PMs 93, % On Time 97%
- Dec-11: Total PMs 84, % On Time 92%
- Jan-12: Total PMs 90, % On Time 96%
- Feb-12: Total PMs 102, % On Time 75%
- Mar-12: Total PMs 108, % On Time 99%

Goals:
- Total PMs: 100
- % On Time: 80%
## Diesel Fleet - Cost Per Mile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fleet Series, Year and # of Vehicles</th>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>Parts</th>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Oil/Fluids</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Cost Per Mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1100s (2000 - 21)</td>
<td>$12,586.17</td>
<td>$4,801.27</td>
<td>$57,916.14</td>
<td>$2,021.62</td>
<td>$77,325.20</td>
<td>66,884</td>
<td>$1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100s (2003 - 8)</td>
<td>$4,482.61</td>
<td>$2,420.65</td>
<td>$25,724.15</td>
<td>$1,343.63</td>
<td>$33,971.04</td>
<td>29,797</td>
<td>$1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700s (2002 - 12)</td>
<td>$8,571.07</td>
<td>$13,607.82</td>
<td>$37,181.86</td>
<td>$1,120.49</td>
<td>$60,481.24</td>
<td>44,252</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700s (2003 - 12)</td>
<td>$9,469.25</td>
<td>$7,636.69</td>
<td>$39,054.29</td>
<td>$2,365.20</td>
<td>$58,525.43</td>
<td>44,328</td>
<td>$1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700s (2007 - 5)</td>
<td>$3,544.71</td>
<td>$3,185.97</td>
<td>$16,490.87</td>
<td>$462.44</td>
<td>$23,683.99</td>
<td>20,098</td>
<td>$1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800s (2002 - 4)</td>
<td>$4,810.80</td>
<td>$3,829.70</td>
<td>$23,110.00</td>
<td>$1,258.61</td>
<td>$33,009.11</td>
<td>30,249</td>
<td>$1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800s (2003 - 4)</td>
<td>$12,921.57</td>
<td>$7,260.88</td>
<td>$21,883.03</td>
<td>$1,071.90</td>
<td>$43,137.38</td>
<td>27,853</td>
<td>$1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s (2007 - 10)</td>
<td>$8,106.49</td>
<td>$7,752.29</td>
<td>$33,881.23</td>
<td>$1,244.56</td>
<td>$50,984.57</td>
<td>37,673</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4500s (2009/10/12 - 4)</td>
<td>$6,107.47</td>
<td>$2,805.44</td>
<td>$14,005.24</td>
<td>$654.57</td>
<td>$23,572.72</td>
<td>20,261</td>
<td>$1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Mar 2012:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>Parts</th>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Oil</th>
<th>Cost Per Mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$0.22</td>
<td>$0.17</td>
<td>$0.84</td>
<td>$0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY12 Cost Per Mile:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>Parts</th>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Oil</th>
<th>Cost Per Mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$0.18</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fleet Cost Per Mile

**March 2012**

Fleet Miles: 321,395   Average Fleet Cost Per Mile: $1.26
MECHANICAL ROAD CALLS BY BUS SERIES
March 2012
Total Diesel Miles: 321,395  Roadcalls: 28

Bus Series & Model Year

Road Calls

0 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20

Bus Series
1100 (00) 1100 (03) 1700 (02) 1700 (03) 1700 (07) 1800 (02) 1800 (03) 2000 (07) 4500 (09/10/12)

9 2 5 4 1 1 0 6 0
12 Month Rolling Inventory, Fuel & Fluids Value - March 2012

Total Inventory: $384,266  Value Per Bus: $3226  12 Month Average: $3271
52 Week Review:
Diesel: High $3.81, Low $3.26, Average $3.50
Gasoline: High $4.16, Low $3.26, Average $3.68
B20 use: Aug 15, 2008 - Dec 18, 2008

FY 2012 Fuel Budget:
Diesel 3.50 Gallon
Gasoline 3.75 Gallon

12 Month Rolling Fuel Cost - As of March 31, 2012

Diesel
Gasoline
ATTACHMENT 3

Date: May, 2012

To: C. Sedoryk, General Manager/CEO

From: Hunter Harvath, Assistant General Manager Finance & Administration; Mark Eccles, Director Information Technology; Kathy Williams, General Accounting Manager; Kelly Halcon, Director of Human Resources/Risk Management; Tom Hicks, CTSA Manager; Sonia Bannister, Office Administrator; Zoe Shoats, Marketing Analyst

Subject: Administration Department Monthly Report March, 2012

The following significant events occurred in Administration work groups for the month of March 2012:

Human Resources

A total employment level for March 2012 is summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Budget FY11</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coach Operators / Trainees</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/O on Long Term Leave *</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Operators Limited Duty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Staff</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Facilities</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration (Interns 2 PT)</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>245.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>242.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>-3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

March Worker's Compensation Costs

| Indemnity (paid to employees) | $9,110.95 |
| Other (includes Legal)       | $2,547.53 |
| Medical includes Case Mgmt, UR, Rx & PT | $14,892.38 |
| TPA Administration Fee       | $4,000.00 |
| Excess Insurance             | $3,493.58 |
| **Total Expenses**           | **$26,550.86** |
| Reserves                     | $1,161,037.77 |
| **Excess Reserved**          | **($388,765.98)** |
| # Ending Open Claims         | 48         |
Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual VTT Training</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Risk Management Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Preventable</th>
<th></th>
<th>Preventable</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle hits Bus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus hits object</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the month of March 2012 there were zero preventable collisions caused by MST. This puts us back on track to our outstanding safety record.

Accident Statistics

![Accident Statistics Chart](chart.png)

- **non-preventable**
- **preventable**
There were $3,360.82 claims paid and no claims recovered during this period.

**Accounting Update**

**General Accounting**

Staff is focused on ensuring that all transactional data is recorded properly. All reconciliations and reports are done in a timely manner. Payroll is developing a bi-weekly time sheet and studying to gain more knowledge of the new Calpers computer system. Accounts payable and payroll continue to meet their payment deadlines.

**Grants/Compliance**

Staff is continually focused on seeking grant funding from any source. Grant applications are very detailed and take considerable time to compile data to submit. During the month of March, staff submitted grant applications to the Federal Transit Administration for two programs: State of Good Repair and Bus Livability Initiative. Additionally, applications were submitted to the Monterey Peninsula Foundation, as well as to Caltrans for the *Job Access and Reverse Commute* (JARC) and *New Freedoms* programs.
**Purchasing/Inventory**

Staff is continually trying to keep track of costs of inventory and alternate methods of securing what is necessary while attempting to lower costs. Staff is issuing RFP’s and RFQ’s as needed for various projects that MST requires. Both Bus Rapid Transit project and the security gate project at MST’s bus maintenance facility in Salinas are out to bid this month.

**CTSA Update**

Staff submitted a grant application to the FTA’s Veterans Transportation and Community Living Initiative (VTCLI) grant program jointly with the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Marin Transit, Santa Rosa Transit, and Outreach, Inc., under the project titled Together We Ride Veterans Transportation and Community Living Initiative Project. The project will use volunteer veterans to provide outreach to other veterans in Monterey County to inform, educate and encourage these vets to take full advantage of the many services available to them at the federal, state and local levels. If funded, MST will work closely 211 Monterey County and the Monterey County Veterans Services Collaborative member agencies to assure that all service providers are prepared to provide current information and assistance to veterans. Staff will also coordinate with Outreach, Inc., a social service transportation agency in San Jose, to provide information and referrals for services available to Monterey County veterans throughout the Bay Area.

The 211 Monterey County project continued to offer transportation assistance along with referrals to social service agencies and programs. The CTSA Manager participated in the quarterly 211 Steering Committee meeting to make recommendations to 211 staff about program goals and funding options for the coming year. The CTSA Manager, along with Ronn Rygg, director of 211 Monterey County, also participated in a meeting of the Monterey County Veteran Services Collaborative to gather information about the transportation needs of veterans with disabilities and other travel challenges. MST, 211 Monterey County and the Monterey County Veteran Services Collaborative are working with other members in finding transportation options for participants of the upcoming Stand Down for veterans and their families scheduled for June in Salinas.

The MST Mobility Advisory Committee (MAC) met on March 28th at the MST Monterey Mobility Management Center. The committee reviewed the accomplishments of the MST mobility management programs over the past 5 years and elected to focus on MAC goals and member roles in the current and future years at its next scheduled meeting on May 23rd.

For the month of March, the MST travel training staff attended S.C.O.R.E (South County Outreach Efforts) meeting in Soledad, the P.A.R.T.S (Preventing Alcohol Related Trauma in South County) meeting in King City, as well as gave two presentations to the Mont Toro School in Salinas, where 35 people attended. Staff took a group trip with students and staff from Alisal, Alvarez and Salinas High Schools’ special education departments, met with 9 staff and 42 students that came to the MST Monterey Mobility Management Center to get there courtesy cards and mobility trainer photo ID cards.
For the month of March the MST volunteer Navigators provided shopping assistance for the residence of Pacific Meadows by carrying grocery bags on and off Line 92. Additionally, the volunteers provided travel training to one individual for a total of 12 hours. Andrea Messenger, the Navigator Intern, taught a class of 9 girl scouts how to travel from Marina to Monterey. The Navigators met at Pacific Meadows to answer transportation questions twice this month as well. They also met with patrons of the Scholze Park Center twice this month.

| Total person trained (including RIDES assessments): | 93 |
| Total # people contacted during public presentations: | 91 |
| Total persons otherwise contacted: | 4 |
| Total volunteer Navigator service hours: | 66.5 |

Customer Service Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Report Type</th>
<th>Mar '12</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mar '11</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Compliment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Compliment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Driving</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed By</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare / Transfer Dispute</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Employee Conduct</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request To Add Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccurate Public Information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Departure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Arrival</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Injury</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Schedule</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe Conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Conduct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Route</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Improper Employee Conduct” (7) represented 10.6% of overall service reports. A review of these reports showed a variety of complaints: Coach Operator would not open bus door for passenger to exit, Coach Operator shut door and drove off before passenger could board bus, Coach Operator was rude. Of the seven “Improper Employee” reports, one involved MST contracted service: Coach Operator spoke only Spanish.

“Improper Driving” reports (10) represented 15.2% of overall service reports for March. These reports showed a variety of complaints: Coach Operator pulled into stop incorrectly, Coach Operator drove roughly, Coach Operator honked at car driver, Coach Operator is tailgating, Coach Operator driving recklessly, and Coach Operator blocked intersection with bus. Of the ten “Improper Driving” reports, three involved MST contracted service: Coach Operator would not back up, Coach Operator ran a red light, and Coach Operator was speeding.

MST received eight “Employee Compliments”. One involved MST contracted service as follows:

- Mr. Shawn Marshall (passenger) complimented the following Coach Operators E. Fernandez, T. Ferrante, T. Powell, and D. Wallace saying “these Coach Operators are smooth drivers.”

- Mr. Luis Garcia (passenger) complimented MV Coach Operator Saul Duran, “He is always responsive to his passengers, and tries to relate to them; everyone greets him by name, something I have never seen on other buses.”

- Mrs. Cindy Erickson (passenger) complimented Coach Operator J. Raines, “I’m very grateful to get my lost backpack returned”.

- Mr. Jim Irwin (passenger) complimented Coach Operator B. McGowan – Very grateful to get lost gloves returned.

- Mrs. Debbie Bohnet-Nuttall (passenger) complimented Coach Operator J. Ramirez – Gomez, “The Coach Operator did an excellent job of informing the passengers of what they could expect while they waited on the bus that had broken down and that ‘Safety’ was the 1st priority”.

MST received one “Service Compliment”:

- Mrs. Gwen Foote (passenger) complimented Salinas Transit Center Security Guard Mario, “He enforced the rules and keeps an eye on everything. I’m very happy with him. He is very professional and takes his job very serious.”
IT Update

Staff configured the Trapeze ITS Transitmaster system. Staff continued to monitor and configure software and hardware for the Assetworks Maintenance system. Staff continued to support and monitors the Navision Payroll system. Staff coordinated with the MST HR Department regarding the HR Module upgrade. Staff continued to configure data for the GIRO DDAM Timekeeping system. Staff updated software components of MST workstations. Staff continued developing functionality of the Customer Service and RIDES databases. Staff kept the MST web page updated and made the appropriate changes as required.

Staff continued to support MST staff as needed, proactively ensuring MST staff was supported fully with their IT needs.

Liaised with vendor to convert GFI Farebox Database to SQL Server Database.

Marketing and Sales Update

Published news stories include: “MST reduces line 16” (The Otter Realm, 3/1/12); “Letters: Parker accusations don’t ring true” (Monterey County Herald, 3/9/12); “Halcon receives Lichtanski scholarship to attend Eno seminar” (Passenger Transport, 3/9/12); “Best of Monterey County: Best do-gooder in a PR pickle” (Monterey County Weekly, 3/15/12); “Off the bus” (Monterey County Weekly, 3/22/12); “Monterey Police: MST bus damaged” (The Californian, 3/12/12); “Letters: Transit views” (Monterey County Weekly, 3/29/12); “Carmel Log: Homeless woman causes problems on bus” (Monterey County Herald, 3/30/12).

Press releases sent include: (none)

Marketing activities: Attended “Tsunami Basics Media Workshop” presented by Monterey County Office of Emergency Services; updated Rider’s Guide maps and schedules for April 28 service change; re-ordered fare media; coordinated MST’s presence at CSUMB’s Focus the Region event; reviewed rider/non-rider survey result reports; attended Libert Cassidy, Whitmore Workshops “Sick and Disabled Employees” and “Legal Issues Related to Generational Diversity and Succession Planning: Opportunities for Building a Stronger Workforce”; participated in webinar “Tweets from Transit: Social Media in Customer Service for Public Transit Agencies”; met with representatives from CSUMB to brainstorm CSUMB Otter Trolley ridership incentives; coordinated photo shoot of Presidio of Monterey passengers; attended “Emergency Management Crisis Communications & Public Information Officer Workshop” held by the San Benito County Office of Emergency Services; attended Monterey County Convention & Visitor’s Bureau focus group to provide membership feedback; participated in APTA’s Transportation & Universities steering committee; ordered MST promotional materials; managed MST website content and Facebook page; coordinated delivery of printed promotional materials.
Planning Update

During the month of March, staff finalized spring route and schedule reductions for implementation on April 28, 2012. Staff continued working with military partners at the Naval Postgraduate School, the Presidio of Monterey and Fort Hunter Liggett to fine-tune and improve bus services for those facilities. Staff worked with MST’s contractor MV Transportation, Inc., to better coordinate late night services on the Monterey Peninsula. Staff met with representatives of Hartnell College to discuss the free fare zone on its campus as well as with California State University Monterey Bay to review its partnership with MST and to discuss ways to improve taxi access and services to the campus. Staff worked with representatives of the city of Salinas to re-establish a bus stop in front of Memorial Hospital on East Romie Lane and on stops in eastern Salinas. Staff continued planning efforts with consultant Nelson-Nyygard on the Salinas Area Service Analysis-II (SASA-II). Staff met with counterparts from Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) to discuss regional transportation issues and coordination of legislative initiatives at the state and federal levels as well as planning efforts in the Watsonville area. Staff met with representatives of the city of Monterey to continue preliminary planning efforts for a future Bus Rapid Transit corridor along Del Monte Avenue. Staff also attended regular meetings of TAMC, AMBAG and the Monterey County Hospitality Association.

Staff traveled to San Francisco to meet with Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Region IX Administrator Leslie Rogers and members of his staff to provide an update on MST’s projects as well as regional transportation priorities and issues. Staff also traveled to Washington, DC, to participate in the American Public Transportation Association’s 2012 Legislative Conference and to meet with representatives of Congress and the FTA to discuss MST’s projects and priorities. And, staff traveled to Sacramento to meet with representatives of Caltrans, California Transit Association (CTA) and California Association of Coordinated Transportation (CalACT) to discuss strategies to improve working relationships, grant application process and other cooperative endeavors.
MONTEREY-SALINAS TRANSIT  
Washington, D.C. Itinerary

Carl Sedoryk, General Manager/CEO  
Hunter Harvath, Deputy CEO

March 12-13, 2012

FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 2012

3:25 p.m.  
Carl Sedoryk and Hunter Harvath arrive Dulles Airport on United Flight #0388.  
They are staying the JW Marriott, 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
202-393-2000

MONDAY, MARCH 12, 2012

8:30 a.m.  
Organization Meeting at JW Marriott

12:00 p.m.  
Lunch with Debbie Merrill and Tom Tucker, Congressman Sam Farr’s Staff  
Charlie Palmer Steak House  
101 Constitution Avenue, N.W.  
202-547-8100

TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 2012

9:00 a.m.  
Ben Owen, Office of Planning and Environment  
Federal Transit Administration  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
East Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, S.E., 4th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20590  
Contact: Ben Owen – 366-5602  
Subject: Very Small Starts Program

9:30 a.m.  
Bonnie Graves, FTA Attorney  
Federal Transit Administration  
Department of Transportation  
East Building, 1201 4th Street, S.E., Room E56-306  
Washington, D.C. 20590  
Subject: Very Small Starts Program

11:30 a.m.  
Duane Callender, Director, Office of Innovative Program Delivery  
Suzanne Sale, Senior Financial Advisor  
Jorianne Jernberg, Financial Analyst  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
East Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, S.E., Room E64-454  
Contact: Jorianne Jernberg – 202-366-0459  
Subject: TIIFA

12:00 p.m.  
Carl and Hunter leave for Dulles Airport to depart on United Flight #0560 at 3:00 p.m.
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ATTACHMENT 5

MST Action Plan FY 2011/2012 Update
March 2012

1. Implement options for Contracted transit services and restructure ADA transit service model to decrease costs and increase efficiency.

   Status: Completed. New contract call for MV to begin utilizing more taxi service for MST RIDES trips and mobility management programs in place and operational.

2. Complete Monterey Bay Operations and Maintenance Building Finance Plan and complete Construction Bid as funding allows.

   Status: Delayed. Project has been stopped by actions of the County Board of Supervisors. Staff is researching other site options as funding allows.

3. Research and identify local transit revenue generating opportunities.

   Status: Ongoing. Staff has attended conferences on developing sales tax and other revenue streams to support transit operations and have met with local hospitality association members to discuss funding options.


   Status: Ongoing. Plans are nearing completion with construction to begin in June 2012.

5. Apply for grants to design Del Monte Bus Rapid Transit Corridor.

   Status: Completed. AB2766 grant awarded to City of Monterey for planning purposes, City of Monterey has committed $700,000 of local funds to support a federal grant application for this project.

6. Implement South County Study Recommendations as funding allows.

   Status: Completed. South County On-Call routes established.
7. Complete Trolley Vehicle Refurbishment and implement new services.

   **Status:** Completed with refurbished trolleys in service.


   **Status:** Completed. Training occurred in October 2011 and software implementation completed in March 2012.

9. Replace/Upgrade TransitMaster ITS systems.

   **Status:** Delayed, as MST did not receive State of Good Repair grant needed to fund replacement of systems. Staff seeking other funding sources.

10. Complete MSTEA MOU negotiation.

    **Status:** Completed. Pending Board ratification in November 2011.

11. Develop adequate staffing and organizational structure for MST and RTA.

    **Complete. All budgeted positions have been hired.**

12. Conduct and implement compensation survey.

    **Status:** Ongoing. Surveys completed with implementation to occur in July 2012 as budget allows.

13. Implement midday service on Presidio.

    **Status:** Delayed pending contract from Presidio of Monterey and reinstatement of federal transit benefit and increased levels.

14. Implement CSUMB on-campus service, if requested and funded.

    **Status:** Completed. Otter Trolley and University Pass system in place.

15. Conduct Legal Services Request for Proposals.

    **Status:** Ongoing with RFP anticipated by June 2012.
16. Evaluate and update transit insurance coverage options.

    Status: Completed.

17. Update email and document retention policy.

    Status: In progress. Estimate completion by June 2012.

18. Conduct Salinas Area Service Analysis and implement recommendations as funding allows.

    Status: Ongoing. Survey completed with Board presentation by June 2012.

19. Research paperless” Board agenda and implement “as appropriate.

    Status: Completed. Conducted survey of board agenda recipients and have implemented paperless agenda preparation process.

20. Implement upgrades to Financial and Human Resources software.

    Status: Completed.


    Status: Completed.
This page left intentionally blank
A number of projects, such as the US 101 San Juan Road Project and the Highway 156 Widening are closer to construction with the California Transportation Commission approval of the State Transportation Improvement Program, a multi-year capital improvement program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System. The 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program will allocate funding for the next five years and will be made available from state and federal gasoline taxes.

Of particular interest, the Highway 156 Widening Project will receive $4.5 million for the engineering phase of the project and $28 million for the purchase of right of way. In response to the Commissions approval of state funds District 2 Supervisor Calcagno said:

"Clearly, Highway 156 through the Oak Hills corridor needs more capacity not only for local residents in North County but also for everybody on the Monterey Peninsula as well. I am pleased with today's action by the California Transportation Commission; and, I am grateful to those leaders in our community, such as Julie Packard, Jason Burnett, and Sam Teel, who continue to work collaboratively with T AMC to make sure that the final project design will meet the collective needs of our community."

Carmel City Councilmember Jason Burnett also said:

"This [project] is particularly important for Carmel because of our visitor serving economy. Visitors who come to Carmel have a wonderful time but then often sit in hours of traffic going home to the Bay Area, leaving them with a bad taste in their mouth. We want to fix that. Improving highway 156 by making it four lanes will reduce this congestion especially when combined with the improvements to highway 101 in the Prunedale area."

Projects on the list for funding include: the US 101 San Juan Road Project, Highway 156 Widening, the US 101 South County Frontage Road Projects, and Commuter Rail to Salinas. The Highway 1 Climbing Lane from Rio Road to Carmel Valley Road in Carmel, and Castroville Bike/Pedestrian Railroad Crossing are also in the proposed
program. These projects are consistent with the list of priority regional transportation projects adopted by the Board of Directors in January 2012.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION MAY AFFECT TRANSPORTATION

Federally funded transportation projects in Monterey County will continue as planned after both the US House and Senate approved a 90-day extension of the federal surface transportation authorization bill and the President’s expected signature in time for its March 31 deadline. Without this extension, the federal gas tax would have expired and all federally funded transportation projects would have been halted. This is the ninth extension of the current bill, the “Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – a Legacy for Users” (SAFETEA-LU).

The Senate and House are both proposing new transportation authorization bills that would have significant implications for transportation funding in Monterey County. The Senate Bill, passed in the Senate on March 14, would provide for major reforms such as program consolidation. The Transportation Agency supports the bill overall but continues to be concerned about two of its proposed reforms:

- Revisions to the way that Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) are designated and the elimination or phasing out of MPOs for regions with less than 200,000 in urbanized area population. This provision would force the Association for Monterey Bay Area Governments to go through a recertification process and would prohibit the Transportation Agency from forming a new MPO.

- Renaming of the New Starts program to “Fixed Guideway Capital Investment Grant program” and making core system improvements eligible for this funding that was previously only available for new projects or system expansions.

Both bills eliminate earmarks and continue funding levels at the same as currently authorized, but the Senate bill is only two years, while the House bill as originally proposed was five years. Both houses have proposed various mechanisms for funding the bill, but neither proposes to raise the gas tax.

TRANSPORTATION AGENCY 2011 ANNUAL REPORT

The Transportation Agency 2011 Annual Report will be mailed to residents throughout the County during the month of April. It will highlight major projects under construction
at this time, such as the US 101 Prunedale Improvement Project, the Highway 1/Salinas Road Interchange project, the, and the US 101 Airport Boulevard Project, and discuss future project needs.

STATE TRANSPORTATION FUNDS
TRANSFERRED TO MONTEREY-SALINAS TRANSIT
FOR NORTH FREMONT STREET IMPROVEMENTS

The Transportation Agency Board approved the City of Monterey’s request for a transfer of more than $600,000 in Regional Surface Transportation Program funds. These projects involve traffic signal improvements on North Fremont Street, Lighthouse Avenue and Foam Street, which comprise the bulk of MST’s Bus Rapid Transit corridor. Monterey Salinas Transit will implement the signal improvements on behalf of the City of Monterey as part of the Bus Rapid Transit corridor.
The third annual Golden Helmet Award was presented to Jan Valencia for his dedication to use bicycle in his daily commute. Mr. Valencia bikes year-round in all weather conditions from his home in Seaside to his business in Salinas. He serves on the board of the local bicycling club, Velo Club of Monterey and volunteers at events, including the Amgen Tour of California, Sea Otter Classic and Seaside Police Activities League Bike Fair. Mr. Valencia demonstrates and promotes safe and courteous riding habits. He is an ambassador for the Monterey County bicycling community.

The first annual Silver Helmet Award was presented to Phil Yenokvian for his dedication to bicycling for his daily commute. Mr. Yenokvian commutes regularly from Seaside to his job at the County Office of Emergency Services in Salinas. He was instrumental in starting a grassroots campaign to build support for the Blanco Road bike lane project. On weekends, Mr. Yenokvian mentors and educates bicyclists who are considering commuting between the Monterey peninsula and Salinas.

The aim of these awards is to highlight the benefits of bicycle commuting and inspire others to utilize alternative transportation modes. The Agency received nomination forms for six different award nominees. The Transportation Agency Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee appointed a subcommittee to review, rank and recommend a winner to the Transportation Agency Board. The winners was determined base on dedication to bicycling as an alternative form of transportation, as well as, frequency and length of travel, history of bicycle commuting, persistence in inclement weather or other materially adverse conditions, adoption of best practice such as courteous riding habits, bicycle advocacy, and inspiration to others.

John Ristow from Valley Transportation Authority gave a presentation to the Transportation Agency for Monterey County on the State Route 152 improvement project, between US 101 and SR 99. This corridor is a heavily traveled east-west route.
that is in need of capacity and safety improvements. It is of particular interest to Monterey County travelers and the agriculture goods movement industry that uses this roadway to travel between US 101 and the Central Valley. The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) is evaluating the need for corridor improvements to serve travel demand.

Santa Clara, San Benito, Merced, and Madera counties have formed a Mobility Partnership to study the feasibility of a public-private partnership for the SR 152 Trade Corridor from SR 99 to U.S. 101. This study will evaluate highway improvements and financing strategies that could benefit the movement of goods throughout the corridor and mobility of commuters. The study also includes an evaluation of SR 152 realignment alternatives between U.S. 101 and SR 156 intended to enhance travel safety and improve travel times while upgrading to expressway standards.

Benefits of an improved SR 152 include:

- A new 4-lane freeway between SR 156 and U.S. 101, curve corrections and access control improvements will improve safety
- A savings of 5 million vehicle-hours per year by 2035, resulting in annual user travel time savings of up to $140 million
- The Los Banos Bypass improves safety by separating regional traffic from local, pedestrian and bicycle traffic and saves traveling time by avoiding the stop-and-go traffic through the downtown traffic signals
- The eastbound Pacheco Pass climbing lanes will improve travel times and safety by separating slower moving vehicles from traffic moving at freeway speeds
- The grade separation in the eastern segment will provide safety crossing for school buses and other local traffic

The next steps for this project will be to complete the realignment study, with completion expected in mid 2015. Depending on when funding is secured, the project could be completed as early as 2020.

---

**ELECTRIC VEHICLES IN MONTEREY COUNTY**

Monterey County residents may see more electric vehicle charging stations in the coming year, thanks to grants received by the Monterey Bay Electric Vehicle Alliance and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County. The Transportation Agency received funding from the Air District to install seven level 2 electric vehicle charging stations throughout the tri-county Monterey Bay Area region. The Monterey Bay Electric Vehicle Alliance (a collection of businesses, public agencies, labor, education, auto retailers, and electric vehicle advocates) also received a grant from the California Energy Commission for an additional forty charging stations.
Working collaboratively with the Electric Vehicle Alliance and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and the Transportation Agency will select seven charger locations to fund from the AB 2766 grant from a pool of private organizations who committed $2,500 towards the charging station installation cost, and by using an Association of Monterey Bay Area Government’s Geographic Information System analysis. These installations will occur by the end of 2012.

Last year, the Transportation Agency partnered with Ecology Action to apply for The Monterey & Santa Cruz Car Share Electrification and Expansion Project, which aimed to reduce mobile emissions through (1) the introduction of zero emission plug in electric vehicles to the existing Santa Cruz-based car share program and (2) expansion of the car share program to Monterey. This application scored highly, but did not receive funding. The Transportation Agency Board of Directors approved for this grant request to be reapplied for in the current grant cycle, and also requested that additional research be conducted into the potential of funding DC fast chargers, which can deliver an 80% charge in just 20 minutes.

**MONTEREY COUNTY BIKE SHARING**

The Transportation Agency for Monterey County approved a contract with Fehr and Peers to prepare the Monterey County Bicycle Sharing Feasibility and Implementation Plan in the amount of $57,000.

The concept of bicycle sharing originated from Europe and has been gaining popularity in the United States, particularly in urban areas. Similar to car sharing, bicycle sharing consists of making available a number of bicycles at docking stations for customers to check out and ride to other areas where they can return the bikes once their trips are concluded. Bicyclists will have the option of returning the bicycles to any docking station in the system.

A Bicycle Sharing Feasibility and Implementation Plan is needed to appropriately design and implement a comprehensive, multi-modal, and functional bicycle sharing system to serve the Monterey County area. The Bicycle Sharing Feasibility Plan is envisioned to examine the potential of success for such a proposed program in Monterey County. If it is found to be feasible, the consultant will prepare an Implementation Plan that will provide a roadmap for launching a bicycle sharing system. Key issues associated with system implementation, including system infrastructure, docking station placement, demand determination, targeted audience, integration with transit systems, estimated cost and funding mechanisms, theft prevention and economic impacts will be studied and explored as part of the planning effort. The Bicycle Sharing Plan is expected to be completed by January of 2013.
MONTEREY COUNTY RECEIVES STATE TRANSPORTATION FUNDS

The Transportation Agency allocated more than $200,000 in Regional Surface Transportation Funds to Monterey County for the Blackie Road Phase I and Phase II safety improvement projects.

Projects eligible for Regional Surface Transportation Program funding include local street and roadway rehabilitation, local match for federal transportation funds, bike lanes, pedestrian facilities, public transit capital, and signal coordination.
TO: Carl Sedoryk

FROM: Thomas P. Walters

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

- Met with Congressman Farr to discuss MST issues and projects.
- Contacted local Delegation to follow up MST staff advocacy meetings in Washington, D.C.
- Provided drafting assistance to Congressman Farr’s staff for support letters for MST State of Good Repair, Livability and Clean Fuels grant applications.
- Worked with Congressman Farr’s office to develop support letter for Veterans Transportation and Community Living Initiative grant application.
- Contacted House Delegation to request support for restoring parity for commuter transit benefits in pending SAFETEA-LU Reauthorization legislation.
- Provided updates to MST on transportation and appropriations legislation.

TPW:dwg
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DATE: May 1, 2012
TO: Carl Sedoryk, General Manager/CEO
    Monterey-Salinas Transit
FROM: John E. Arriaga, President
SUBJ: April 2012 Activity Report

Week of April 2, 2012

- Monitored Legislative policy, fiscal and budget committee hearings on State Budget and transportation related issues
- Monitored gubernatorial appointments
- Continuous scheduling and checking in on meeting requests for May 23rd and a separate meeting request in the district with Assembly Member Alejo per Carl Sedoryk’s request
- Attended California Transit Association Transit Caucus meeting
- Monitored California Transportation Commission activities
- Monitored and updated the Legislative Track for MST
- Provided MST with JEA & Associates Capitol Weekly Report on key events and activities in Sacramento/the Capitol
**Week of April 9, 2012**
- Continuous scheduling and checking in on meeting requests for May 23rd and a separate meeting request in the district with Assembly Member Alejo per Carl Sedoryk’s request
- Monitored Legislative policy, fiscal and budget committee hearings on State Budget and transportation related issues
- Monitored gubernatorial appointments
- Monitored California Transit Association activities
- Monitored California Transportation Commission activities
- Provided an updated Legislative Track for MST
- Provided MST with JEA & Associates Capitol Weekly Report on key events and activities in Sacramento/the Capitol

**Week of April 16, 2012**
- Continuous scheduling and checking in on meeting requests for May 23rd and a separate meeting in the district with Assembly Member Alejo per Carl Sedoryk’s request
- MST legislative priorities conference call with Hunter Harvath, John Arriaga, Erica Arriaga, Tim Egan
- Monitored Legislative policy, fiscal and budget committee hearings on State Budget and transportation related issues
- Monitored gubernatorial appointments
- Monitored California Transit Association activities
- Monitored California Transportation Commission activities
- Monitored and updated the Legislative Track for MST
- Provided MST with JEA & Associates Capitol Weekly Report on key events and activities in Sacramento/the Capitol

**Week of April 23, 2012**
- Continuous scheduling and checking in on meeting requests for May 23rd and a separate meeting in the district with Assembly Member Alejo per Carl Sedoryk’s request
- Monitored Legislative policy, fiscal and budget committee hearings on State Budget and transportation related issues
- Monitored gubernatorial appointments
- Monitored California Transit Association activities
- Monitored California Transportation Commission activities
- Provided an updated Legislative Track for MST
- Provided MST with JEA & Associates Capitol Weekly Report on key events and activities in Sacramento/the Capitol

Please feel free to contact me at (916) 669-1340 with any questions or concerns you may have regarding information contained in this report.
May 3, 2012

To: Carl Sedoryk

From: Hunter Harvath, Assistant General Manager – Finance & Administration

Subject: TRIP REPORT

From March 10 through 13, 2012, I attended the 2012 American Public Transportation Association’s (APTA) Legislative Conference in Washington, DC. While at the conference, I attended several committee meetings and sessions, including:

- APTA Legislative Committee
- APTA Small Operators Committee
- Welcome to Washington, featuring Congressional and political update from commentator Major Garrett, National Journal
- What’s Ahead for Transit -- New Opportunities in 2012, featuring U.S. Department of Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood
- View from the Hill – Updates from key Congressional staffers from the Senate Banking, Housing & Urban Affairs Committee, House Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

In addition to attending the conference, I participated in several meetings with Federal Transit Administration staff and representatives of US Congressman Sam Farr.

On March 22 and 23, 2012, I was in Sacramento for meetings with Mark Codey, the new Caltrans Division of Mass Transportation Office Chief for Federal Grant Programs, and with the California Transit Association / California Association for Coordinated Transportation / Caltrans working group, which convenes bi-monthly to discuss strategies to improve communication, develop policies and procedures, and solve problems between small and medium transit agencies and the office of state government through which tens of millions of dollars of federal funding flows to rural and small urban areas.
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The Honorable Peter M. Rogoff
Administrator
Federal Transit Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
4th and 5th Floors, East Building
Washington, D.C. 20590-0001

Dear Administrator Rogoff:

I am writing to express my strong support for the application submitted jointly by Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority and its partners Monterey-Salinas Transit, Marin Transit, Santa Rosa Transit, and Outreach, Inc., for the FTA’s Veterans Transportation and Community Living Initiative (VTCLI) grant program.

The *Together We Ride Veterans Transportation and Community Living Initiative Project* will expand OUTREACH’s existing One-Call/One-Click Transportation Management Coordination Center to provide veterans, military personnel and their families with access to current and comprehensive information that connects them with transportation to health care, work, employment services, and other community benefits that support their efforts to live healthy and independent lives. Through this project, veterans, active military personnel and their families along this 250-mile corridor of California Highway 101, will have easy access to information on transportation and human service resources through a phone call, online chat or simple click of the computer on an online searchable database.

*Together We Ride* is a highly collaborative project that includes the participation of the aforementioned transit authorities, veterans and military service organizations, the VA health and hospital system, 2-1-1 & 5-1-1 systems and other community providers serving the needs of veterans, active military personnel and their families. The project will bring together in one place information and individualized assistance that will enable these targeted groups to access resources whether they live in urban, suburban or rural areas and will create partnerships between transportation providers and veterans and military communities, increase the involvement of veterans and military communities in transportation planning processes, and increase the awareness of available community resources by the military community.

Outreach will be a major component in this effort with agency staff and volunteers seeking out both active duty and veteran populations, telling them about the multitude of services available to them, and immediately linking them to those services using both in-house and mobile technologies. Consistent with the capital funding made available through the VTCLI-II program,
the project will focus on upgrading communication and technology equipment of project partners to better enable coordination of information and services.

California is home to 10 percent of the nation's veterans. Between the four transit agency applicants, this very collaborative and innovative program will provide transportation and related services to a core population of 147,552 veterans, thousands and thousands of active military personnel and countless more family members. I hope you will give this application the full and fair consideration that it deserves based on its outstanding merits.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

SAM FARR
Member of Congress

SF/dm
April 17, 2012

The Honorable Bonnie Lowenthal
1020 N Street, Room 112
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Chair Lowenthal:

On behalf of Monterey-Salinas Transit, I ask you to SUPPORT AB 1706 (Eng). AB 1706 authorizes an analysis of the state weight limit for public transit buses, by creating a task force that will report to the legislature recommendations for how to address weight limits in the future.

State law currently mandates that the weight on any single axle of a transit bus may not exceed 20,500 lbs. However, due to other numerous state and federal mandates, including ADA requirements and mandated emissions reduction equipment, some transit buses today may often exceed that weight, especially when carrying significant passenger loads (as transit’s mission calls for). As a result, some transit systems have been cited recently by local police departments for violation of the Vehicle Code.

Merely relying on the current procedures in state law for overweight vehicles -- paying fines resulting from citations, or, paying fees and administering thousands of annual permits on a city-by-city basis -- will prove costly and time consuming for transit agencies and other local governments statewide. Moreover, such an approach would continue to ignore the underlying problem: the Vehicle Code limit was created more than 35 years ago, and simply does not contemplate today’s operating environments or legal and regulatory requirements for public transit.

AB 1706 would create a task force with the purpose of preparing a report which:

- Makes recommendations regarding any changes that should be made to current axle weight limits
- Makes recommendations relative to the design and construction of highways and local streets and roads, taking into account the need to support a sustainable transportation network including adequate public transportation service by bus, and federal and state requirements that affect the weight of transit vehicles
- Compares and analyzes the costs of the pavement wear caused by transit buses with the costs of the pavement wear caused by other vehicles such as trucks or vehicles such as municipal garbage trucks or fire engines
• Considers past and ongoing efforts at the Federal level to address this issue, including transit bus weight exemptions contained in the last federal surface transportation authorization bill

The task force, made up of representatives from the transit industry, cities and counties, the state, and law enforcement, would be required to submit the report by January 1, 2015. Between January 1, 2013, when this bill would go into effect, and January 1, 2016, transit systems would be allowed to run their current buses, but would not be allowed to procure buses that are heavier than what's in their current fleet; however, if transit systems need to procure a new type of bus that they do not currently run, then they would not be prohibited from doing so provided that there would be oversight through a public hearing.

California’s public transit systems carry thousands of passengers each day, providing mobility to Californians from all walks of life. Additionally, public transit helps to achieve the goals of AB 32 and SB 375 by reducing car trips, thereby reducing congestion and greenhouse gas emissions, and providing better air quality to California’s communities. AB 1706 acknowledges the important role that public transit plays and seeks a solution to allow buses to fulfill this role while abiding by the state’s weight limits. It provides the opportunity for state and local government stakeholders to collaboratively develop a balanced solution. For these reasons, we ask for your support of this bill.

Sincerely,

Carl Sedoryk
General Manager/CEO

Cc: Members of the Assembly Transportation Committee
   Assembly Member Luis Alejo, Assembly Member Bill Monning
   Senator Anthony Canella, Senator Sam Blakeslee
   Joshua Shaw, Executive Director, California Transit Association
April 18, 2012

Mr. Hunter Harvath
Assistant General Manager, Finance & Administration
Monterey-Salinas Transit
One Ryan Ranch Road
Monterey, CA 93940

Re: Request for Covered Transit Shelters

Dear Hunter,

Over the past year we've had several conversations about covered transit shelters that MST will be removing from existing locations when the Jazz Line is implemented. As you know, CSUMB has asked to receive as many of the shelters as appropriate since we currently do not have any covered transit shelters anywhere on the main campus or the Frederiks neighborhoods.

Based on our last meeting, you have conveyed that four shelters may be available to CSUMB, currently located at the Edgewater shopping center and at the Seaside center at the corner of Fremont and Broadway. Please note that we are interested in receiving more than four, but above all we are grateful for the opportunity to receive four shelters. We are interested in working with MST to locate or pursue funding opportunities for more shelters.

With consideration to space requirements, existing and planned stops, bus routes and direction, ADA compliance/accessibility, and wind patterns, we have identified a list of priority locations to install the covered transit shelters. The list below is presented in priority order and includes additional locations in case more shelters come available, or MST decides to prioritize recipient locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lines Served</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 4th Ave/Divarty</td>
<td>AVC bldg</td>
<td>16, 25, On-Call, Trolley</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Divarty</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>16, 25, On-Call, Trolley</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inter-Garrison/2nd Ave</td>
<td>Sports Center</td>
<td>25, On-Call, Trolley</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bunker Hill/Princeton</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>16, 25, On-Call</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Manassas/Wilderness</td>
<td>Wilderness</td>
<td>16, 25, On-Call</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Adjacent Area</td>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Parking Lot 71</td>
<td>6th Ave/Inter-G</td>
<td>Trolley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Divarty</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>16, 25, On-Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A St/6th Ave</td>
<td>6th Ave</td>
<td>16, 25, On-Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Inter-Garrison/2nd Ave</td>
<td>Sports Center</td>
<td>25, On-Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Abrams Dr/Schoonover</td>
<td>Schoonover</td>
<td>16, 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please keep me informed as to how to proceed with formalizing this request for the existing shelters. You can reach me at 831-582-4262 or via email at mtolbert@csumb.edu.

Best regards,

Megan Tolbert
Transportation Planner

Cc: Bob Rench, Associate Director of Quality Improvement and Sustainability, CSUMB
John Marker, Senior Director for Facilities Services and Operations, CSUMB
Mike Gallant, Planning Manager, MST
Carl Sedoryk, General Manager/CEO, MST
April 20, 2012

Fernando Armenta, Chair
Board of Directors
Monterey Salinas Transit
One Ryan Ranch Road
Monterey, CA 93940

Dear Chair Armenta:

Thank you again for the opportunity to meet with General Manager, Carl Sedoryk and Deputy General Manager, Hunter Harvath, recently to discuss the opportunity for development of the MST Maintenance and Operations Facility at the Marina Municipal Airport Business Park. This meeting was informative and helpful in clarifying the letter provided previously to Mayor Pro Tem Frank O’Connell, a copy of which is attached for your reference.

It is our understanding that while MST desires to continue exploring the viability and location of this consolidated maintenance and operations facility, funding constraints prevent additional planning, design and environmental work at this time. Further, it is our understanding that the federal funding for construction of this facility may only be allowed on the former Fort Ord, and that the Federal Department of Transportation is eager to see these funds committed and this project proceed in a timely manner.

Given these circumstances, the Marina Municipal Airport is a location that presents an even better opportunity now for MST for this maintenance and operations facility. First, the City of Marina is proceeding with preparation of an amended Specific Plan, CEQA review, tentative map, utility and infrastructure master plan, biological review, and other entitlements to position the Marina Airport Business Park property as a regional business and industrial park, with an offering to the development community by the end of this calendar year. Staff is continuing discussions with the Federal Aviation Administration regarding the various opportunities that exist for property disposition whether leased or sold.

The pre-development planning effort recently completed by MST at the previous County location could be folded into this entitlement effort by the City of Marina and create a first phase development for the MST facility. This cooperative effort could provide a cost effective opportunity for MST in utilizing the existing entitlement documents which have a significant value. Absent this utilization, these documents represent a significant sunk cost to MST with little benefit.

Serving a World Class Community
Second, as the federal low interest loan program that provides a sizable portion of the funding for this facility is constrained to projects only on the former Fort Ord, the Marina Municipal Airport is the ideal location for the MST facility. The Marina Municipal Airport is positioned equal distance between the major population centers in the County, i.e. Salinas and the Monterey Peninsula, with easy access via major arterials. Water, sewer, fiber optic, gas, electricity, signalization are already provided to the development site, where other locations in Fort Ord may require significant off-site infrastructure development. Other locations in Fort Ord may require significant demolition of structures, removal of trees, significant grading for site preparation or other constraints which could add to the cost and delay of the development of the facility. The Marina Airport Business Park site has none of those constraints.

Third, time may be of the essence relative to financing and funding of the MST facility. Future state and federal funding is uncertain, particularly with budget deficits, and transportation funding from Proposition 1B funds and in the federal loan program designated for this project may not be present in future fiscal years. Additionally, fare bond revenue opportunities may not be as available in the future years as well, particularly if there is a shift downward in fare box receipts.

It is our hope that MST recognizes the benefits of this opportunity and considers the Marina Municipal Airport as the premier choice for the new operations and maintenance facility. The City of Marina is eager to assist MST, and specifically requests that the MST Board provide direction to MST staff to work closely with City of Marina staff in the entitlement and pre-development process as described previously.

Further, as we understand that MST may be seeking interest from other locations in Fort Ord and throughout the county, we would request that MST enter into an exclusive negotiating arrangement with Marina in pursuing this development at the Marina Municipal Airport. Alternatively, we request that the City of Marina be considered to participate in an RFP process to determine the optimal location on Fort Ord for this facility.

Thank you again for your cooperation in this important matter, and we look forward to hearing from MST regarding our requests.

Sincerely,

Bruce C. Delgado
Mayor
City of Marina

Cc: Board Members, MST
    Members, Facilities and Financing Committees, MST
    City Council
    City Manager
    Community Development Director

Encl.
April 24, 2012

Carl Sedoryk, CEO
Monterey Salinas Transit
One Ryan Ranch Road
Monterey, CA 93940

Subject: City of Monterey Cash Match for the Bus Livability Grant for the Del Monte Corridor Enhancement Project

Dear Mr. Sedoryk,

On April 17, 2012, the City Council adopted “Resolution 12-054 Authorizing the Use of $600,000 From the City's Parking Fund as a Required Grant Match for the Del Monte Corridor Enhancement Project.” The intent is to use these funds as a local cash match for the grant application being submitted to the Federal Transit Administration for Fiscal Year 2012 Bus and Bus Facilities Program: Bus Livability Initiative. The signed resolution is enclosed.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to leverage public funds for a project that will have such a positive impact on the community.

Sincerely,

Fred Meurer
City Manager

Encl.
RESOLUTION NO. 12-054 C.S.

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MONTEREY

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF $600,000 FROM THE CITY'S PARKING FUND AS A REQUIRED GRANT MATCH FOR THE DEL MONTE CORRIDOR ENHANCEMENT PROJECT

WHEREAS, Monterey Salinas Transit (MST) staff has submitted a grant application to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for the Del Monte Corridor Enhancement Project, which consists of the design and construction of the Interim Del Monte Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and Multi-Modal Transit Center on Washington Street between Del Monte Avenue and Franklin Street;

WHEREAS, to demonstrate local commitment to the project, the grant requires a 20% match;

WHEREAS, the local match may consist of cash, land value, and/or Caltrans toll credits;

WHEREAS, the total project cost is $18,005,400, the Federal request is $13,875,400 (77%) and the total local match is $4,130,000 (23%), consisting of a combination of cash, land value, and toll credits;

WHEREAS, the sum of $600,000 has been identified as a viable amount to use from the Parking Fund as a cash match and the City would be obligated to appropriate those funds to the project once the grant is awarded by the FTA and accepted by the City Council; and

WHEREAS, for the purpose of project scalability, separate implementation plans have been developed and the cash match would be applied to the Interim BRT portion of the project to increase its overall scoring and therefore its chances of receiving funding and being implemented first.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MONTEREY that it hereby authorizes the use of $600,000 from the City's Parking Fund as a required grant match for the Del Monte Corridor Enhancement Project
PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MONTEREY

this 17th day of April, 2012, by the following vote:

AYES: 5  COUNCILMEMBERS: Downey, Haferman, Selfridge, Sollecito, Della Sala
NOES: 0  COUNCILMEMBERS:
ABSENT: 0  COUNCILMEMBERS:
ABSTAIN: 0  COUNCILMEMBERS:

APPROVED:

[Signatures]

Mayor of said City

City Clerk thereof
With BOSS, Public Transit Can Invest in Bus Operators

BY SUSAN BERLIN, Senior Editor

Public transportation agency heads understand that their operators are as important an investment as the vehicles they will operate. APTA’s Bus Operator Selection Survey (BOSS) provides a tool that will help them make the correct hiring decisions.

“The hiring of employees is one of the largest, most important investments a public transit agency can make,” said Carl Sedoryk, general manager/chief executive officer, Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST), Monterey, CA. “It’s critical to hire the right people, not only to provide excellent customer service and ensure the safety of both customers and system employees, but also to limit the financial liability of the organization.”

APTA has offered the BOSS process for almost 15 years as a way to help public transit systems select reliable, safe, and customer-oriented bus operators for their fleets. The firm of EB Jacobs worked with DOT, the Department of Labor, and APTA member transit system CEOs and training directors to develop the program.

MTA New York City Transit (NYC Transit) is the largest subscriber to the BOSS program and a participant since its inception.

Walter Orlowski, NYC Transit assistant chief officer, safety and training, noted that the agency instituted BOSS around the same time it made internal changes to its training process to add a one-year probation period. “Between the two, we’ve been able to provide a better operator,” he said, noting that the agency hires an average of 1,000 bus operators each year.

According to Sedoryk, BOSS has shown evident benefits to MST: “We’ve reduced our turnover by 25 percent and lowered our insurance premiums, accident frequency, and severity since we began using BOSS in 2003 as part of an overall program focusing on customer safety and service.”

More specifically, he said, the implementation of BOSS has reduced the system’s recruitment and training costs by approximately $40,000 per year; cut the number of accidents and injuries; and lessened the amount of time MST spends on managing poor performers. These results parallel APTA’s study of more than 800 bus operators hired using the BOSS system, which projects an average of seven fewer missed days per operator and 20 percent fewer accidents per year.

Orlowski explained that human resources employees use BOSS, as part of the hiring process, to ask bus operator applicants how they would respond in a variety of on-the-job situations. “Their answers identify who’s an appropriate candidate for your system,” he noted. “These employees deal with customer service, people taking public transit to work… they need the proper tools to let them communicate with the public.”

While saying the program is not a “silver bullet,” Sedoryk said: “Programs like BOSS should be part of everyone’s program to ensure the highest levels of safety for both customers and employees, customer service, on-time performance, and improved employee attendance.”
Components of BOSS
The BOSS selection protocol includes a pre-employment screening survey and structured interview process. Applicants can take the 75-item BOSS survey either in person, with paper and pencil, or online. The virtue of the online “eBoss” application is that test results become available immediately. “We make BOSS part of our recruitment process,” Sedoryk said. “After applicants submit their applications and come in for an interview, the first thing we do is have them take the BOSS test. This can actually save time and effort because some people will show through their responses they don’t have a predisposition for the job. Others do, and that’s where the system will want to focus its attention.”

He continued: “When looking at our history, we found that once we started hiring employees with the help of BOSS—only selecting those with the highest rankings for safety and attendance—we reduced our involuntary terminations within the first year of employment by 25 percent.”

The BOSS process also includes a structured interview process that complements the survey; it offers standardized questions and behaviorally anchored rating scales linked specifically to the job of bus operator, as well as up to three hours of consulting assistance by phone.

In summation, Sedoryk said: “Is a public transit agency using any type of employment selection criteria in its hiring—for example, safety, customer service, on-time performance, attendance? If they are hiring and retaining individuals who are predisposed to be excellent in these areas, a program like BOSS should be considered.”

More information about BOSS is available from Cheryl Pyatt.
ADA paratransit services are in demand, but now with limited budgets the new normal, many transit providers are looking for alternatives for contracting and managing the delivery of paratransit and community-based mobility options. In this On Board With… we talk with Monterey-Salinas Transit General Manager/CEO Carl Sedoryk about how MST has taken advantage of federal New Freedom grants to create a series of programs for the elderly, persons with disabilities and those with limited mobility.

Transit California:
Why did the federal government offer New Freedom grants?

Carl Sedoryk:
The 2000 Census showed that only 60 percent of people between the ages of 16 and 64 with disabilities are employed. Further, it was found that lack of adequate transportation is a primary barrier to employment for individuals with disabilities. When the last transportation bill, SAFETEA-LU, was enacted in 2005, it prioritized transit services for elderly and disabled riders and created the New Freedom grant program, which aims to provide additional tools to overcome existing barriers facing Americans with disabilities seeking integration into the workforce and full participation in society. With this new program, MST has created several programs that go beyond what is required under the Americans with Disabilities Act – and that makes transportation more affordable and rider-friendly for Monterey County residents.
Transit California:
The programs MST created with the grants have been well received by the community, as evidenced by the February award presented to MST from the Monterey County Commission on Disabilities. How did MST opt to use the grant funding?

Carl Sedoryk:
We have rolled out a whole series of programs for the elderly, persons with disabilities and those with limited mobility. A new senior shuttle links residents of Carmel Valley’s Pacific Meadows senior community with medical centers and shopping districts; a free travel training program is now teaching new riders and those uncertain about taking the bus due to physical or cognitive challenges; and a New Freedom federal grant is covering costs for taxi vouchers available to seniors in several Monterey County cities, making a common taxi ride only $3.

Next, MST used grant money to purchase some of Monterey County’s first wheelchair-accessible taxis providing new transportation options for persons with disabilities; members of the new MST Navigators volunteer corps are leading travel training sessions and riding senior shuttle routes providing training for passengers with mobility devices, and assisting seniors with carrying packages; and finally, the Special Medical Trips program, previously available to MST RIDES ADA passengers only, was opened to the general public, providing 200-mile round-trip transportation to specialized medical services in the San Francisco Bay Area for only $40 with an appointment.

These new routes, taxi services and travel training opportunities aim to make public transit a more attractive alternative, regardless of a passenger’s age or limitations.

Transit California:
Do riders contact MST to request the special cab or the taxi company? How did the private taxicab companies respond to the wheelchair-accessible taxis purchased by MST?

Carl Sedoryk:
Currently the Monterey County Regional Taxi Authority, which is administered by Monterey-Salinas Transit, provides customers with a list of taxicab operators who are pre-qualified and authorized to accept taxicab vouchers that are funded through the New Freedom program. The customers receive their vouchers from participating cities that provide the local matching funds for the program, and
contact the authorized taxicab operator directly when they need to schedule a trip. The voucher is of sufficient value that it provides a guaranteed tip to the taxicab driver providing the trip.

As for the taxicab operators, initial interest from private taxicab companies would best be described as “cautious” as there were concerns expressed about the need for special training requirements for drivers and increased liability insurance coverage for disabled passengers. It has taken some time for MST to convince private taxicab companies that there is an untapped demand for same-day taxicab services within the disabled community of Monterey County. However, in the past year we were able to introduce the first wheelchair accessible taxicab within our county. Since then, MST has taken delivery of three additional accessible taxicabs which we will be distributing to interested taxicab companies who agree to comply with New Freedom program requirements. We also have grant funds that would allow us to introduce another six accessible taxicabs, if sufficient demand for these services is demonstrated. We have recently learned of private cab companies in the area who are interested in purchasing their own accessible cabs, as they want to begin responding to the customer demand that exists today, and not wait for MST to distribute the cabs that we have.

As seniors age, we’re going to have more and more demand on MST RIDES. These taxis provide new options for persons with disabilities and seniors, and they make room for new people to come into our MST RIDES ADA program.

**Transit California:**
In addition to the taxi voucher program all MST fixed-route and ADA paratransit buses are equipped with lifts. How often are lifts deployed?

**Carl Sedoryk:**
Using our onboard Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technology we have determined in the past year MST fixed-route buses deployed their lifts 26,400 times and the MST RIDES ADA program carried over 105,000 passengers assisting persons with mobility limitations to board an MST bus an average of once every 15 minutes of every day helping them reach important destinations like work, school, worship, social, and medical appointments.

**Transit California:**
Beautiful Monterey County has a large concentrated senior population. How did MST go about promoting the new mobility management programs and training riders?
Carl Sedoryk:
The MST Travel Training program is designed to ease the concerns of new riders and those uncertain about taking the bus due to physical and cognitive challenges. A combination of free classroom and on-board training sessions teach participants to read schedules, board the bus and pay a fare, signal a stop and navigate other public transit procedures. Community members can call MST directly to schedule free travel training sessions. The service is particularly useful for members of the MST RIDES program, the agency’s transportation program for ADA paratransit travelers, who want the option of riding affordable fixed-routes from time to time.

Members of the new MST Navigators volunteer corps lead Travel Training sessions and ride Senior Shuttle routes. They are available to help carry packages, provide training for passengers using mobility devices, such as scooters and wheelchairs, and answer general transit questions.

Transit California:
How has MST determined what services are needed to meet the needs of MST RIDES travelers?

Carl Sedoryk:
All of our mobility management programs are planned and implemented with the input and oversight of a group of consumers and social service agency personnel who have first-hand experience using our services and/or in assisting others do so. The Mobility Advisory Committee (MAC) reports directly to the MST board of directors, and provides advice and recommendations on improving these services. In addition to the advisory committee, MST conducts surveys of its passengers and will target surveys to
specific senior centers, and medical facilities in order to gain insight on the demand for additional services.

Transit California:
MST has certainly addressed the Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and more. Beyond the award recognition from Monterey County Commission on Disabilities, how have riders responded to the new programs?

Carl Sedoryk:
Overall it appears that riders are pleased with the new programs. Seniors living in residential communities, young adults with learning disabilities, and new applicants for the MST RIDES ADA program have shown the most interest in participating in these new programs. Persons with disabilities that already take advantage of the MST RIDES program and that have completed our travel training programs enjoy the independence and cost savings that the fixed-route system provides to them. Currently, we average 71 travel training orientations and trainings per month.

As for the other programs, we currently have 10,000 boardings per month for our ADA Paratransit Services and the Senior Shuttle program currently has 618 boardings per month, at an average of 4.4 passengers per hour between three routes. The Paratransit Taxi Vouchers program just started, so we don’t yet have statistics available for that. But the Senior Taxi Vouchers program offered in partnership with local city governments, which began in November 2011, has provided 1,262 taxi rides in just the first three months.

Transit California:
If readers would like to know more about how MST used the New Freedom grants, or specifics on how the mobility programs came together, what is the best way to be in touch or learn more?

Carl Sedoryk:
There are many ways to find out more information about MST and our programs including calling toll free at 888-MST-BUS1 (1-888-678-2871); visit online at www.mst.org/mobility; friend us on Facebook; or, follow us on Twitter @MST_BUS.
May 3, 2012

Natalie Stickler  
District Manager, Monterey Bay District  
Wells Fargo Bank  
399 Alvarado Street  
Monterey, CA 93940

Re: Donation for Linear Jazz Museum/ BRT Project

Dear Natalie:

On behalf of the Board and Staff of Monterey-Salinas Transit, I would like to thank you for your generous donation to the Linear Jazz Museum/Bus Rapid Transit project partnership between the Monterey Jazz Festival and MST.

This project not only offers riders the benefit of reduced travel times, but also provides an interactive cultural experience for locals and tourists, providing a visual and interactive history of Jazz music while promoting the Monterey Peninsula’s renowned Jazz Festival.

Your contribution is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Carl Sedoryk  
General Manager/CEO
Via Mail

May 2, 2012

Board of Directors
1 Ryan Ranch Road
Monterey, CA 93940
Attn: Hunter Harvath

RE: Availability for Purchase of 2.50AC Vacant Land
Address: 280 Reservation Road, Marina (APN 032-171-005-000)

Dear Board of Directors,

I am working closely with a client who is very interested in developing in Monterey County, particularly in the City of Marina.

Yesterday Theresa Szymanis, the Planning Manager, spoke with me regarding the above subject property and its availability. And she referred me to you, the Board, to discuss the possibility of its sale.

We would like to know how the Board would like to handle the transaction. I can be reached at (626) 628-4118.

Thank you

Sincerely yours,

Cathy L. Wong
Broker Associate

Enclosure