# M I N U T E S

**VRE Operations Board Meeting**  
PRTC Headquarters – Prince William County, Virginia  
September 19, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members Present</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Bulova (NVTC)</td>
<td>Fairfax County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cook (NVTC)</td>
<td>Fairfax County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. Jenkins (PRTC)</td>
<td>Prince William County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Kelly (PRTC)</td>
<td>City of Fredericksburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Milde (PRTC)</td>
<td>Stafford County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suhas Naddoni (PRTC)</td>
<td>City of Manassas Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Skinner (PRTC)</td>
<td>Spotsylvania County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Smedberg (NVTC)</td>
<td>City of Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Walter Tejada (NVTC)</td>
<td>Arlington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Thomas (PRTC)</td>
<td>Stafford County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Way (PRTC)</td>
<td>City of Manassas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members Absent</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Caddigan (PRTC)</td>
<td>Prince William County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternates Absent</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marc Aveni (PRTC)</td>
<td>City of Manassas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg Bohmke (PRTC)</td>
<td>Stafford County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Ellis (PRTC)</td>
<td>City of Fredericksburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Fisette (NVTC)</td>
<td>Arlington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank C. Jones (PRTC)</td>
<td>City of Manassas Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Lovain (NVTC)</td>
<td>City of Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael C. May (PRTC)</td>
<td>Prince William County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff McKay (NVTC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin E. Nohe (PRTC)</td>
<td>Prince William County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Trampe (PRTC)</td>
<td>Spotsylvania County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff and General Public</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doug Allen – VRE</td>
<td>Pierre Holloman – Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Ayala – VRE</td>
<td>Bryan Jungwirth – VRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg Baxter – Keolis</td>
<td>Ann King – VRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Boxer – VRE</td>
<td>Mike Lake – Fairfax County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Collins – Stafford County</td>
<td>Lezlie Lamb – VRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Dalton – VRE</td>
<td>Bob Leibbrandt – Prince William County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Duque – VRE</td>
<td>Betsy Massie – PRTC Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Durany - Prince William County</td>
<td>Steve Maclsaac – VRE legal counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Gilchrest – NVTC staff</td>
<td>Dick Peacock – Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Harf – PRTC staff</td>
<td>Lynn Rivers – Arlington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Henry – VRE</td>
<td>Scott Schenk – Free Lance- Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Hickey – VRE</td>
<td>Brett Shorter – VRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Hoeffner – VRE</td>
<td>Joe Swartz – VRE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Delineates arrival following the commencement of the Board meeting. Notation of exact arrival time is included in the body of the minutes.
Chairman Milde called the meeting to order at 9:38 A.M. Following the Pledge of Allegiance, Roll Call was taken.

Approval of the Agenda – 3

Mr. Smedberg moved, with a second by Ms. Bulova, to approve the Agenda. The vote in favor was cast by Board Members Bulova, Cook, Jenkins, Kelly, Milde, Mitchell, Nadonni, Skinner, Smedberg, Tejada, Thomas and Way.

Approval of the Minutes of the July 18, 2014 Operations Board Meeting – 4

Mr. Kelly moved approval of the minutes and Ms. Bulova seconded. The vote in favor was cast by Board Members Bulova, Cook, Jenkins, Kelly, Milde, Skinner, Smedberg, Tejada and Thomas. Ms. Mitchell, Mr. Naddoni and Mr. Way abstained.

Chairman’s Comments – 5

Chairman Milde announced that Congressman Wittman will be here next month to talk about transportation reauthorization, capacity funding, and the Gainesville/Haymarket extension project.

Chairman Milde also acknowledged that this has been a big summer for VRE with the groundbreaking ceremonies at the Potomac Shores and the Spotsylvania Stations. He asked Mr. Skinner to give a brief update on the Spotsylvania station. Mr. Skinner reported that county staff is meeting today with VDOT and the new contractor for a pre-construction conference. The contractor is ready to begin construction as soon as the Notice to Proceed is approved. In response to a question from Chairman Milde, Mr. Skinner stated that it is hard to predict when construction will be completed but if the weather cooperates the ribbon cutting ceremony could be in the January-February timeframe.

Chief Executive Officer’s Comments – 6

Mr. Allen reported that on-time performance (OTP) for the month of August was 95 percent, which was up from the previous month. Ridership for the month was an average of 18,000 which is typical during the August vacation season. He reported that four of the initial eight replacement railcars were delivered last Saturday and he anticipates they will be put into service next week. Three of the Legacy railcars have been shipped to Chicago as part of the six car purchase by Metra. He also reported that station painting has begun at Manassas Park, Rolling Road, Brooke and Rippon stations.

Mr. Allen reported that the Commonwealth Transportation Board approved the revised Six-year Improvement Plan (SYIP). He thanked Jennifer Mitchell and Kevin Page for their assistance in advancing an amendment for the next expansion railcar purchase. There was
also action taken on the Rail Enhancement Funding for the Brooke and Leeland Stations. Mr. Allen announced that VRE received confirmation that the TIGER Grant from the US Department of Transportation was approved to advance environmental work on the Long Bridge project. Mr. Allen reported that he submitted a letter of support for the Virginia Avenue Tunnel project as part of the Environmental Impact Statement process.

Mr. Allen stated that last week VRE hosted a tour for APTA Commuter Rail CEO’s from across the country. He also reported that Mr. Tejada was able to take a system tour. Mr. Tejada thanked VRE staff for letting him ride the entire line. They started at the Ivy City Yard and travelled the entire length of the Fredericksburg Line. He stated that he now has a more practical understanding of the system and he encouraged members who have not yet taken a tour to do so. Chairman Milde stated that he would like to take a tour and suggested one be scheduled for interested Board Members.

Mr. Allen drew Board Members’ attention to NVTC’s 50th Anniversary Poster that was provided to Board Members. Chairman Milde noted that this milestone is a big deal because this was the beginning of Metro and VRE exists today because of NVTC. PRTC was created in 1986 and there has been a great partnership since as co-owners of VRE.

Mr. Allen stated that Ms. Bulova suggested he share the status of NVTA funding. NVTA issued a call for projects in early 2014. Projects had to be in the TransAction 2040 Plan or the current CLRP. A recent NVTA policy change now requires projects to be in the TransAction 2040 Plan. The entire Franconia-Springfield to Woodbridge third track project is not in TransAction 2040. However, the south side platform expansion portion of the project is in the TransAction 2040. VRE would like to pursue NVTA funding for this portion the project. Mr. Allen reviewed the priority list:

1. VRE Rippon Platform Expansion and Second Platform ($10M)
2. Slaters Lane Crossover ($7M); an element of the Alexandria Tunnel project
3. VRE Franconia-Springfield (south-side) Platform Expansion ($30M); an element of the Franconia-Springfield to Woodbridge 3rd track project
4. VRE Franconia-Springfield (north-side) Platform Expansion ($5M)
5. VRE Crystal City Platform Expansion Study ($2M)
6. VRE Manassas Park Station Parking Expansion ($19M)

Ms. Bulova asked if VRE would seek federal funds for some of these projects. Mr. Allen replied that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has a federal program that relates to adding capacity to systems called the Core Capacity Program. It is a relatively new program and VRE wants to actively compete for this funding source, especially for projects like the Long Bridge. Funding could be in the hundreds of millions of dollars. However, it requires a 50 percent match, which could be state or local. The local match for these other projects can count towards the overall full funding grant agreement. He explained that VRE’s overall strategy is to assemble funding sources for groups of projects and then match them with federal funds. Ms. Bulova stated that this is essentially assembling various projects together that will ultimately be used to acquire more federal funding. She observed that VRE is limited to what funding can be provided by NVTA. It will be
important to identify the opportunities that make VRE eligible for funding. She suggested the approach of breaking it into components is beneficial so it creates better opportunities to receive funding.

Mr. Way asked if VRE’s list of priorities will bring the system capacity up to running 8-car trains, which it will. Mr. Allen is also working with Ms. Boxer to develop a financial plan to complement the 2040 System Plan.

Mr. Kelly stated that the ultimate goal is to increase capacity and lengthen the trains to expand service. A question that came up at FAMPO was that millions of dollars are being spent to add the third track to increase capacity, but there is no solid understanding from CSX as to how this translates into increased capacity for VRE. Mr. Allen stated that VRE will begin discussions with CSX to start defining this using a complex modeling process to quantify capacity when the third track is done. Chairman Milde asked if VRE will get more slots before the Long Bridge project is completed. He also wants to know at what phase VRE will be able to run 10-car trains. Mr. Allen stated that the Long Bridge is critical because it is the choke point where trains get backed up. VRE will continue to work on other projects too. Mr. Skinner stated that he would like to see VRE consider express trains from Spotsylvania.

Ms. Bulova stated that the purpose of this discussion was to inform the Operations Board about this issue and it is important to convey to NVTA that the Operations Board had this discussion. She recommended that staff look for opportunities to breakdown the components of the NVTA VRE projects list to make it more fundable by NVTA. Mr. Naddoni stated that the federal funding focuses on core capacity which ties into platform expansions. NVTA is asking for priority of these projects. He stated that if VRE can obtain federal funding for some of these projects maybe VRE should switch up the priority list of projects. Mr. Allen stated that the funding from NVTA can serve as the local match as a target for the federal funding. Ms. Bulova stated that it is important to be strategic.

VRE Riders’ and Public Comment – 7

Mr. Peacock expressed his support of the implementation of the Daily Pass because business travelers are on an expense account and it provides an extra convenience. VRE needs to find ways to fill its trains in the summer with tourists and business travelers. He stated that he is pleased to hear that the Spotsylvania Station construction is moving forward and that there is an RFP out for fencing.

Closed Session – 8

It was determined that a Closed Session was not needed.

Referral of Preliminary FY 2016 Operating and Capital Budget to the Commission – 9A
Mr. Allen stated that Resolution #9A-09-2014 recommends that the Commissions refer the preliminary FY 2016 Operating and Capital Budget to the jurisdictions.

Mr. Shorter briefed the Operations Board on the FY 2016 baseline budget that includes a shortfall of $3.9 million. The CAO Task Force and the Capital Committee will continue to be heavily involved in the budget process as staff seeks to close the budget gap. A balanced budget will be presented at the December Operations Board meeting. Current projections of federal funds are estimated at $21.7 million, which is $6.6 million less than FY 2015. A major project in this budget is the purchase of nine expansion railcars for $23.6 million (28 percent federal funds, 68 percent state and four percent local out of surplus funds). All indications are that reauthorization will provide less funding in FY 2016 compared to FY 2015. The State fiscal cliff remains after FY 2018. State operating funds were estimated at $10.3 million for FY 2015 but VRE was only awarded $9 million. For FY 2016 preliminary state projections are $8.7 million.

Mr. Shorter stated that the Capital budget is $32.8 million. Major assumptions include 19,600 daily ridership. Current ridership is 18,700. This budget does not include a fare or subsidy increase at this time. Service level remains at 34 trains which includes the train added this year to the Fredericksburg line. Mr. Kelly asked what is the basis for adjusting ridership projections to 19,600. Mr. Shorter replied that projections are based on the increased ridership expected from the opening of the Spotsylvania Station.

Mr. Shorter stated that the budget includes funding for additional staff because of expansion requirements and system growth. Staff is working closely with the CAO Task Force on this and will provide them with a detailed justification for each position. The total cost of $585,000 is for five new positions and three cost neutral positions. This would bring the total number of employees from 39 to 47.

In response to a question from Mr. Thomas, Mr. Dalton explained that there is strategic planning underway and one of the proposed positions focuses on addressing Positive Train Control and cyber security. In response to a question from Mr. Cook, Mr. Allen stated that he anticipates that these positions will cover at least 2-3 years. As VRE advances the System Plan, the work load will increase. Mr. Allen stated that VRE runs a lean organization now and to add these positions will give VRE some latitude to get current work done as well as future work.

Mr. Way asked if VRE can afford these positions with a gap in the preliminary proposed budget. Mr. Allen stated that these positions will give VRE the depth that it needs for the next couple of years. There is a budget gap in the preliminary budget, but it will be filled. He stated that VRE needs to lay out the System Plan and show the “whole big picture” to accommodate growth and what it will require.

Mr. Way stated it will be difficult for jurisdictions facing financial constraints. Mr. Allen stated that the budget request will make sure that VRE has the depth to do what it has already committed to do and to prepare for the growth resulting from the System Plan. Mr.
Thomas asked staff to think about prioritizing the positions. Mr. Allen stated that staff would provide this and stated the positions were requested because they were needed. Part of this budget process is to get feedback from the Board and jurisdictions. He feels that it is a little early to put them in a priority list.

Mr. Cook stated that if the Board had an outline of where VRE is going over the next 5-10 years then they could see the whole picture and how these positions could fit into that picture. Mr. Allen gave an example of the work that is needed now. There are more grant requirements that have increased the work load. The Financial Analyst position is needed for current work to ensure VRE is complying with federal and state grant and contract requirements. It is not tied to the System Plan. Each contract and grant agreement needs to be scrutinized to make sure VRE is in compliance. Ms. Boxer stated that virtually everything VRE does uses federal and/or state funds and the requirements have gotten more intense in the last few years. Mr. Kelly stated that it is important to look at this in context and how these are interrelated and how they fit into the overall picture. He stated that is important to identify what is pivotal to keep things moving forward. Mr. Skinner stated that it will impact the future, but a few of these are needed now. Ms. Mitchell stated that it is preferable to not have a subsidy increase since there are cutbacks in state and federal assistance. She also stated that the purpose of the presentation of a preliminary budget is to have the discussion and refer it to the Commissions.

Mr. Jenkins stated that what is important at this meeting is to give guidance to the jurisdictions. Ms. Bulova stated it is preferable to not have a subsidy increase since there are cutbacks in state and federal assistance. She also stated that the purpose of the presentation of a preliminary budget is to have the discussion and refer it to the Commissions.

Mr. Cook stated that staff should have provided this staffing request a month ago. By approving the resolution it is in essence endorsing it. Ms. Bulova said she does not see it as an endorsement, especially since the discussion has been cautionary which should be conveyed to the jurisdictions. She suggested amending the motion to include comment made by the Operations Board.

Ms. Bulova moved, with a second by Mr. Tejada, to approve Resolution #9A-09-2014, with wording “address comments by members of the Operations Board.”

Mr. Cook suggested including language that conveys that the Operations Board will continue to have further discussions at their next meeting. Chairman Milde stated that Stafford County does not want any subsidy increase for its portion of the bill. Mr. Allen stated that he understands the concerns and would work with Board Members and bring this back for more discussion.

Mr. Way stated that each year VRE submits to the Commissions an intentionally unbalanced budget. He suggested including an addendum to the budget that lists the things that VRE is continuing to look at in order to balance the budget (fares, staffing levels, costs.
in general, and building up the reserve). He submitted this as a friendly amendment and Ms. Bulova and Mr. Tejada agreed to include it in the main motion.

Mr. Skinner stated that he would like to hear the rest of the budget briefing including information on the subsidy change. Mr. Kelly stated that some of these questions and issues are political issues that elected officials need to address, while staff’s job is to present a budget of what is needed to operate a good system. He doesn’t have a problem moving this forward with the understanding that that it is a baseline budget. He stated that it is important to have this discussion in public so that riders know what VRE needs to run the system and what won’t be funded.

Mr. Shorter continued with his presentation. He stated that there are five budget items that are driving the shortfall: reductions in federal and state operating assistance, increased train operations, increased staffing positions; and costs associated with Positive Train Control and the Amtrak budget. The next steps are to request the Commissions refer the budget to the jurisdictions. Staff will also bring an amended FY 2015 budget back to the Board for approval in December. Mr. Allen stated that there can be further discussion at the October Board meeting. Mr. Tejada stated that he supports the motion because it allows the process to go forward but gives the Operations Board more opportunity to provide input as the budget moves forward.

Mr. Cook asked when staff anticipates the fare and subsidy discussion. Mr. Shorter stated that those discussions begin immediately with the CAO Task Force. The Operations Board will discuss it again in November. He stated that staff will scrutinize every department budget to fill the gap. A five percent fare increase was recommended in FY 2016 SYIP and would generate $2 million. A subsidy increase of the same percentage was also listed as an option. Mr. Cook stated that this information would have been helpful to have in advance for this discussion and should be included in the addendum.

Mr. Shorter stated that staff could have presented a balanced budget with a fare increase, but staff is still working on looking for ways to reduce the budget gap. Mr. Allen stated that next year staff will bring the budget forward earlier. Staff will also bring it back next month for discussion.

Ms. Boxer stated that the budget process always starts with a budget shortfall and as information comes in, the gap closes. Mr. Smedberg stated that having the information upfront is more helpful. It will be important to have a discussion in October especially because the November meeting may have some quorum issues with the Thanksgiving holiday.

Mr. Way called the question. Ms. Bulova reviewed the motion which would approve the resolution and include “comments by the Operations Board” and add the addendum.

The Board then voted on the motion and it passed. The vote in favor was cast by Board Members Bulova, Cook, Jenkins, Kelley, Milde, Mitchell, Naddoni, Skinner, Smedberg, Tejada, and Way. Mr. Thomas voted no.
Mr. Naddoni also requests staff send the key points in the addendum to the Board as well as a breakdown of FY 2015 subsidies by jurisdictions, which should help everyone get a full picture.

Authorization to Increase Amount for General Engineering Consulting VI Contract – 9B

Mr. Allen stated that the VRE Operations Board is being asked to increase the authorization for General Engineering Consulting VI Contract by $500,000 for a total accumulated value of $5,500,000. Resolution #9B-09-2014 would accomplish this.

Mr. Allen explained that the GEC VI is rapidly approaching the $5 million authorization limit after only 19 months of activity. With the addition of task orders currently pending, the GEC VI authorization is expected to be fully committed by the end of October. Actions have been initiated to procure new GEC contracts, but uninterrupted access to a GEC contract is needed to progress on several important and/or timely projects. Procurement and legal counsel advise it is permissible to increase the accumulated value authorized.

Mr. Kelly moved, with a second by Mr. Thomas, to approve Resolution #9B-09-2014. The vote in favor was cast by Board Members Bulova, Cook, Jenkins, Kelly, Milde, Mitchell, Naddoni, Skinner, Smedberg, Tejada, Thomas and Way.

Authorization to Issue a Request for Proposals for General Planning Consulting I Contract for Project Development Services – 9C

Mr. Allen reported that Resolution #9C-09-2014 would authorize him to issue a RFP for General Planning Consulting Services to support project development. Mr. Allen explained that staff recommends dividing future work into two contracts (GPC 1 for project development services and GEC VII for project implementation services related to construction) in order to provide a broader and more specific assignment of consultant services. The GPC I Contract will be awarded to multiple firms to promote competition and will allow tasks to be assigned based on areas of best expertise and qualifications. This contract will be used to provide general services in support of non-construction related projects for a period of up to five years (one base year with four option years for renewal) or an accumulated value of authorized projects not to exceed $5 million. After proposals are received and evaluated through a competitive process, VRE staff will return to the Operations Board with a recommendation for award.

Mr. Thomas asked if breaking it down into more contracts affects the work load of the contract team. Mr. Allen explained that it is a new procedure but it is being done for several reasons. As part of its triennial review, FTA wants more breakdown on tasks and which firms are best for which tasks. VRE also wants to make a distinction between general engineering and planning contracts as it relates to going to construction because there is a limit on how much can be spent on those kinds of contracts. Mr. Smedberg asked
if this codifies an internal policy or is it specific to these two requests. Mr. Allen replied that it is a new process VRE plans to continue going forward. Mr. Thomas asked if breaking it down by task order accomplishes this. Mr. Allen replied that the distinction is what services lead to construction.

Mr. Kelly moved, with a second by Mr. Cook, to approve Resolution #9C-09-2014. The vote in favor was cast by Board Members Bulova, Cook, Jenkins, Kelly, Milde, Mitchell, Naddoni, Skinner, Smedberg, Tejada, and Way.

Authorization to Issue a Request for Proposals for General Engineering Consulting VII Contract for Project Implementation Services – 9D

Mr. Allen stated that the VRE Operations Board is being asked to authorize him to issue a RFP for General Engineering Consulting services to support project implementation related to construction. Resolution #9D-09-2014 would accomplish this. The GEC VII will encompass a number of engineering and construction services projects in support of the initial stages of the VRE System Plan 2040 as well as the state-of-good-repair maintenance projects. Work will be distributed and managed through task orders. The GEC VII contract will be awarded to multiple firms to promote competition and allow tasks to be assigned based on areas of best expertise and qualifications. GEC VII will be used to procure architectural and professional services in support of construction related projects for a five year term (one base year with four options for renewal) or an accumulated value of authorized projects not to exceed $5 million. A recommendation for award will be presented to the Operations Board following a competitive review process.

Mr. Cook moved, with a second by Mr. Skinner, to approve Resolution #9D-09-2014. The vote in favor was cast by Board Members Bulova, Cook, Jenkins, Kelly, Milde, Mitchell, Naddoni, Skinner, Smedberg, Tejada, Thomas and Way.

Authorization to Issue an Invitation for Bids for Consolidated Security Alarm and Access System Monitoring and Maintenance Services – 9E

Mr. Allen stated that the VRE Operations Board is being asked to approve Resolution #9E-09-2014 which would authorize him to issue an IFB for the purchase of services consolidate the monitoring and maintenance of VRE’s security alarm and access control system for a period of a base year and two option years.

Mr. Allen explained that currently VRE has multiple contractors for these services. The scope of the work for the IFB consolidates system monitoring and maintenance services for all security alarm and security access control functions at all VRE facilities into one contract. This will provide a single point of contact and allow for quicker response times and increased reliability of the security system critical to the daily operations of VRE.
Mr. Cook moved, with a second by Mr. Skinner, to approve Resolution #9E-09-2014. The vote in favor was cast by Board Members Bulova, Cook, Jenkins, Kelly, Milde, Mitchell, Naddoni, Skinner, Smedberg, Tejada, Thomas and Way.

Authorization to Amend the Contract for Passenger Railcars – 9F

Mr. Allen stated that the VRE Operations Board is being asked to recommend that the Commissions authorize him to amend the contract with Sumitomo Corporation of America to place an option order for five additional railcars and increase the contract by $10,545,200, from $36,045,714, plus a contingency of $527,260, for a total amount not to exceed $47,118,174.

Ms. Bulova moved, with a second by Mr. Cook, to approve Resolution #9F-09-2014. The vote in favor was cast by Board Members Bulova, Cook, Jenkins, Kelly, Milde, Mitchell, Naddoni, Skinner, Smedberg, Tejada, Thomas and Way.

Mr. Tejada asked if the funding sources are secure. Ms. Boxer stated that VRE has already received the funding for this project.

Authorization to Issue a Request for Proposals for Engineering and Environmental Services for a Life Cycle Maintenance Facility – 9G

Mr. Allen stated that Resolution #9G-09-2014 will authorize him to issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for engineering, environmental, and limited construction support services necessary to advance a Life Cycle Maintenance Facility and associated track work. In January 2014, the VRE Operations Board adopted a life cycle maintenance strategy for VRE rolling stock. The basis of this strategy is to maintain VRE locomotives and passenger cars at the highest level of reliability throughout the life cycle of the equipment. VRE needs to add a new building fully dedicated to these activities.

Mr. Cook moved, with a second by Mr. Skinner, to approve Resolution #9G-09-2014. The vote in favor was cast by Board Members Bulova, Cook, Jenkins, Kelly, Milde, Mitchell, Naddoni, Skinner, Smedberg, Tejada, Thomas and Way.

Authorization to Amend the Contract for Auditing Services – 9H
Mr. Allen stated that the VRE Operations Board is being asked to authorize him to amend the contract with PBMares, LLP for auditing services to increase the not to exceed contract value by $20,000, from $347,525 to $367,525 for the seven-year term of the contract, including option years. Resolution #9H-09-2014 will accomplish this.

Mr. Cook moved, with a second by Ms. Bulova, to approve Resolution #9H-09-2014. The vote in favor was cast by Board Members Bulova, Cook, Jenkins, Kelly, Milde, Mitchell, Naddoni, Skinner, Smedberg, Tejada, Thomas and Way.

Authorization to Award a Contract for Marketing and Advertising Services – 9I

Mr. Allen stated that the VRE Operations Board is being asked to authorize him to execute a contract with Puslar Advertising of Washington, DC for marketing, advertising, public relations, and web design services for a base period of three years with two option years to be exercised at the CEO’s discretion, in an amount not to exceed $1,680,000 over the five year term beginning October 1, 2014. Resolution #9I-09-2014 would accomplish this.

Mr. Allen stated that best value was deemed to be Puslar Advertising. Mr. Smedberg asked if there were factors or reasons why a Virginia firm was not selected. Mr. Jungwirth stated that Puslar Advertising is a much respected firm and has a subcontractor, Redmon Group, located in Alexandria. They have a lot of transit experience and are well respected. Mr. Tejada stated that Arlington County has been pleased with the work of Pulsar.

Mr. Cook stated that the Board talked previously of staff providing an advanced memo a week before the meeting to provide the list of companies for potential conflict of interests. Ms. Bulova stated that with the General Assembly Conflict of Interest legislation we need to be careful moving forward.

Ms. Bulova moved, with a second by Mr. Nadonni, to approve Resolution #9I-09-2014. The vote in favor was cast by Board Members Bulova, Cook, Jenkins, Kelly, Milde, Mitchell, Naddoni, Skinner, Smedberg, Tejada, Thomas and Way.

Authorization to Amend the VRE Tariff Replacing the Two-Ride Ticket with a Day Pass and Making Other Administrative Edits — 9J

Mr. Allen stated that the VRE Operations Board is being asked to authorize him to amend the VRE Tariff replacing the Two-Ride ticket in the current fare structure with a Day Pass and make minor administrative edits to clarify and update sections dealing with System Safety and Security. Resolution #9J-09-2014 would accomplish this.

The current Two-Ride ticket was originally introduced as a means to allow passengers to make a single purchase for round-trip travel on a given day. The benefit was that a rider
could purchase one ticket instead of two tickets for each way. This led to confusion regarding the need to validate the ticket prior to each ride. Many passengers mistakenly believed that they only had to validate one time in the morning. To eliminate this confusion, the Operations Board is being asked to authorize VRE to replace the Two-Ride ticket with a Day Pass. The Day Pass would be priced the same, but would only need to be validated one time prior to the first ride. The pass would expire at midnight on the day validated.

Mr. Way moved, with a second by Mr. Thomas, to approve Resolution #9J-09-2014. The vote in favor was cast by Board Members Bulova, Cook, Jenkins, Kelly, Milde, Mitchell, Naddoni, Skinner, Smedberg, Tejada, Thomas and Way.

**Update on Jurisdictional Action on the Master Agreement – 10A**

Mr. Allen stated that this item was provided as information on the status of action taken by jurisdictions to approve the Master Agreement Amendment. Currently six jurisdictions have approved the Master Agreement.

**Fredericksburg Mitigation Accommodations – 10B**

Mr. Allen stated that the last time the Master Agreement was amended in 2007, a list of mitigation accommodation projects were approved that dealt with certain projects in different jurisdictions. Mr. Kelly asked that the list be reviewed for Fredericksburg projects not completed and indicated that this issue should be resolved before the current recommended revision to the Mast Agreement is considered by the Fredericksburg City Council for action. Mr. Allen stated that upon review of the list it appears that some additional work at the Fredericksburg station is warranted. In lieu of the original projects, Mr. Kelly has asked that repairing the remainder of the platforms be substituted. Mr. Allen stated that State of Good Repair funding can be used for this purpose. The FY 2016 CIP can be amended to accommodate this. Mr. Kelly gave a brief history. The bridges and station are owned by CSX and they are deteriorating significantly. The City would like VRE to be aware of several issues and wants VRE’s support as it relates to the problems with bridges and station and how to work with CSX to get things done, as well as the $1.6 million restored to the FAMPO budget for planning and engineering for a parking facility. He stated that Fredericksburg is not asking for funding at this time; they just want VRE’s support.

**2014 Customer Service Survey – 10C**

Mr. Henry reported that VRE conducted its annual customer service survey on-board all northern VRE and Amtrak cross-honor trains on the morning of May 7, 2014. He gave a brief overview of the findings of the master customer service survey. In response to a question from Mr. Smedberg, Mr. Henry stated that it was an on-board survey where 6,000
riders participated. Mr. Harf complimented Mr. Henry on the presentation and asked if riders had a reaction to the schedule. Mr. Henry stated that VRE can follow-up with a survey monkey to ask these questions. There is a three hour gap in afternoon service and riders want service during this time.

Mr. Naddoni stated that he has been a rider for almost 10 years. For delays longer than 10 minutes, VRE still needs to communicate better. He gave two examples of major delays. Mr. Henry stated that for one of these incidents there were 130 people stranded on the train but that would have left 800 stranded at Union Station.

Operations Board Members’ Time – 11

There were no comments.

Adjournment

Without objection, Chairman Milde adjourned the meeting at 12:11 A.M.

Approved this 17th day of October, 2014.

________________________________________
Paul Milde
Chairman

________________________________________
Gary Skinner
Secretary
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