1. **Call to Order**

   Chairman Tessitor called the meeting to order at 7:06 PM

2. **Roll Call:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Appointing Entity</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doug Tessitor, Chair</td>
<td>City of Pasadena</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Pedroza, Vice Chair</td>
<td>SGVCOG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisol Rodriguez (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Leon</td>
<td>City of South Pasadena</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fasana</td>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Bowen</td>
<td>Governor of California</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Masuda</td>
<td>City of Pasadena</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Evans</td>
<td>City of South Pasadena</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Wapner</td>
<td>SBCTA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Sandoval</td>
<td>SGVCOG</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Robertson</td>
<td>SBCTA</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Pledge of Allegiance**

   Habib Balian led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. **Public Comments on Items On/Off Agenda**

   Chair Tessitor inquired if there was anyone who wished to provide public comment on items on or off the Agenda – hearing and seeing none, Chair Tessitor closed public comment.
5. **Closed Session**

Chair Tessitor requested that General Counsel Smith provide the report on Closed Session.

General Counsel Smith indicated that the Board would conference with legal counsel pursuant to Government Code section 54956.9(d)(2) regarding Anticipated Litigation – one case.

Chair Tessitor convened the Board into closed session at 7:08 pm.

CONFERECE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - G.C. 54956.9(d)(2)

Anticipated Litigation: one case

Chair Tessitor reconvened the Board Meeting at 7:24 pm.

General Counsel Smith indicated that there was no reportable action as a result of Closed Session.

6. **CEO's Monthly Report**

Mr. Balian reviewed the Critical Path Schedule for Phase 2B which indicated that staff will submit Group 1 CPUC applications by July 2017; issue Request for Bids for DBI (Utilities) in July 2017; Award contract for DB1 in September 2017; issue Request for Qualifications for DB2 (Alignment and parking) in November 2017; complete SCARRA Master Cooperative Agreement by December 2017; process USACE Permits in December 2017; conduct and Industry Review of DB2 in February 2018; finalize BNSF Agreement in April 2018; complete work with the Grade Crossing Working Group by June 2018; finalized Gap Funding for LA County Segment by June 2018; Award DB2 Contract in October 2018 and finalize SBCTA Funding and Construction Agreement by January 2021.

Mr. Balian reminded the Board of the upcoming Groundbreaking Ceremony for the Foothill Gold Line from Glendora to Montclair which will take place on December 2, 2017 @ 9:30 am at Citrus College. Mr. Balian indicated that additional details will be provided shortly.

Item received and filed.
7. Consent Calendar:

   a. Approval of Minutes of Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority Board Meeting held September 27, 2017

   b. Consider approval of Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRRA) Second Interim Work Authorization for a portion of fiscal year (FY) 2018, in an amount not to exceed $400,000 to support the Foothill Gold Line project

Chair Tessitor requested a motion to approve the Consent Calendar. Board Member Fasana requested that Agenda Item 7.b be pulled for discussion and made a motion to approve the remainder of the Consent Calendar which was seconded by Board Member Pedroza and approved unanimously.

Chair Tessitor requested a report on Agenda Item 7.b.

Mr. Balian provided the report. Mr. Balian indicated that SCRAA has requested $400,000 for a work authorization for a portion of the fiscal year 2018. Mr. Balian indicated that SCRAA initial estimate was $2.7 million dollars which was far in excess of prior work.

Board Member Fasan inquired if approving half of the request was appropriate until such time as SCRAA provides an update and a better understanding of the “burn-rate” is provided.

Board Member Bowen inquired if SCRAA is actually doing the work or a consultant. Mr. Burner indicated that the work was being conducted by Rail Pros.

Chair Tessitor inquired as to the relationship with SCRAA. Mr. Balian indicated that under the Trust Agreement with Metro, the Construction Authority holds the title to the land in the right of way and SCRAA is a tenant and has an Operating Agreement with Metro. Mr. Balian indicated that in the Operating Agreement SCRAA has the right to be the review matters concerning their right of way. Mr. Balian noted that SCRAA had spent a total of $900,000 over the previous several years in working with the Construction Authority. Chair Tessitor inquired if there is increased exposure or review than in prior segments. Mr. Burner indicated that while there may be more shared right of way in this phase, the amounts being requested do not correlate when the same work was done in the prior phase.

Board Member Fasana made a motion to approved $200,000 of the $400,000 requested in the report. Board Member Leon seconded the motion.

Chair Tessitor requested a roll-call vote for the item. The Clerk conducted a roll-call vote and the item passed unanimously. (Roll Call Results: Yes: Tessitor, Pedroza, Fasana and Leon; No: None; Absent: Rodriguez)

8. General Board Items:

   a. Receive and File Project Update: Peer Review

Mr. Balian requested Mr. Chris Burner, Chief Project and Planning Officer, to provide the report. Mr. Burner indicated that as a best practice on large projects such as the Foothill
Gold Line, a peer review is conducted as an independent evaluation of the project at some point during the planning phase. Mr. Burner indicated that peer reviews are intended to validate the project’s design/specifications and provide recommendations for improvement.

Mr. Burner indicated that a peer review panel tasked with reviewing the Glendora to Montclair project met during the week of October 9th, and reported that the project is well-conceived, the contract documents are progressing well, and that the known challenges appear to be manageable. Mr. Burner indicated that the peer review panel consisted of senior transit experts from various agencies throughout the country, including representatives from LA County Metro, Sound Transit, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Valley Metro Regional Public Transportation Authority, the Expo Construction Authority, and Hampton Roads Transit. Mr. Burner indicated that the panel offered diverse experience in transit projects, including claims prevention, civil engineering, systems, construction, operations, project management, and safety.

Mr. Burner reviewed the results of the Peer Review Recommendations and summarized the feedback from the Construction Authority staff.

Below is the presentation accompanying the above report.

**Peer Review Panel Members**
- John Coard (Ret.) – Presenting
- Ramesh Dhingra (VTA)
- Tony Raben (Sound Transit)
- Bill Reagan (Explo Construction Authority)
- Bruce Shelburne (LA Metro)
- Jay Yenerich (Valleymetro)

**Summary**
- Overall consensus of the group was that Authority has a good handle on the overall project, particularly with those elements that require more development
- Peer review team did not find any fatal flaws or significant risks that have not already been identified by Authority

**Recommendations: RFQ/RFP Phase Considerations**
- Need to clearly communicate to the bidders which contract documents are prescriptive or for reference. (i.e. Structures)
- Concern with lack of identification of drainage needs
- Require Contractor to provide rail cut-in experience in SOQ
- Assign RFP value/points to project schedule
- Consider making the proposals part of the contract. Glean the betterments and elevating in order of precedence.

**Recommendations: Parking Reduction**
- Consider more real estate for surface parking in lieu of parking structures. Provides future TOD opportunities.
- Consider incorporating findings of Metro parking study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Station</th>
<th>Parking Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>420 (new structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>450 (new structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>600 (new structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>850 (new structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>1,260 (new structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair</td>
<td>1,603 existing (surface lot)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Station</th>
<th>Parking Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>420 (new structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>450 (new structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>600 (new structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>850 (new structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>1,260 (new structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair</td>
<td>1,603 existing (surface lot)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendations: Montclair Goldline Station Status**

- Make operational/systems accommodations for Claremont Station terminus including:
  - Front and Rear Crossovers
  - Tail Tracks
  - Supervisor’s Room
  - Security Kiosk
- Re-evaluate parking demand (more floors may be needed if Claremont is terminus)
- Include a bid alternate for Montclair Station

**Recommendations: Claremont Metrolink Station**

- Spacing of Pomona, Claremont and Montclair very close
- Consider removal of Metrolink Claremont Station
  - Operational improvements for Metrolink
  - Traffic circulation improvement
  - Track geometry greatly improved for both systems
- Pomona is best multi-modal station

**Recommendations: Freight and Metrolink Corridors**

- Consider having the Contractor advance the level of design (60%) of civil and systems of Metrolink/Freight relocation in contractor’s proposal.
  - Potential Freight/Metrolink acceleration
- Hire independent construction scheduler to review if 7 year duration may be compressed.
- Contractor to demonstrate in proposal their plan to maintain freight and Metrolink service. i.e. provide bus bridge, closures, etc.

**Recommendations: Maintenance of Traffic Circulation**

- Full vs. Partial Closures
  - Consider getting agreements with or advancing discussion of full closures with Cities/AVJ prior to issuing final RFP.
- Complete Grade Crossing Study and achieve CPUC approval prior to RFP
- Construction constraints should be identified (i.e. Fair Grounds, Holiday Season, local Special Events)
- Confirmation of Traffic Studies

**Recommendations: Third Party**

- Identify the work needing third party permits and determine what will be required (and when) under DB delivery method
- Form MOUs with Third Parties now
  - Actively manage relationships
  - Dedicate resources
  - Prepare a plan of third party interface to get to RFP, construction, start-up (permits, property, reviews, etc)

**Recommendations: Third Party (Cont.)**

- Recommend partnering between Contractor and Utility Companies
- USACE—Start Now!!!
  - Clarify LA County Flood Control authority
- Multi-Agency Operational Coordination
  - Need Metrolink, Metro, BNSF to buy off on conceptual construction staging plan (Track, signaling, grade crossings, etc.)
  - Operating track construction taskforce
  - Construction Authority to develop linear schedule to aid in communicating staging plan
Board Member Fasana thanked staff for conducting the peer review as it is always helpful to have another set of eyes on the project and process.

Receive and file.

b. **Authorization of the Chief Executive Officer to Issue Construction Request for Qualifications (RFQ) C2002 Phase 2B Alignment Design-Build Project**

Mr. Balian indicated that this is another major milestone in the project.

Mr. Balian introduced Mitch Purcell, Chief Contracting Officer and In-House Counsel, to provide the report. Mr. Purcell indicated that in May 2017, the Construction Authority held an industry workshop to discuss the scope of work and contracting opportunities associated with the Glendora to Montclair extension of the Foothill Gold Line, including information regarding the procurement and scope of the C2002 Phase 2B Alignment Design-Build Project. Mr. Purcell indicated that the next step in the process to procure a design-build team who will design and construct all elements of the project to extend the Foothill Gold Line light rail project from Glendora to Montclair, except for certain utility work under separate contract, is to create a shortlist of design-builders who ultimately will be able to submit proposals to perform the work. Mr. Purcell indicated that the purpose of this RFQ document is to solicit information, in the form of a Statement of
Qualifications (SOQ) from each prospective bidder. Mr. Purcell indicated that these SOQs will be evaluated by an evaluation committee using an adjectival rating method to determine which teams have demonstrated the highest qualifications to successfully deliver the Project in accordance with Authority’s standards and expectations.

Mr. Purcell indicated that the evaluation committee will evaluate the SOQs using the following four evaluation criteria: (1) Related Project Experience; (2) Staffing and Organization; (3) Legal Qualifications; and (4) Financial Qualifications.

Mr. Purcell indicated that while many teams may be well-qualified to perform the work, only a limited number of teams demonstrating the highest qualifications will be included on the shortlist and be eligible to submit proposals in response to the subsequent Request for Proposal (RFP), if any, to be issued by the Authority.

Chair Tessitor requested a motion to Authorize the Chief Executive Officer to Issue Request for Qualifications (RFQ) C2002 Phase 2B Alignment Design-Build Project. Board Member Fasana made a motion to approve the item which was seconded by Board Member Pedroza and approved unanimously.

c. Receive and File: Monthly Update

Mr. Chris Burner provided the Report.

Mr. Burner indicated that with respect to the Glendora to Montclair segment of the project, staff continued to attend coordination meetings with corridor City staff; draft Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) under review; Resubmitted the Aerially Deposited Lead (ADL) Investigation report to Caltrans for approval based on their preliminary comments; Preliminary Hazard Analysis (PHA) under internal review; Threat & Vulnerability Assessment (TVA) under review by stakeholders; Continued geotechnical work (completed testing for phase 2 of 3-phase process, awaiting final reports); submitted package 1 and 2 grade crossing applications to CPUC; continued reviewing comments from Metro, SCRRRA, SBCTA, and corridor cities on the final verification ACE package; continued design of parking facilities and stations; continued updated noise and vibration analysis; finalizing agreement with Golden State Water, AT&T, and Metropolitan Water District and completed Peer Review of the Alignment Project.

Mr. Burner indicated that with respect to the next six to twelve months staff will complete Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment; receive approval from Caltrans on ADL report; complete geotechnical work (phase 3); receive approval of the Type Selection for SR-57 and I-210 from Caltrans; release Alignment industry review package to Metro, SCRRRA, SBCTA, corridor cities and potential design-builders; complete updated noise and vibration analysis; receive approval of CPUC applications; execute MCAs with remaining third parties and obtain USACE permits.

Item received and filed.
9. **General Counsel’s Report**
   None.

10. **Board Member Comments**
    Board Member Fasana congratulated staff on the commencement of the DB2 process, a major milestone in the project.

11. **Adjournment**
    Chair Tessitor adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:03 pm.