

MINUTES
MEETING OF THE SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 6, 2025

[Clerk's note: Except where noted, public, staff and board member comments are paraphrased. The full comment can be heard by reviewing the recording at the [MTS website](#).]

1. Roll Call

Chair Whitburn called the Executive Committee meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. A roll call sheet listing Executive Committee member attendance is attached as Attachment A.

2. Public Comment

Karely Serrano – Representing Mid-City CAN made a verbal statement to the Board during the meeting. Serrano expressed concerns from parents and school officials about the difficult PRONTO youth verification process. Serrano urged the Board to consider a simpler process at the next meeting.

3. Approval of Minutes

Board Member Fernandez moved to approve the minutes of the February 6, 2025, MTS Executive Committee meeting. Board Member Hall seconded the motion, and the vote was 5 to 0 in favor with Board Member Montgomery Steppe and Board Member Elo-Rivera absent.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

4. Orange Line Improvement Project Update (Heather Furey; and Consultant T.Y. Lin)

Heather Furey, MTS Director of Capital Projects, and Davis Holman with T.Y. Lin, presented on the Orange Line improvement project update. They provided details on: project summary, schedule and project updates, project funding, solicitation process, construction contract, other orange line project and next steps

Public Comment

There were no Public Comments.

Committee Comment

Vice Chair Goble began by referring to slide 11, noting that two years ago, the project was 30% complete. Now, two years later, it's at 80% completion, with costs only increasing by \$9 million, approximately a 20% rise from the original estimate. Vice Chair Goble emphasized that it's rare to see a project with such a modest increase in cost and praised the progress as good news. Ms. Furey clarified that the cost increase was \$12 million, not \$9 million. She explained that \$9 million of the increase was due to the escalation in construction costs, as reflected in California's construction index. She also mentioned that the pre-purchasing of materials helped avoid cuts, and the competitive bidding process resulted in the winning bidder being \$1 million under the independent cost estimate. She assured that no design cuts were made. Vice Chair Goble acknowledged the good news of the modest cost increase and that no cuts were made in design or features. He noted the impressive accuracy in predicting material and labor costs and praised the project's management, suggesting that it would be helpful for the Board to be informed that no sacrifices were made in the project's features or design.

Board Member Fernandez asked about the wide variance in cost between the lowest and highest bids, particularly since the highest bid was nearly double the lowest one. He wanted to

understand what factors contributed to this difference. Ms. Furey explained that, based on feedback from the construction community, the wide variance in bids was primarily due to differing estimates about the amount of time required to work without trains operating. One of the biggest cost drivers was a very conservative estimate of two hours of work per night, compared to a more realistic estimate from a company with more experience working with the agency, which expected to get work done on half-hour headways before the full shutdown of the evening.

Board Member Dillard inquired about a specific issue on page 17 regarding the VMS signs. She mentioned receiving inquiries from citizens who were unable to see the trolley arrival times on the signs, which they were accustomed to. Board Member Dillard asked whether there was a way to display some temporary information on the screens to indicate that the issue was being worked on, as people were concerned about when it would be fixed. Ms. Furey acknowledged the issue and explained that there had been glitches with the software that publishes information on the new signs. She assured Board Member Dillard that they were working through these issues and would collaborate with the Marketing team to ensure the right messaging was being communicated. Ms. Furey confirmed that the full installation should be completed by May and expressed hope that the problem would be resolved by then, appreciating the feedback provided.

Action Taken

No action taken. Informational item only.

5. Fiscal Year (FY) 2026 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) (Mike Thompson)

Mike Thompson, MTS Deputy Chief Financial Officer, presented on FY 2026 CIP. He outlined the following information: capital funding levels - proposed FY 2026, guiding principles, Development of the FY 2026 CIP, unconstrained project list, capital project summary proposed Fiscal Year 2026, FY 2026 CIP project highlights: bus revenue vehicles, rail revenue vehicles, FY 2026 CIP – facility & construction projects, rail infrastructure projects, other equipment & installation projects, five-year forecast – SGR, other initiatives, five-year summary and staff's recommendation.

Public Comment

There were no Public Comments.

Committee Comment

Board Member Elo-Rivera asked for clarification regarding the breakdown of funding sources. He noted that while the funding sources were listed, he did not see a clear explanation of the mix of funding for each project, especially when there was a deficit that MTS needed to fill. He asked whether any of these projects had general fund allocations. Mr. Thompson responded that no general fund money was being used to fill project gaps. He explained that the agency starts with a formula for sharing funds between operations and capital and then builds from available capital funding. He clarified that certain funding sources, like federal and TDA, have fewer restrictions, while specific grants for projects, such as the Orange Line Improvement Project, must be used for their designated purpose. Ms. Cooney added that there are restrictions with general funding, where allocations cannot be spent entirely on operations, only preventative maintenance. Board Member Elo-Rivera expressed that it would be helpful to understand the mix of funding sources for each project and how decisions are made regarding which projects are chosen. He emphasized that it would be useful to distinguish between

projects funded by competitive grants versus those funded through discretionary choices. He also asked for clarification on which projects were not specifically grant-funded but were prioritized by the agency. Ms. Cooney acknowledged Board Member Elo-Rivera's request and explained that some grants are very specific, such as a mural project in Chula Vista, which was funded based on the agency's own initiatives rather than a state of good repair need. She assured that they could provide more clarity on which projects were funded through competitive versus discretionary grants and would work to break this down for the Board.

Board Member Elo-Rivera then asked about the Stadium Station Platform project, which had been listed as unfunded for FY 2026, and requested clarification on what that meant. He asked if this indicated that the work would not happen or if the project was just deferred due to lack of funding. Mr. Thompson explained that the Stadium Station Platform project had been submitted but deferred due to insufficient funding. Ms. Furey provided additional details about the project, mentioning that the platform, which used a lightweight concrete product called lithocrete, had been cracking over time due to vibrations from the station structure. The project to replace it had been delayed, but they were also exploring alternative materials that might perform better in that environment. Board Member Elo-Rivera asked about the maintenance frequency. Ms. Furey replied that at a minimum there has been one replacement in the past 10 years.

Board Member Elo-Rivera then followed up by asking about the potential for a digital billboard at the Stadium Station to help fund improvements and upkeep. He suggested that with the stadium becoming a busier area, this could be a viable option for generating revenue. Karen Landers, MTS General Counsel, responded that while the idea of a digital billboard had been considered, there were legal issues to investigate regarding the agency's rights to place a billboard at the stadium. She agreed to work with staff to clarify the legal aspects and see if this opportunity could be pursued.

Board Member Elo-Rivera raised a final question about the transit amenities, noting that he could not see a clear breakdown of specific improvements in the documents. He asked for a list of these amenities to help the Board make more informed decisions when allocating funds to these projects. Ms. Cooney explained that a transit amenities study was ongoing and that the listed amount in the documents was a placeholder for funding projects once the board approves the amenities policy. She clarified that, similar to the previous SELT process, this would allow the agency to begin funding projects immediately once the policy was in place, though a clearer list of amenities would be provided once the policy was finalized. Board Member Elo-Rivera expressed the need for a clear list of amenities to help the Board make informed decisions on funding allocations, as the current lack of clarity made the process feel vague. He acknowledged that this issue wouldn't be resolved immediately but emphasized its importance for future decision-making.

Board Member Fernandez sought clarification on the federal funding, asking if it could be confirmed with certainty that funds had been awarded and would be disbursed. Ms. Cooney replied that she could not provide certainty because transit agencies have not received guidance from the Department of Transportation. Board Member Fernandez asked staff to include that detail in the upcoming Board presentation.

Vice Chair Goble asked for clarification on the bus procurement plan, specifically how much of the \$54 million in FY 26 was allocated for CNG buses and how much for ZEBs. He noted that the \$54 million seemed to cover CNG procurements for FY 26. Mr. Thompson confirmed. Vice Chair Goble questioned whether future years were placeholders due to uncertainties around credits and rules. Mr. Thompson explained that the decisions for future years were made on a

year-by-year basis, with plans being formed as new information about credits and regulations became available. The amounts for future years were placeholders to reflect the anticipated need for a large sum of money for procurement. Vice Chair Goble then asked if the dollar amounts were based on a worst-case scenario, assuming each ZEB cost \$1.2 million, and inquired if the budget was averaged across the years. Mr. Thompson informed that the figures were smoothed out, with some carryover funds expected from the previous fiscal year, making the average cost of each bus around \$1 million. Vice Chair Goble also inquired about the electrical charging infrastructure required for the electric buses. He clarified that the assumption was the buses would be electric, and the necessary infrastructure would need to be in place before further electric bus purchases could be made. Mr. Thompson confirmed that the fleet plan was based on a requirement to purchase 50% electric buses starting the following year, though adjustments could be made as needed.

Board Member Hall began by asking about the progress of other state agencies in transitioning to electric buses, particularly regarding the 50% requirement for future purchases. He noted that the challenge was financial, as larger agencies like those in Orange County and Oakland were already pushing back, stating they could not afford the transition. Mike Wygant, Chief Operating Officer for San Diego Transit (bus division), responded by explaining that, as part of a statewide task force, he had been in discussions with the California Air Resources Board (CARB) about the difficulties agencies face. He mentioned that the technology for electric buses was available but costly, and that some agencies were struggling to meet the new regulations, with some even considering reducing service to continue the transition.

Board Member Hall further inquired about the 12-year service life limit for buses and what would happen if buses were kept for 14 or 15 years. He wanted to understand the implications of extending the life of the buses beyond the prescribed limit. Mr. Wygant explained that any vehicle receiving federal funding was required to pass a certification process, called Altura, which ensured that it would meet a minimum service life, typically 12 years or 500,000 miles. He also noted that the agency had kept buses past their useful life in the past, which resulted in higher maintenance costs and a decrease in service reliability, especially for the larger 60-foot buses. Ms. Cooney asked about the requirement to replace CNG tanks after a certain number of years. Mr. Wygant clarified that while earlier CNG tanks had a 12-year lifespan, current tanks were certified for 20 years. He pointed out that running a bus for 20 years, especially under MTS's heavy-duty cycle, would significantly impact maintenance and operational costs. Board Member Hall concluded by emphasizing his concern about balancing the budget. He expressed a preference for extending the life of buses rather than cutting service, given the financial constraints, and reiterated his frustration over the lack of available funding for the needed transition to zero emission vehicles.

Vice Chair Goble asked about the lifespan of the batteries in the ZEBs, specifically inquiring whether the batteries would last for 12 years or if additional costs would be required for replacements. He noted that the buses had been in service since 2019 and wanted to understand the longevity of the batteries. Mr. Wygant responded that after six years of service and less than 200,000 miles on the buses, the battery degradation had been minimal. He explained that the industry expected the batteries to lose performance after 12 years, and at that point, the agency would need to decide whether to replace the batteries or reassign the buses to routes that required less range. Vice Chair Goble asked for clarification on the warranty period for the batteries. Mr. Wygant clarified that the warranty for the batteries typically lasted five years, although there might be some variation depending on the specific components of the propulsion system.

Chair Whitburn asked for a reminder on when the results or recommendations from the transit amenities study would be available. Ms. Cooney stated that a grant is being pursued for the study. The award of the study contract was expected in the fall of 2025. She stated that it would not be a lengthy study and mentioned that the Board would select the consultant for the project once it was ready. Chair Whitburn expressed appreciation for the digital advertising efforts finding them effective and useful.

Action Taken

Chair Whitburn moved to forward a recommendation to the MTS Board of Directors to: 1) Approve the FY 2026 CIP with the estimated federal and non-federal funding levels (Attachments A and B). As the federal appropriation figures are finalized and/or other project funding sources become available, allow the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to identify and adjust projects for the adjusted funding levels; and 2) Recommend that the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Board of Directors approve the submittal of Federal Section 5307, 5337, and 5339 applications for the MTS FY 2026 CIP; and 3) Recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve amendment number 5 of the 2025 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) in accordance with the FY 2026 CIP recommendations. Board Member Elo-Rivera seconded the motion, and the vote was 6 to 0 in favor with Board Member Montgomery Steppe absent.

6. Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 Operating Budget Midyear Amendment (Gordon Meyer)

Gordon Meyer, MTS Manager of Financial Planning, presented on FY 2025 Operating Budget Midyear Amendment. He outlined: revenue assumptions: levels, revenue, other revenue, federal revenues, sales tax revenues, State Transit Assistance (STA), Senate Bill (SB) 125, revenue summary, expense assumptions – personnel, expense assumptions - outside services, expense assumptions – energy, expense assumptions – other, expenses summary, consolidated revenues less expenses, budget development calendar and staff's recommendation.

Public Comment

There were no Public Comments.

Committee Comment

Vice Chair Goble referenced slide number 3 and asked about the fare enforcement changes that began on February 1 and the estimated 11 cents increase per passenger related to the fare. He wanted to know the breakdown between passengers who had funds loaded onto their PRONTO cards and those who had to buy tickets. Ms. Landers explained that while there wasn't enough data to be very specific, staff had noticed an increase in fare payments since the February 1 deadline. More people were tapping before boarding, which resulted in an extra \$20,000 a day in revenue, though this had slightly decreased over time. She added that 6% of tickets issued in the first two weeks had already been paid, had one-time waivers requested, or were under appeal. She emphasized that the goal of fare enforcement was not to generate revenue from fines but to encourage passengers to pay before boarding. Vice Chair Goble clarified that if people had funds loaded but weren't tapping their cards, that represented a different situation than those who couldn't afford the fare at all. He emphasized the importance of understanding the dynamics behind the enforcement. Ms. Cooney confirmed that enforcement mainly occurred on the trolley, where there had been a significant increase in people purchasing one-way paper tickets. Mr. Thompson stated that they could track whether the PRONTO cards had funds but had not been tapped, which would offer further insights into

the issue. Vice Chair Goble noted the philosophical policy implications of fare enforcement, asking for a breakdown of how many riders were economically challenged and how many simply hadn't tapped their cards, as this was an important distinction. Mr. Thompson mentioned that the 11-cent increase was based on just a few weeks of data, and more accurate figures would be available after a full 120-day period. Ms. Landers added that trends of 6 months or more would create a better analysis narrative. Vice Chair Goble agreed that waiting for a few months to gather more data would be ideal.

Vice Chair Goble then moved on to slide 13, asking about the wages and hiring targets, especially regarding the challenge of filling positions. Mr. Meyer explained that there was no significant issue with filling operator positions and that recent driver classes had around 35 participants. He mentioned the \$2 per hour wage increase for operators a couple of years ago, as well as recent wage adjustments, and indicated that they had not encountered major challenges in attracting applicants since then. Vice Chair Goble expressed relief that hiring issues were not a concern. He asked for a long-range outlook on wages, to determine if the agency was competitive in the market or needed to continue raising wages.

Vice Chair Goble referenced slide 16 and asked why sums under Other Services were expensed and not part of a capital program. Mr. Meyer explained that certain expenses, such as maintenance and replacement of CCTV cameras, were now categorized as operating expenses rather than capitalized costs because they didn't result in new assets. He clarified that this shift had been happening over the past few years to better align with accounting standards.

Chair Whitburn commended staff's expense projection and noted that the expense projection was accurate. He noted that factors under the agency's control, such as ridership, revenue, and digital advertising, performed well. He did note that sales tax revenue, which is outside the agency's control, posed challenges. Ms. Cooney asked the Committee about their preferred level of detail that staff should use for the Board presentation on the FY25 operating budget. The Committee instructed staff to simplify the information for the Board presentation.

Action Taken

Chair Whitburn moved to forward a recommendation to the MTS Board of Directors to enact Resolution No. 25-01 amending the FY 2025 operating budget for MTS, San Diego Transit Corporation (SDTC), San Diego Trolley, Inc. (SDTI), MTS Contract Services, and the Coronado Ferry. Vice Chair Goble seconded the motion, and the vote was 5 to 0 in favor with Board Member Montgomery Steppe and Board Member Dillard absent.

7. Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) Scope of Work & Selection Process

(Brent Boyd and Brianda Diaz)

Brent Boyd, MTS Director of Planning and Scheduling, and Brianda Diaz, MTS Procurement Specialist, presented on the COA Scope of Work & Selection Process. They outlined: the project management, scope of work, task 1 through 5, consultant selection process, consultant selection schedule and the overall COA timeline.

Public Comment

There were no Public Comments.

Committee Comment

Chair Whitburn asked staff to include prepared material deliverables to present to the Ad Hoc committee. Mr. Boyd confirmed they will plan for those presentations.

Board Member Elo-Rivera inquired about how the analysis would be presented to the Board, stressing the importance of addressing the human impacts of any proposed changes, which he felt wasn't explicitly mentioned. He also asked about exploring potential revenue opportunities through tourist-specific service routes, given the region's popularity with tourists. He wondered if MTS could leverage its position as a tourist destination to help supplement its budget and better serve San Diego residents. Board Member Elo-Rivera further clarified that he was interested in whether MTS could compete with for-profit companies running similar routes. He acknowledged that there were regulations around charter services but suggested that MTS could explore running specific routes with higher fares for tourists. He emphasized that this would not only benefit tourists but also bring revenue back to MTS, potentially improving services for residents.

Ms. Cooney stated that the agency incorporates all ridership in its assessment, whether it's tourist-driven or specific to certain industries like NASCO. This will be considered as we analyze the segmentation of each route. For example, we'll examine routes like the 992, which serves both airport employees and tourists. Staff also considered beach routes, where we increased service in the summer due to the influx of people. Board Member Elo-Rivera clarified that he was asking if MTS could potentially compete with for-profit companies running tourist transport services. He wanted to know if MTS could operate similar routes for profit, rather than just subsidizing routes for tourists. Ms. Landers clarified that federal rules prevent MTS from running one-time trips or charter services, as these were the domain of private companies. MTS could operate fixed-route services, but these would have to be more expensive and not part of the regional transit pass system. While staff could explore this, it would be difficult to avoid directly competing with private businesses.

Board Member Elo-Rivera followed up by asking if higher-cost routes could be designed separately from the regular fare system and specifically targeted at tourists, without competing with private companies. Ms. Cooney confirmed that higher-cost routes for tourists could be designed separately from the regular fare system. However, it was a complex issue. They would have to ensure that these routes didn't compete with private companies, and it was crucial to avoid draining MTS resources while ensuring profitability. Board Member Elo-Rivera agreed and clarified that his main point was whether MTS could replicate routes already being run profitably by private companies. If this was possible, MTS could profit and use that revenue to benefit the general fund and improve services for riders. He recognized it was theoretical but wanted to ensure they were considering ways to leverage tourism for the benefit of San Diego residents. Ms. Landers responded by stating that there was no need to make changes to the COA scope to explore this idea. They could research models from other areas to see if any were relevant, and staff could separately investigate it alongside the current analysis. Mr. Boyd stated that tourism was part of a major market that the agency would serve. Board Member Elo-Rivera understood the response and reiterated that he the goal was to ensure tourists used MTS, benefiting residents, but without subsidizing routes just for tourists.

Board Member Hall rephrased Board Member Elo-Rivera's suggestion and thought that MTS might need a rapid bus service from downtown to major tourist spots like SeaWorld or the zoo. These routes could serve tourists while benefiting the broader community.

Board Member Elo-Rivera confirmed that the idea was to replicate profitable routes run by private companies. If MTS could run those routes, it could generate revenue to support the general fund and improve services for riders. He asked staff to create an analysis so the Board could better understand the viability.

Vice Chair Goble asked if the operational analysis included any aspirational elements, such as opportunities MTS might not currently be taking advantage of. He referred to slide 7, specifically the second bullet point about assessing existing and future transit demand and travel patterns for each market. He inquired whether the analysis considered military transportation needs, sharing that he had toured all the military installations in the county the previous year. Vice Chair Goble highlighted that people at Point Loma were interested in seeing ferry service return, and that approximately 20,000 people entered through the front gate at 32nd Street. His question was whether military transit demand could be considered in the aspirational analysis for future service expansion. Mr. Boyd confirmed that aspirational elements would be part of the analysis, particularly in Task 4, where additional funding could be used to expand services. Task 1, however, was focused on evaluating current services, identifying gaps, and gathering information. Mr. Boyd acknowledged that increasing service to military bases and studying related travel patterns would be an opportunity for future exploration. Vice Chair Goble also suggested contacting the SANDAG military working group, which coordinates the military installations, as they have a liaison who could facilitate discussions on transit needs for the military. Mr. Boyd added that they had recently met with the Navy to discuss their downtown headquarters and return-to-work plans, and that MTS was already working with military groups on various transit-related matters. Vice Chair Goble thanked staff for their response and appreciated the ongoing collaboration with military groups regarding transit solutions.

Board Member Elo-Rivera suggested that a ferry service from the airport to the new Gaylord Resort in Chula Vista, with a stop at the Rady Shell, could appeal to tourists and generate revenue for MTS. Ms. Cooney explained that the ferry concept was part of the Elevate 2020 plan and would be revisited in Task 3. She agreed it could serve both residents and tourists while offering potential revenue for MTS. Ms. Cooney shared an example of a shuttle system in Washington D.C. and noted that the San Diego Bay had been underutilized for public transportation despite its potential.

Action Taken

No action taken. Informational item only.

OTHER ITEMS

8. Review of Draft March 13, 2025 Board Agenda

Recommended Consent Items

3. Approval of Minutes

Action would approve the February 13, 2025 Board of Director meeting minutes.

4. CEO Report

5. **Kearny Mesa Transit Center – Property Purchase**
Agenda Item will be provided prior to Board Meeting.
6. **Orange Line Variable Message Signs (VMS) Replacements – Contract Amendment**
Action would authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to: 1) Approve up to \$150,000 contingency for future contract change orders to ensure construction progresses to completion without delay, under MTS Doc. No. PWL393.0-24, with Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. (Balfour Beatty), for Orange Line VMS replacements; and 2) Ratify PWL393.1-24, with Balfour Beatty, for Orange Line VMS replacements in the amount of \$54,006.73 to add a 1 double sided VMS for the new Copper Line, add a media converter to each VMS sign, and include VMS signs for the Green Line Platform at the 12th and Imperial Transit Center; and 3) Ratify PWL393.2-24, with Balfour Beatty, for Orange Line VMS replacements in the amount of \$87,089.87 to rewire power and data for Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) systems located on existing VMS poles. The change order provides funding for modifications to up to 30 CCTV installations.
7. **Orange Line (OL) Phase 1 Construction – Contract Award**
Action would authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute MTS Doc. No. PWL409.0-25, to Stacy and Witbeck, Inc. (Stacy and Witbeck), for the OL Phase 1 Construction in the amount of \$26,890,732.50 plus 10% contingency.
8. **Pyramid Building Improvements – Work Order Agreement**
Action would authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute Work Order No. WOA352-AE-27 to MTS Doc No. PWL352.0-22, with HDR Engineering, Inc. (HDR), in the amount of \$329,608.51 for the Pyramid Building Improvements design project.
9. **Board Policy No. 59, “Natural Gas and Energy Commodity Hedge Policy” – Policy Revisions**
Action would approve the proposed revisions to MTS Board Policy No. 59, “Natural Gas and Energy Commodity Hedge Policy”.
10. **Purchase of Class A, B, and Z1 Paratransit Vehicles – Contract Award**
Action would authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute: 1) MTS Doc. B0775.0-25, with Model 1 Commercial Vehicles, Inc. for the purchase of two (2) battery powered Class Z1 Paratransit Vehicles in the amount of \$291,539.60. 2) MTS Doc. B0776.0-25, with Model 1 Commercial Vehicles, Inc. for the purchase of ten (10) propane powered Class B Paratransit Vehicles in the amount of \$2,112,034.50. 3) MTS Doc. B0777.0-25, with Model 1 Commercial Vehicles, Inc. for the purchase of twenty (20) gas powered Class A Paratransit Vehicles in the amount of \$3,167,236.35.
11. **Investment Report – Quarter Ending December 31, 2024**
12. **12th and Imperial Transit Center Rehabilitation Design Amendment 1 – Work Order Amendment**
Action would authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute Work Order WOA353-AE-08.01 under MTS Doc No. PWL353.0-22, with Dokken Engineering (Dokken), in the amount of \$435,963.92, to provide 30% engineering design services for the 12th and Imperial Transit Center Rehabilitation Design (Amendment 1 to Work Order).

- 13. Fire Extinguisher Maintenance and As-Needed Repairs – Contract Award**
Action would authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute MTS Doc. No. PWG428.0-25, to Fire Technology and Solutions, for the provision of fire extinguisher maintenance and as needed repair services for a period of five (5) years in the amount of \$156,485.24.
- 14. On-Call Job Order Contracting (JOC) Railroad Construction Services – Contract Amendment**
Action would authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute Amendment No. 4 MTS Doc. No. PWG348.4-22 with Veterans Engineering Services, Inc., (Veterans), a Disabled Veterans Business Enterprise (DVBE), for an increase in capacity to the Railroad Construction Services JOC in the amount of \$4,800,000.00.
- 15. Broadway & C Street Wheel Counter and Signal Replacement – Contract Award**
Action would authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute contract MTS Doc No. PWL394.0-24, with Modern Railway Systems, Inc., in the amount of \$673,396.00 for the replacement of the existing wheel counters and signaling systems located at Broadway and C Street.
- 16. Modernization of Stadium Trolley Station Elevator – Change Order**
Action would authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to: 1) Ratify Contract Change Order (CCO) 01 under MTS Doc No. PWG347.0-22 to Work Order MTSJOC347-21.01, with ABC General Contracting Inc. (ABCGC), in the amount of \$149,867.29 for the additional cost to install a Sapphire Novec Fire Suppression System in the elevator control room at the Stadium Trolley Station; and 2) Authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to approve CCO 02 under MTS Doc No. PWG347.0-22, to Work Order MTSJOC347-21.02, with ABCGC, in the amount of \$144,022.59 to provide additional elevator revisions and smoke dampers as required by the State Fire Marshal.
- 17. Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) Accident Repair Services - Contract Award**
Action would authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute MTS Doc. No. L1693.0-25 with Carlos Guzman, Inc. (CG, Inc.), a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE), for the provision of LRV accident repair services, for five (5) years, in the amount of \$28,998,544.20.
- 18. Purchase of 24 Class C Propane Powered Medium Duty Mini Buses – Contract Amendment**
Action would authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute MTS Doc. No. B0744.1-22 with Model 1 Commercial Vehicles, Inc. (Model 1) in the amount of \$153,763.20 to change the seating on twenty-four (24) Class C Propane Powered Medium Duty Mini Buses.
- 19. Elevator Maintenance at San Diego State University Transit Center – Operations and Maintenance Agreement Amendment**
Action would authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute Amendment No. 2 to the Operation and Maintenance Agreement with San Diego State University (SDSU), MTS Doc. No. M6644.2-06, regarding elevator maintenance at the SDSU Transit Center.

20. Property Insurance Renewal

Agenda Item will be provided prior to Board Meeting.

21. Excess General Liability (Liability) and Excess Workers' Compensation (Workers' Compensation) Insurance Renewal

Agenda Item will be provided prior to Board Meeting.

9. Other Staff Communications and Business

Vice Chair Goble commended the Marketing team for its videography production.

10. Committee Member Communications and Other Business

There was no Committee Member Communications and Other Business discussion.

11. Next Meeting Date

The next Executive Committee meeting is scheduled for April 10, 2025, at 9:00 a.m.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:19 a.m.

/S/ Stephen Whitburn
Chairperson
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

/S/ Dalia Gonzalez
Clerk of the Board
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

Attachment: A. Roll Call Sheet

SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

ROLL CALL

MEETING OF (DATE): March 6, 2025 CALL TO ORDER (TIME): 9:02 a.m.
 RECESS: _____ RECONVENE: _____
 CLOSED SESSION: _____ RECONVENE: _____
 PUBLIC HEARING: _____ RECONVENE: _____
 ORDINANCES ADOPTED: _____ ADJOURN: 11:19 a.m.

REPRESENTING	BOARD MEMBER		ALTERNATE		PRESENT (TIME ARRIVED)	ABSENT (TIME LEFT)
Chair	Whitburn	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Alternate	<input type="checkbox"/>	9:02 a.m.	11:19 a.m.
City of San Diego	Elo-Rivera	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Whitburn	<input type="checkbox"/>	9:16 a.m.	11:19 a.m.
County of San Diego	Montgomery Steppe	<input type="checkbox"/>	VACANT	<input type="checkbox"/>	ABSENT	ABESENT
East County	Vaus	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hall	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9:02 a.m.	11:19 a.m.
SANDAG Transportation Committee	Dillard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fernandez	<input type="checkbox"/>	9:02 a.m.	10:37 a.m.
South Bay	Fernandez	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fleming	<input type="checkbox"/>	9:02 a.m.	11:19 a.m.
Vice Chair	Goble	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Alternate	<input type="checkbox"/>	9:02 a.m.	11:19 a.m.

SIGNED BY THE CLERK OF THE BOARD: /S/ Dalia Gonzalez