TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING
AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23, 2016
6:00 p.m. (or immediately after IVRMA or LTA)

County of Imperial Administration Center
Board of Supervisors Chambers
940 W. Main Street, Second Floor
El Centro, CA 92243

CHAIR: JAMES PREDMORE       VICE CHAIR: DOUG COX

Individuals wishing accessibility accommodations at this meeting, under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), may request such accommodations to aid hearing, visual, or mobility impairment by contacting ICTC offices at (760) 592-4494. Please note that 48 hours advance notice will be necessary to honor your request.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

II. EMERGENCY ITEMS
   A. Discussion/Action of emergency items, if necessary.

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Any member of the public may address the Commission for a period not to exceed three minutes on any item of interest not on the agenda within the jurisdiction of the Commission. The Commission will listen to all communication, but in compliance with the Brown Act, will not take any action on items that are not on the agenda.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR
   (Executive Director recommends approval of consent calendar items)
   A. Approval of ICTC Board Draft Minutes: February 24, 2016 Pages 4-17
   B. Receive and File:
      1. ICTC Management Committee Draft Minutes: March 9, 2016
      2. ICTC TAC Minutes: February 24, 2016
      3. ICTC SSTAC Minutes: February 3, 2015

ICTC Management Committee met on March 9, 2016 and forwards this item to the Commission for review and approval after public comment, if any:

   1. Receive and file the Specific Transit Operator Fiscal Reports; Med Express and West Shores Dial-A-Ride for the Imperial County Transportation Commission for FY 2014-15

CITIES OF BRAWLEY, CALEXICO, CALIPATRIA, EL CENTRO, HOLTVILLE, IMPERIAL, WESTMORLAND,
IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT AND COUNTY OF IMPERIAL
D. Specific Transit Operator Fiscal Reports FY 2014-15 for IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT

ICTC Management Committee met on March 9, 2016 and forwards this item to the Commission for review and approval after public comment, if any:

1. Receive and file the Specific Transit Operator Fiscal Reports; IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT for the Imperial County Transportation Commission for FY 2014-15

V. REPORTS

A. ICTC Executive Director
   - See attached Executive Director Report on page 71

B. Southern California Association of Governments
   - See attachments on page 76 for the following items:
     - SCAG 2016 General Assembly and Regional Conference Save the Date Postcard
     - SCAG Executive Director Monthly Report March 2016
     - SCAG & County Transportation Commissions Comment Letter on “Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA” to Implement SB 743
     - SCAG 27th Annual Demographic Workshop -The Continued Rise of the Millennials Save the Date Postcard
     - SCAG Support Letter – Calexico West LPOE Phase II Project

C. California Department of Transportation – District 11
   - See attached report on page 90

D. Commission Member Reports

VI. ACTION CALENDAR

A. Applications for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5311 Program Funds FY 2015-16

ICTC Management Committee met on March 9, 2016 and forwards this item to the Commission for review and approval after public comment, if any:

1. Adopt the attached resolution authorizing the Executive Director to sign the FTA 5311 FY 2015-16 grant application and all supporting documentation, and, submit the application to Caltrans.

B. Imperial County Safe Routes to School Regional Master Plan

ICTC Management Committee met on March 9, 2016 and forwards this item to the Commission for review and approval after public comment, if any:

1. Review and adopt the Imperial County Safe Routes to School Regional Master Plan

VII. NEXT MEETING DATE AND PLACE

A. The next meeting of the Imperial County Transportation Commission will be held on Wednesday, April 27, 2016 at 6:00 p.m., at the County of Imperial Board Chambers, at 940 W. Main Street, El Centro, CA.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Motion to adjourn
IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. APPROVAL OF BOARD DRAFT MINUTES:
   FEBRUARY 24, 2016

B. RECEIVE AND FILE:
   1. ICTC MANAGEMENT DRAFT MINUTES:
      MARCH 9, 2016
   2. ICTC DRAFT TAC MINUTES:
      FEBRUARY 24, 2016
   3. ICTC SSTAC MINUTES:
      FEBRUARY 3, 2016
The following action minutes are listed as they were acted upon by the Imperial County Transportation Commission and as listed on the agenda for the meeting held Wednesday February 24, 2016 together with staff reports and related documents attached thereto and incorporated therein by reference.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL
Chair Predmore called the Commission meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

II. EMERGENCY ITEMS
There were none.

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS
There were none.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR
A motion was made by Walker and seconded by Hurtado to approve the consent calendar, Motion carried unanimously.

A. Approved ICTC Board Draft Minutes: January 27, 2016
B. Received and Filed:
   2. ICTC TAC Draft Minutes: January 28, 2016
   3. ICTC SSTAC Minutes: January 6, 2016

V. REPORTS
A. ICTC Executive Director

Mr. Baza and staff had the following announcements:
- On January 15th, SeaPort Airlines announced that it will discontinue all scheduled service to destinations in California and Mexico as of 11:59 pm on January 15, 2016. According to their press release, the company was forced to take this action because of the impact on SeaPort’s business and operations following the effects of
the shortage of airline pilots in the United States. Stations will be closed and service is to be ceased at the following California cities: Imperial, Burbank, Sacramento, San Diego, and Visalia, as well as, San Felipe, BC, Mexico. The U.S. DOT issued an emergency RFP that closed on February 3, 2016. Three proposals were received. The proposals received were from Mokulele Airlines, Boutique Air, Inc. and Great Lakes Aviation, Ltd.

- The City of El Centro is supporting the proposal from Mokulele Airlines. They are a Hawaii based inter-island carrier and propose aircraft similar to Sea Port with service to LAX and interoperability with Alaska, Air New Zealand and potential for others coming online.
- The County of Imperial is supporting Boutique Air Inc. They are headquartered in San Francisco and has been in operation since 2007 as a charter service provider, and operating as a commuter operator since 2014. Boutique proposes an 8-9 seat, modern, pressurized Pilatus PC-12 aircraft, with a term of 2 years, and 24 nonstop roundtrips to LAX, and one potential roundtrip to Phoenix.
- The third proposer was Great Lakes Aviation, Ltd and is based in Cheyenne, Wyoming. They have been in operation for over 30 years. Great Lakes proposes 14 roundtrip flights from Imperial to Los Angeles and 14 roundtrip flights from Visalia to Los Angeles in Beech 1900-D aircraft.

- Every three years, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) conducts an intensive review of practices and procedures to determine compliance with twenty-one (21) areas for the continued use of federal transit grant funding. The FTA review team visited ICTC on February 9th and 10th, 2016. ICTC staff received a comprehensive site review package for the on-site portion of the review. The FTA review team visited transfer terminals and the bus operations yard, and talked with staff from ICTC, Brawley, Imperial and El Centro and Imperial Valley Transit (IVT). The final draft report is anticipated within 30 days. The review was intensive and we received positive feedback on many of our requirements with minor direction for improvements.
- Guillermo Gonzalez, the recently hired Regional Mobility Coordinator was introduced at the meeting.
- The second Unmet Transit Needs (UTN) meeting will be held at the City of Brawley Council Chambers located at 383 Main Street on March 16, 2016 and will begin at 3:30 p.m.
- A complete list of ICTC updates can be found on Page 21 of the agenda.

B. Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)

Mr. San Miguel had the following announcements:
- The deadline to submit a SCAG Sustainability Award is March 1, 2016 at 2 p.m. Sustainability Awards recognize excellence in green region, active transportation and integrated planning. The award winners will be notified in late March, with an Awards Program to be held at the SCAG General Assembly on March 5-6, 2016 in La Quinta.
- The SCAG scholarship program is accepting applications from students that are Junior/Seniors in high school with a GPA of 3.0 or higher. The deadline to submit an application is April 1, 2016. For more information go to: [http://scag.ca.gov/opportunities/Pages/ScholarshipProgram.aspx](http://scag.ca.gov/opportunities/Pages/ScholarshipProgram.aspx)

C. California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

Mr. Figge had the following updates and announcements:
- The signal posts are up on SR-78 and Hovley Road in Brawley for the Traffic Signal Project. Crews were busy raising four posts for the new traffic signals and two posts
for flashing beacons. Work will continue next week to install the electrical connections. The job is on track to be completed and the new traffic signals activated in March.

- Caltrans initiated a traffic investigation to review field conditions, collision history and traffic collision reports for the intersection of SR-115/Worthington Road in Holtville. The investigation analysis resulted in the recommendation of signing and pavement marking enhancements which are being installed in the next couple of months at different times.

- Caltrans District 11 will host the 2016 Imperial Transportation Update/Interstate 8 Update Project Groundbreaking Ceremony on Wednesday, Feb. 24 at noon. The event will take place in front of the new El Centro Maintenance Station at 1102 Montenegro Street in El Centro in Imperial County. Featured speakers are Caltrans District 11 Director Laurie Berman, Imperial County Transportation Commission Executive Director Mark Baza and California Highway Patrol Captain Menteck. The event will provide an update to the media about transportation projects and related issues in Imperial County covering FY 16/17 and serve as a groundbreaking ceremony for the I-8 Update Pavement project. The five segments of the project will construct 48 miles of Continuously Reinforced Concrete Pavement along I-8 from the Arizona border.

- On March 16, 2016 the California Transportation Commission (CTC) will approve the Cycle 3 ATP Guidelines. The Cycle 3 Call for Projects is tentatively scheduled for late March 2016 through mid-June 2016. And includes 19/20 and 20/21 state funding years totaling about $230M.

- Caltrans presented the Excellence in Transportation Award to the Imperial County Transportation Commission for the Andrade Port of Entry (POE) – Quechan Crossing Transportation Enhancement (TE) Project. The Project completed pedestrian access and landscaping improvements along SR-186 at the Andrade/Algodones Port of Entry.
  - The Andrade Port of Entry (POE) is located on State Route 186 (SR-186) in Imperial Valley on the Quechan Indian Reservation and is the nation’s 11th busiest crossing for pedestrians entering into Mexico. The U.S. Customs and Border Protection processed over one million pedestrians in 2010, and in the peak season (late September through April) approximately 5,000 pedestrians cross the border every day. Before the project, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards were not met and walkways were inadequate to accommodate wheelchairs and walkers. While deficient by any standards, this was especially problematic in an area where a large proportion of the users are either elderly or disabled.
  - The project has improved the accessibility, character and visual quality of the area with enhancements and design themes reflecting the regional character of the Quechan Indian Tribe and capturing historical context of this very unique area. The Andrade POE project was a collaborative effort with the Tribe, Customs and Border Protection and the Department of General Services Administration; and is a successful project that provides a more effective, safe and pleasant travel experience for all modes of transportation, with an emphasis on pedestrian circulation.

- A full report of Caltrans updates can be found on page 70 of the agenda.

D. Commission Member Report

- There were various reports by Commission members of countywide issues and events happening in each of their respective cities/county.
VI. ACTION CALENDAR

A. Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) resolution for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2016/17 – 2021/2022 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)

1. Authorized the Chairman to sign the resolution that certifies funding has been identified for the projects in the FFY 2016-2021/22 FTIP and affirms our commitment to implement all projects in the program.

A motion was made by Hurtado and seconded by Walker, Motion Carried unanimously.

B. Resubmit the 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Recommendations for Imperial County

1. Approved the 2016 STIP Recommendations for Imperial County, requesting:

- **Imperial Avenue Interchange project**
  - Decrease funding for construction by $2.238 million from $27.650 million to $25.412 million (remains programmed in FY17/18).
  - Increase funding for PS&E (Design) by $1.489 million from $1.8 million to $3.289 million (remains programmed in FY14/15).
  - Increase R/W Support by $0.689 million from $0.8 million to $1.489 million (remains programmed in FY14/15).

- **Planning, Programming and Monitoring (PPM)**
  - Add $300,000 in FY19-20 and $300,000 in FY20-21 to fully-fund PPM activities through the end of the 2016 STIP period.

A motion was made by Walker and seconded by Ritchie, Motion Carried unanimously.

C. Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) FY 2015-2016 Funds

1. Directed staff to submit an application to the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP);
2. Authorized for the execution of the certifications and assurances and authorized agent forms for the LCTOP;
3. Authorized the Execution of the LCTOP Project: Capital construction costs for the Calexico Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC)

A motion was made by Hurtado and seconded by Walker, Motion Carried unanimously.

D. Imperial Valley Regional Assembly and Economic Summit – Proposed Dates

1. Approved the proposed dates of May 18 – May 19, 2016 for the Imperial Valley General Assembly and Economic Summit

A motion was made by Ritchie and seconded by Hurtado, Motion Carried unanimously.
VII. NEXT MEETING DATE AND PLACE

A. The next meeting of the Imperial County Transportation Commission will be held on Wednesday, March 23, 2016 at 6:00 p.m., at the County of Imperial Board Chambers, at 940 W. Main Street, El Centro, CA.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m. Motion by Ritchie, seconded by Hurtado, Motion Carried.
The following minutes are listed as they were acted upon by the Imperial County Transportation Commission Management Committee and as listed on the agenda for the meeting held Wednesday, March 9, 2016 together with staff reports and related documents attached thereto and incorporated therein by reference.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL
Chair Best called the Committee meeting to order at 10:34 a.m. Roll call was taken. Introductions were made.

II. EMERGENCY ITEMS
A. There were none.

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS
A. There were none.

IV. CONSENT ITEMS
A motion was made by Wells seconded by Bayon Moore to approve consent items 4A-4D. Motion carried unanimously.

A. Approved ICTC Management Committee Minutes for February 10, 2016
B. Received and filed:
   1. ICTC Board Draft Minutes for February 24, 2016
   2. ICTC TAC Draft Minutes for February 24, 2016
   3. ICTC SSTAC Draft Minutes for February 3, 2016

   It was requested that the Management Committee forward this item to the Commission for review and approval after public comment, if any:

   1. Receive and file the Specific Transit Operator Fiscal Reports; Med Express and West Shores Dial-A-Ride for the Imperial County Transportation Commission for FY 2014-15

D. Specific Transit Operator Fiscal Reports FY 2014-15 for IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT
It was requested that the Management Committee forward this item to the Commission for review and approval after public comment, if any:

1. Receive and file the Specific Transit Operator Fiscal Reports; IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT for the Imperial County Transportation Commission for FY 2014-15

V. REPORT

A. ICTC Executive Director

ICTC staff had the following announcements:

- The Regional Mobility Coordinator has been hired and Guillermo Gonzalez was introduced at the meeting.
- A tentative date of May 25th for a ICTC Budget Workshop was discussed.
- The Unmet Transit Needs (UTN) second meeting is scheduled for March 16, 2016 at the City of Brawley Council Chambers at 3:30 p.m. Alternatives and possible recommendations will be presented to the panel. Panel members are Mayor Doug Cox, Council Member George Nava and Supervisor Jack Terrazas.
- The IVT Ride El Centro Service Area Request Proposals (RFP) are due to ICTC on March 11th. A review committee to score and rank proposals is scheduled for March 16th at the ICTC offices.
- An IMBA meeting is scheduled for March 10, 2016 at 10 a.m. at the Barbara Worth Country Club in Imperial County. Presentations will include US Consulate General Jason Vorderstrasse regarding High Level Economic Dialogue and IID Director Benson regarding Water and Energy.
- Student surveys and campus workshops at SDSU-Calexico and IVC were held on Wednesday, November 18, 2015 and Thursday, November 19, 2015 as a part of the SDSU/IVC Transit Shuttle Analysis. The existing conditions analysis has been drafted and is under staff review. A second round of outreach is tentatively scheduled for late March / early April 2016. This project does not have funding set-aside for it at this time.
- A complete list of ICTC updates can be found on Page 68 of the agenda.

B. Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)

- Handouts for the following items were attached to the agenda on page 118:
  o SCAG 2016 General Assembly and Regional Conference Save the Date Postcard
  o SCAG Executive Director Monthly Report March 2016
  o SCAG & County Transportation Commissions Comment Letter on “Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA” to Implement SB 743
  o SCAG 27th Annual Demographic Workshop -The Continued Rise of the Millennials Save the Date Postcard
  o SCAG Support Letter – Calexico West LPOE Phase II Project

C. Caltrans Department of Transportation – District 11

- Mr. Medina provided Local Assistance updates and announcements.
- Mr. Amen provided project updates for Imperial County.

D. Committee Member Reports

- There were none.
VI. ACTION CALENDAR

A. Applications for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5311 Program Funds FY 2015-16

It was requested that the Management Committee forward this item to the Commission for review and approval after public comment, if any:

1. Adopt the attached resolution authorizing the Executive Director to sign the FTA 5311 FY 2015-16 grant application and all supporting documentation, and, submit the application to Caltrans.

A motion was made by Bayon Moore seconded by Villa, Motion carried unanimously.

B. Imperial County Safe Routes to School Regional Master Plan

It was requested that the Management Committee forward this item to the Commission for review and approval after public comment, if any:

1. Review and adopt the Imperial County Safe Routes to School Regional Master Plan

A motion was made by Duran seconded by Bayon Moore, Motion carried unanimously.

VI. LTA INFORMATIONAL CALENDAR

A. Imperial County Local Transportation Authority Annual Financial Audit for Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015

Ms. Williams stated that the DRAFT LTA Measure D audit reports were distributed for review and comment to the Cities and the County the week of February 16, 2016. Comments on the drafts indicating “no further action required” have been received from all agencies except for the City of Imperial and the County of Imperial. However, no draft audit is available for the City of Calexico at this time. The audit team has been unable to complete the audit due to internal delays within the City.

Comments were requested from Management Committee regarding whether to proceed with review and adoption of the LTA audits for the other member agencies, without the City of Calexico’s draft audit report, or to wait for the completion. Staff was requested to proceed with normal processes to adopt for the other member agencies, without the City of Calexico if needed.

The LTA Local Taxpayer Supervising Committee (LTSC) is set to meet on March 22, 2016 and the LTA Board is set to meet on March 23, 2016. The staff of the office of Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co, LLP will be presenting the Audit and Recommendations at both meetings.

VIII. NEXT MEETING DATE AND PLACE

The next meeting of the Management Committee will be held on April 13, 2016 at the City of Brawley, Brawley, CA.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

A. Meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES
February 24, 2016

Present:
Yazmin Arellano  City of Brawley
Lily Falomir   City of Calexico
Jack Fleming    City of El Centro
Hector Orozco   City of Holtville
Jesus Villegas   City of Imperial
Joel Hamby    City of Westmorland
William Brunet County of Imperial

Others:
Virginia Mendoza  ICTC
David Salgado   ICTC
Cristi Lerma   ICTC
Jacob Armstrong  Caltrans
Luis Medina    Caltrans
Carlos Flores  The Holt Group

1. The meeting was called to order by Chair Villegas at 10:08 a.m. A quorum was present and introductions were made. There were no public comments.

2. A motion was made to adopt the minutes for January 28, 2016. (Hamby/Falomir) Motion Carried.

3. FFY 2015-16 CMAQ & RSTP Project List – RFA Updates

Ms. Mendoza asked agencies to provide an update to each of their respective CMAQ and RSTP RFA’s and used the following format. This format will be used for future meetings also.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Total Project Cost (in thousands)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brawley</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>S. Palm Ave. Rehab</td>
<td>$734</td>
<td>March 4th submittal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brawley</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Sidewalk Rehab-Various</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>Design in May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calipatria</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>S. International Ave. Sidewalk</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>ROW in Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Ross Ave. Rehab</td>
<td>$571</td>
<td>Design in March</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ICTC TAC minutes 022416

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holtville</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Walnut Ave.</td>
<td>$562</td>
<td>E76 rcvd 1/28/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holtville</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Cedar Ave. Sidewalk</td>
<td>$136</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Various Roads</td>
<td>$1,102</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>N. Center St. Pavement Rehab</td>
<td>$372</td>
<td>PE RFA submitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. ICTC Updates / Announcements
   - Transit Planning Updates (by David Salgado):
     - The FTA review team visited ICTC on February 9th and 10th, 2016. ICTC staff received a comprehensive site review package for the on-site portion of the review. The FTA review team visited transfer terminals and the bus operations yard, and talked with staff from ICTC, Brawley, Imperial and El Centro and Imperial Valley Transit (IVT). The final draft report is anticipated within 30 days. The review was intensive and we received positive feedback on many of our requirements with minor direction for improvements.
     - A Regional Mobility Coordinator was hired. The new ICTC employee is Guillermo Gonzalez and will be introduced at the next meeting.
     - The Unmet Transit Needs (UTN) Hearing took place on February 11, 2016 at the City of Brawley Council Chambers. Transportation from the transfer terminal on 7th and State Streets in El Centro was provided for free with one individual using it. There were 5 members of the public that made comments to the panel. The second meeting is scheduled for March 16, 2016 at 3:30 p.m. at the Brawley Council Chambers.
     - IVT Access will be acquiring 11 new vehicles.
     - The Imperial County Safe Routes to School Regional Master Plan will be on the March Management Committee and Commission agendas for review and approval. It was a comprehensive project and will be on the ICTC website soon. Comments are appreciated. SCAG will be working with ICTC and agencies willing to participate in a group ATP application for all of Imperial County. Applications are due on June 1, 2016.

   - Transportation Planning Updates (By Virginia Mendoza):
     - The first round of workshops at SDSU-Calexico and IVC were held in November 2015. The existing conditions analysis has been completed. A second round of outreach is scheduled for April 18th and 19th at both SDSU-IV and IVC campuses.
     - The programming of the FY 16/17 CMAQ and RSTP funds will be programmed in the 2015 FTIP through a Formal Amendment in April. Ms. Mendoza stated that an FTIP amendment schedule will be a standing item on the TAC agenda moving forward.

   - LTA Updates:
     - The estimated balances for participating bond agencies have been updated and reflect the balances on the December 2015 bank statements. Agencies that are nearing the submittal of their last invoice please contact Ms. Mendoza prior so that the final invoice reflects the actual balance.

5. Cities and County Planning / Public Works Updates:
   - Each agency provided project updates.
     - Brawley: Projects out to bid include; the reservoir at the airport, splash pad and sports complex under construction, and airport improvements.
     - Calexico: Park improvements
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 El Centro: Euclid / La Brucherie road improvements, Buena Vista from 6th to 8th St road improvements, design phase of an HSIP project, design phase of an ATP project on Aurora and Adams, water plant projects
 Holtville: Sewer plant project
 Imperial: Finished Phase III of Aten/Dogwood project
 County of Imperial: Salton Sea project, 3.2 miles on Hwy 86, SR 86/Dogwood Signal, SR 111 at Cruikshank clean-up

6. SCAG Updates / Announcements: (By Ms. Mendoza)
   - Mr. Arnold San Miguel will be filling in for the Imperial region until the replacement is selected.
   - SCAG’s 2016 Annual Regional Conference & General Assembly at La Quinta Resort & Club on May 5-6.
   - The SCAG Sustainability Awards Program is open to all parties, including local governments, non-profits, developers, and others. Eligible submittals include plans, projects, and programs completed or adopted after January 1, 2012 and prior to March 1, 2016. The deadline for nomination submittals is March 1, 2016.

7. Caltrans Updates / Announcements
   Mr. Medina had the following updates:
   - The obligation plan is due to headquarters on April 1st.
   - Inactive projects that are flagged for inactivity should submit an invoice to the District office by February 19, 2016. There are none for Imperial County so there is no concern there.
   - The next meeting of the Southern California Local Assistance Management (SCLAMM) will be on March 24, 2016 at District 7.
   - List server subscriptions are available online.
   - The safety summit is tomorrow (February 25, 2016) at Caltrans District 11.
   - No Buy America exemptions are being granted at this time.

8. Presentation on SB 743
   - Mr. Armstrong gave a brief presentation regarding the changes taking place on how projects will be analyzed by Caltrans staff throughout the transportation planning and project development process and in the review of local land use development projects. He urged agencies to participate in the development of the Caltrans Transportation Analysis Guide (TAG) and Transportation Impact Study Guide (TISG). The concept of level of service has been used for many years; with SB 743 the new proposed metric for evaluating transportation impacts under CEQA will be Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), which will impact rural areas. Mr. Armstrong stated that workshops will be held later this year and participation is encouraged. He also stated that a project website is available to keep up with the progress at www.catranstag-public.pbworks.com.

9. General Discussion / New Business
   - Mr. Medina stated that he will be rotating in construction and he will be introducing his replacement at the next meeting.

10. Meeting adjourned at 11:14 a.m. (Arellano/Hamby) The next TAC meeting will be on March 23, 2016.
1. Chair Zuno called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. A quorum was present. Introductions were made.

2. Minutes adopted for January 6, 2016. (Hack/Williams) **Motion Carried.**

3. **CTSA Reports:**

   Ms. Williams had the following announcements:
   - Ms. Williams stated that Mr. Salgado and Ms. Bastidas are attending a Caltrans workshop for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant training in San Bernardino. Caltrans will be moving to computerized grant application process from now on.
   - An offer has been made for the Mobility Coordinator position. The new employee will be busy learning all things for the paratransit services and should be at the next SSTAC meeting.
   - At the last SSTAC meeting there was a request to provide more data and trend reports for the transit service agencies. A handout was distributed to all that compared FY 2013/14 to 2014/15 for Imperial Valley Transit services only. After some discussion it was agreed that the transit operators will keep their standard method of updates at the SSTAC meeting. Ms. Zuno stated that agencies should remember the role of the SSTAC and their responsibility to social services agencies.
A conference call with ICTC staff and Caltrans is scheduled to discuss the IVT Ride – El Centro and Med-Express RFP’s. A release date in the next 2 weeks is anticipated if everything goes as planned. ICTC Staff will be reaching out to members to see if they will want to be a part of the Proposal review committee.

4. FY 2016-17 Master Needs List

The Master Needs list was presented to everyone at this meeting. During the meetings in December and January, changes were made to the list and no more changes were recommended at this meeting. A motion was made to approve the Master Needs list, (Hack/McNeer) Motion Carried.

5. FY 2016-17 UTN Letter to the Hearing Panel

Ms. Williams stated that this letter is read and submitted to the hearing panel and should contain general comments as well as specific issues. The following changes were made to the UTN Letter for FY 2016-17 via a motion at the January meeting. For review purposes only the changes are below.
- FY year changed to 2016-17
- Restart the numbering at 1 on the second section of the letter and the priority be changed to:
  - Improve cleanliness and upkeep at all El Centro City area stops, and other stops in the region as identified.
  - Enhance communication of available services as a way to disseminate information to the passengers, as documented as in the intent of Finding #8 in FY 2010-11 UTN Findings: (Staff will research options to provide schedules and information for passengers for Imperial Valley Transit (IVT) bus stops. Staff is to return with options and cost estimates by December 2010, for consideration on implementation from the ICTC).
  - Review of capacity restraints on Med-Express.
  - Review of a proposed Transit Mobility Summit.
- An edit was recommended to change the “Orange Line” in Calexico to the “Garnet Line.”
- A motion was made to approve the letter with the proposed changes, (Hack/Garcia), Motion Carried.
- Ms. Zuno volunteered to read the letter to the Unmet Transit Needs meeting on February 11, 2016.

6. Transit Operator Reports:

- El Centro Dial-a-Ride: Updates were given by Ms. Cordova for the month of December
  - Passengers per hour were 4.4, weekdays were 117, Saturday were 26.3
  - Wheelchairs: 808 (30.5%)
  - On Time Performance was 100%
  - No-shows: 50 and Late Cancellations: 6

- Med-Express: Updates were given by Ms. Cordova for the month of December
  - Passengers per hour were 3.4
  - Passengers for the month were 458
  - Wheelchairs: 11 (2.4%)
  - On Time Performance was 98%
  - No-shows: 0 and Late Cancellations: 16

- A trend report was provided for Imperial Valley Transit, IVT Access and IVT Ride due to the data request at the previous meeting.

7. General Discussion

- Mr. Ceasar stated that IVC recently signed an agreement with NAU, U of A and Arizona State Universities. All 3 schools have campuses in Yuma and have programs not offered in Imperial
Valley, such as the Bachelor’s in Social Work and Agriculture programs. The program is promoting to High Schools. Currently a carpool system in place, but as the program grows; transit to Yuma may be a good idea.

- Mr. Hack stated that the Peoples First Conference will be on March 5, 2016 at the Palms Resort. The theme is “Royal Prom” with the crowning of a king and queen.

- Ms. Blankenship thanked ICTC for providing transportation services to the Senior Appreciation event. 466 seniors attended the event and 200 were transported by Imperial Valley Transit. Next year the event will be held on January 25, 2017.

- Ms. McNeer stated that the Med-Express has wonderful customer service.

8. Adjournment

- The next meeting of the SSTAC will be on March 2, 2016 at 10:00 a.m.
- Meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.
IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

C. SPECIFIC TRANSIT OPERATOR FISCAL REPORTS FY 2014-15 FOR MED-EXPRESS AND WEST SHORES DIAL-A-RIDE
March 17, 2016

James Predmore, Chair
Imperial County Transportation Commission
1405 N. Imperial Ave., Suite 1
El Centro, CA 92243


Dear Commission Members:

The Commission must conduct fiscal reviews of its transit operators on an annual basis. The two services are performed under contracts with ARC-Imperial Valley.

Attached, please find the financial reports performed by the CPA firm, Hutchinson and Bloodgood:

- Med Express – non emergency transportation to San Diego area medical facilities
- West Shores Dial-A-Ride – demand response transit service in the West Shores communities (July 2014- November 2014)

The Management Committee met on March 9, 2016 and forwards this item to the Commission for their review and approval after public comment, if any:

1. Receive and file the Specific Transit Operator Fiscal Reports FY 2014-15; Med Express and West Shores Dial-A-Ride for the Imperial County Transportation Commission for FY 2014-15

Sincerely,

MARK BAZA
Executive Director

BY: [Signature]

Kathi Williams
Senior Transit Planner

MB/mb/cl

Attachments
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INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS’ REPORT

Imperial County Transportation Commission
1405 N. Imperial Avenue Suite 1
El Centro, California

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the Imperial County Transportation Commission’s Management, solely to assist the specified party in evaluating the specific ARC-IV Med-Express items for the year ended June 30, 2015 identified by the service contract. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of those specified parties in this report. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

Our procedures and findings are as follows:

1. We reviewed the transit service contract, including contract modifications, between the Imperial County Transportation Commission and ARC-Imperial Valley for the provisions of specific transit services to be provided.

2. We reviewed documents provided by the Imperial County Transportation Commission and ARC-Imperial Valley to verify that expenditure and fare amounts reported to the Imperial County Transportation Commission Administration for the specific transit services were presented fairly and accurately. We found that ARC-Imperial Valley is in compliance with the contract terms and reporting properly as agreed per contract(s). See Exhibit A as a reference for this review.

3. We reviewed on a test basis fuel expenditures reported for all specific transit services provided and noted if these expenditures were in accordance to the fuel related terms included in the service contract. We found that ARC-Imperial Valley is in compliance with the contract terms and these expenditures are within budget and reported accordingly.

4. We reviewed ARC-Imperial Valley’s internal controls over cash handling procedures and tested their fare collection process and related activities. We found that the internal controls set by ARC-Imperial Valley are adequate based on established guidelines. See Exhibit B as a reference for this review.

We were not engaged to, and did not, conduct an audit, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the accounting records. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.
This report is intended solely for the information and use of the management, the Imperial County Transportation Commission, the County of Imperial Board of Supervisors and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Hutchison and Bloodgood LLP

February 17, 2016
ACCOUNTANTS’ COMMENTS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this engagement pertaining to the service contract between the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) and ARC – Imperial Valley Med Express was to provide an independent assessment of compliance with certain contract requirements during the period July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015 and to assess the adequacy of ARC – Imperial Valley's internal controls over cash handling and reporting procedures.

FARE REVENUES

The contract states that the fare box ratio of fare revenue divided by operating costs shall be maintained at or above twenty percent (20%). The actual fare revenue was over sixteen percent (16.18%); ($33,641 fare revenue divided by $207,862 operating costs). The farebox recovery ratio was not met for this year. During the course of this engagement it was noted that fares increased by nearly five percent while expenditures increased by nine percent in comparison to prior year’s activity.

ICTC SUBSIDY

The contract states that the subsidy shall not exceed the amount of $193,467 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015, which includes an additional subsidy in the amount of $13,500 for marketing costs. The maximum payments shall not exceed $14,997 per month of the service year. According to the contract, the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) will pay an additional amount, not to exceed $7,500 per year, for excessive wear and tear and mechanical repairs that exceed the line item budget amount. The ICTC will also pay an additional amount, if needed, at the end of the fiscal year to offset increased fuel costs of no more than $5,000. The total subsidy paid by the ICTC for July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015, was $191,404.

EXPENDITURES

The budgeted expenditures for July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015, were $238,463. The actual expenditures for this period were $225,045. This is a favorable variance of $13,418 (See Exhibit A). The following expenditures exceed the budgeted amount:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Under/(Over) Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>$ 493</td>
<td>$ 975</td>
<td>$ (482)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability Insurance</td>
<td>4,329</td>
<td>4,581</td>
<td>(252)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>11,772</td>
<td>15,182</td>
<td>(3,410)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>15,707</td>
<td>18,147</td>
<td>(2,440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>4,071</td>
<td>(1,351)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, as long as total expenditures are within the total budget per service contract, there is no language that specifically disallows costs that are over the line item budgeted amount.
IMPERIAL COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
AND  
ARC – IMPERIAL VALLEY  
MED-EXPRESS TRANSIT SERVICE CONTRACT  
COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF BUDGET TO ACTUAL EXPENDITURES  
FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015  

EXHIBIT A  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Under/(Over) Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$101,120</td>
<td>$98,238</td>
<td>$2,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Expense</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety/Training</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry/Uniforms</td>
<td>1,923</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>(482)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Repair/Maintenance</td>
<td>25,480</td>
<td>21,626</td>
<td>3,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Fuel</td>
<td>34,374</td>
<td>30,278</td>
<td>4,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Repair/Maintenance</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes</td>
<td>7,736</td>
<td>7,212</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax &amp; License Fees</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Insurance</td>
<td>7,253</td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>5,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers' Comp. Insurance</td>
<td>5,056</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>1,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability Insurance</td>
<td>4,329</td>
<td>4,581</td>
<td>(252)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues &amp; Subscriptions</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Interest</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>11,772</td>
<td>15,182</td>
<td>(3,410)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>15,707</td>
<td>18,147</td>
<td>(2,440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>4,071</td>
<td>(1,351)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>13,112</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$238,463</td>
<td>225,045</td>
<td>$13,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fares Collected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Expenditures Eligible for Subsidy</td>
<td>$191,404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Paid Per Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$191,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Ratio Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Ratio Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OBJECTIVE

Review established internal control procedures over cash handling and perform a walkthrough observation of the fare collection cycle and related processes.

PROCEDURES

Reviewed ARC-Imperial Valley’s established guidelines over cash handling. Interviewed management and staff associated with the fare collection cycle. Observed cash count of total fares for a day of activity and confirmed amount collected with amount counted and amount reported.

OBSERVATIONS

During the performance of this walkthrough it was noted that staff associated with the fare collection cycle were in compliance with established procedures. The majority of the passengers pay their fares days prior to their scheduled trip, however, a morning clerk is available to collect fares from those unscheduled passengers that arrive on the day of the trip. Fares are not collected by drivers except in the event that a driver picks up an unscheduled passenger from a San Diego area pick up point. When this occurs, the driver will prepare a receipt, add the name to the passenger list, place cash in a locked bag and provide the list along with the cash collected to the evening clerk. Dual custody procedures were noted throughout all levels of the fare collection cycle.

The driver also keeps records of the time and miles driven, including deadhead time and miles. This information is recorded in the driver manifest and is provided to the evening clerk at the end of the driver’s shift.

No cash or percentage variances were noted during our observation of the fare collection process.

CONCLUSION

We found that the internal controls procedures over cash handling set by ARC-Imperial Valley are adequate based on established guidelines and that actual fares received are properly reported to the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC).
Imperial County Transportation Commission & ARC-Imperial Valley

West Shores Dial-A-Ride Transit Service Report
For The Year Ended June 30, 2015
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INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS’ REPORT

Imperial County Transportation Commission
1405 N. Imperial Avenue Suite 1
El Centro, California

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the Imperial County Transportation Commission’s Management, solely to assist the specified party in evaluating the specific ARC-IV West Shores Dial-A-Ride items for the year ended June 30, 2015 identified by the service contract. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of those specified parties in this report. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

Our procedures and findings are as follows:

1. We reviewed the transit service contract, including contract modifications, between the Imperial County Transportation Commission and ARC-Imperial Valley for the provisions of specific transit services to be provided.

2. We reviewed documents provided by the Imperial County Transportation Commission and ARC-Imperial Valley to verify that expenditure and fare amounts reported to the Imperial County Transportation Commission Administration for the specific transit services were presented fairly and accurately. We found that ARC-Imperial Valley is in compliance with the contract terms and reporting properly as agreed per contract(s). See Exhibit A as a reference for this review.

3. We reviewed on a test basis fuel expenditures reported for all specific transit services provided and noted if these expenditures were in accordance to the fuel related terms included in the service contract. We found that ARC-Imperial Valley is in compliance with the contract terms and these expenditures are within budget and reported accordingly.

4. We reviewed ARC-Imperial Valley’s internal controls over cash handling procedures and tested their fare collection process and related activities. We found that the internal controls set by ARC-Imperial Valley are adequate based on established guidelines. See Exhibit B as a reference for this review.

We were not engaged to, and did not, conduct an audit, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the accounting records. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.
This report is intended solely for the information and use of the management, the Imperial County Transportation Commission, the County of Imperial Board of Supervisors and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

February 17, 2016
ACCOUNTANTS’ COMMENTS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this engagement pertaining to the service contract between the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) and ARC – Imperial Valley West Shores Dial-A-Ride was to provide an independent assessment of compliance with certain contract requirements during the period July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015 and to assess the adequacy of ARC – Imperial Valley’s internal controls over cash handling and reporting procedures. This contract ended on November 30, 2014 which results in the fiscal year only reflecting five (5) months of service.

FARE REVENUES

The contract states that the fare box ratio of fare revenue divided by operating costs shall be maintained at or above five percent (5%). The actual fare revenue was above five percent (5.22%); ($1,476 fare revenue divided by $28,259 operating costs). During the course of this engagement it was noted that fares decreased by over eleven percent while expenditures increased by over one percent in comparison to prior year’s activity.

ICTC SUBSIDY

The contract states that the subsidy shall not exceed the amount of $29,011 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015, which includes an additional subsidy in the amount of $900 for marketing costs. The maximum payments shall not exceed $2,343 per month of the service year. According to the contract, the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) will pay an additional amount, not to exceed $2,500 per year, for excessive wear and tear and mechanical repairs that exceed the line item budget amount. The ICTC will also pay an additional amount, if needed, at the end of the fiscal year to offset increased fuel costs of no more than $2,500. The total subsidy paid by the ICTC for July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015, was $26,952.

EXPENDITURES

The budgeted expenditures for July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015, were $30,489. The actual expenditures for this period were $28,428. This is a favorable variance of $2,061 (See Exhibit A). The following expenditures exceed the budgeted amount:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Under/(Over) Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$171</td>
<td>$ (71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Expense</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Repair/Maintenance</td>
<td>2,871</td>
<td>4,731</td>
<td>(1,860)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>(132)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, as long as total expenditures are within the total budget per service contract, there is no language that specifically disallows costs that are over the line item budgeted amount.
### Comparative Statement of Budget to Actual Expenditures

**For the Year Ended June 30, 2015**

**Exhibit A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Under/(Over Budget)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$11,689</td>
<td>$10,396</td>
<td>$1,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>(71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Expense</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety/Training</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry/Uniforms</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Repair/Maintenance</td>
<td>2,871</td>
<td>4,731</td>
<td>(1,860)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Fuel</td>
<td>6,129</td>
<td>5,844</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Repair/Maintenance</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax &amp; License Fees</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Insurance</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Comp. Insurance</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability Insurance</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues &amp; Subscriptions</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Interest</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>(132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$30,489</td>
<td>28,428</td>
<td>$2,061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fares Collected**

1,476

**Net Expenditures Eligible for Subsidy**

$26,952

**Amount Paid Per Contract**

$26,952

**Farebox Ratio Actual**

5.22%

**Farebox Ratio Contract**

5.00%
OBJECTIVE

Review established internal control procedures over cash handling and perform a walkthrough observation of the fare collection cycle and related processes.

PROCEDURES

Reviewed ARC-Imperial Valley’s established guidelines over cash handling. Interviewed management and staff associated with the fare collection cycle. Observed cash count of total fares for a day of activity and confirmed amount collected with amount counted and amount reported.

OBSERVATIONS

During the performance of this walkthrough it was noted that staff associated with the fare collection cycle were in compliance with established procedures. The majority of the passengers pay their fares days prior to their scheduled trip, however, a morning clerk is available to collect fares from those unscheduled passengers that arrive on the day of the trip. Fares are not collected by drivers except in the event that a driver picks up an unscheduled passenger from a San Diego area pick up point. When this occurs, the driver will prepare a receipt, add the name to the passenger list, place cash in a locked bag and provide the list along with the cash collected to the evening clerk. Dual custody procedures were noted throughout all levels of the fare collection cycle.

The driver also keeps records of the time and miles driven, including deadhead time and miles. This information is recorded in the driver manifest and is provided to the evening clerk at the end of the driver's shift.

No cash or percentage variances were noted during our observation of the fare collection process.

CONCLUSION

We found that the internal controls procedures over cash handling set by ARC-Imperial Valley are adequate based on established guidelines and that actual fares received are properly reported to the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC).
IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

D. SPECIFIC TRANSIT OPERATOR FISCAL REPORTS FY 2014-15 FOR IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT
March 17, 2016

James Predmore, Chair  
Imperial County Transportation Commission  
1405 N. Imperial Ave., Suite 1  
El Centro, CA 92243  

SUBJECT: Specific Transit Operator Fiscal Reports FY 2014-15 for Imperial Valley Transit, IVT Access and IVT Ride

Dear Commission Members;

The Commission must conduct fiscal reviews of its transit operators on an annual basis. The three services are performed under contracts with FIRST TRANSIT, Inc.

Attached, please find the financial reports performed by the CPA firm, Hutchinson and Bloodgood:

- Imperial Valley Transit
- IVT Access
- IVT Ride

The Management Committee met on March 9, 2016 and forwards this item to the Commission for their review and approval after public comment, if any:

1. Receive and file the Specific Transit Operator Fiscal Reports FY 2014-15; IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT, IVT ACCESS and IVT RIDE for the Imperial County Transportation Commission for FY 2014-15

Sincerely,

MARK BAZA  
Executive Director

BY: [Signature]

Kathi Williams  
Senior Transit Planner

MB/mb/cl

Attachments
Imperial County Transportation Commission & First Transit, Inc.

Imperial Valley Transit Service Report

For the Year Ended June 30, 2015
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INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS’ REPORT

Imperial County Transportation Commission
1405 N. Imperial Avenue Suite 1
El Centro, California

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the Imperial County Transportation Commission’s Management, solely to assist the specified party in evaluating the specific First Transit, Inc. transit services contract items for the year ended June 30, 2015. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of those specified parties in this report. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

Our procedures and findings are as follows:

1. We reviewed the transit service contract, including contract modifications, between the Imperial County Transportation Commission and First Transit, Inc. for the provisions of specific transit services to be provided.

2. We reviewed documents provided by the Imperial County Transportation Commission and First Transit, Inc. to verify that expenditure and fare amounts reported to the Imperial County Transportation Commission Administration for the specific transit services were presented fairly and accurately. We found that First Transit, Inc. is in compliance with the contract terms and reporting properly as agreed per contract(s). See Exhibits C through H as references for this review.

3. We reviewed on a test basis fuel expenditures reported for all specific transit services provided and noted if these expenditures were in accordance to the fuel related terms included in the service contract. We found that First Transit, Inc. is in compliance with the contract terms and these expenditures are within budget and reported accordingly.

4. We reviewed First Transit’s internal controls over cash handling procedures and tested their fare collection process and related activities. We found that the internal controls set by First Transit, Inc. are adequate based on established guidelines. See Exhibit A as reference for this review.

5. We reviewed that transit vehicles owned by the Imperial County Transportation Commission are utilized as part of the transit service assigned for, are maintained in a secure location and are serviced accordingly by First Transit, Inc. See Exhibit B as reference for this review.
We were not engaged to, and did not, conduct an audit, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the accounting records. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the management, the Imperial County Transportation Commission, the County of Imperial Board of Supervisors and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

February 17, 2016
ACCOUNTANTS’ COMMENTS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this engagement pertaining to the service contract between the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) and First Transit, Inc. was to provide an independent assessment of compliance with certain contract requirements during the period July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015, to assess the adequacy of First Transit Inc.’s internal controls over cash handling and reporting procedures and document the performance of our observation of the transit vehicles owned by ICTC under the custody of First Transit, Inc.

FARE REVENUES

The service contract for each of the services provided by First Transit, Inc. states that the farebox ratio of fare revenue divided by operating costs shall be maintained at or above seventeen percent (17.0%) for the Imperial Valley Transit service line, five percent (5.0%) for the El Centro Shuttle (Blue and Green Line) and four percent (4.0%) for the Brawley Shuttle (Gold Line).

For the El Centro Shuttle (Blue and Green Line) the actual farebox recovery ratio was over four percent (4.2%); ($26,312 fare revenue divided by $619,876 operating costs). See Exhibit E.

For the Brawley Shuttle (Gold Line) the actual farebox recovery ratio was over four percent (4.1%); ($10,426 fare revenue divided by $253,874 operating costs). See Exhibit F.

For the Imperial Valley Transit service line the actual farebox recovery ratio was over twenty-six percent (26.3%); ($711,302 fare revenue divided by $2,701,779 adjusted operating costs). See Exhibit G.

The letter from the California Department of Transportation dated May 9, 2013 states that the suggested blended farebox recovery ratio calculation for the transit services above was approved and the blended farebox recovery ratio was set at seventeen percent (17.0%).

For fiscal year ended June 30, 2015 the actual blended farebox ratio for all transit services combined was of over twenty percent (20.9%); ($748,041 fare revenue divided by $3,575,528 adjusted operating costs). See Exhibit H.
ICTC SUBSIDY

The contract’s sixth modification, dated June 25, 2013, states that the compensation for the Imperial Valley Transit Line for the period of July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015 is identified as $3,131,869 less the farebox of 17% for a net subsidy not to exceed $2,599,451, with a marketing budget of $156,593. Actual costs for the year reported to ICTC were $2,459,263 in operational expense, $6,294 in additional fuel expenses, and $41,412 in marketing expenses for a combined total of $2,506,969. See Exhibit G.

For the El Centro Shuttle service line, which includes the Blue and Green Lines, the compensation is identified as $663,808 less the farebox of 5.0% for a net subsidy not to exceed $630,618, with a marketing budget of $33,190. Actual costs for the year reported to ICTC were $590,221 in operational expense, $333 in additional fuel expenses, and $3,009 in marketing expenses for a combined total of $593,563. See Exhibit E.

For the Brawley Shuttle service line, which is known as the Gold Line, the compensation is identified as $252,437 less the farebox of 4.0% for a net subsidy not to exceed $242,340, with an adjusted marketing budget of $12,622. Actual costs for the year reported to ICTC were $242,308 in operational expense, $146 in additional fuel expenses, and $994 in marketing expenses for a combined total of $243,447. See Exhibit F.
OBJECTIVE

Review established internal control procedures over cash handling and perform a walkthrough observation of the fare collection cycle and related processes.

PROCEDURES

Reviewed First Transit, Inc. established guidelines over cash handling. Interviewed management and staff associated with the fare collection cycle. Observed cash count of total fares contained in farebox and confirmed amount collected with amount counted and amount reported.

OBSERVATIONS

It was noted that empty fareboxes are placed inside the transit vehicle under dual custody. Drivers observe that boarding passengers place money inside the farebox and keep a log of boarding passengers separated by fare type. At the end of the day, each full farebox is removed, also under dual custody, and locked inside the vault. All cash fares are counted the following day by two staff members in a locked room. Once cash is counted it is placed in sealed deposit bags and kept under key until ready to be deposited at the bank. If foreign currency is detected, it is separated, exchanged once a significant amount is collected and allocated among all transit services.

During the performance of this review it was noted that variances are generated when comparing the number of passengers to the projected fare they are required to pay. Some passengers do not have the correct fare and this results in most of them paying more than the required fare. Frequently it results in positive fare variances since the passengers that overpay is larger than those that underpay. It is recommended to perform a cost benefit analysis of upgrading fareboxes to those that can make change, accept only U.S. currency and are able to accept other forms of payment. Actual fares and not projected fares are those fares reported to the ICTC as fares received.

CONCLUSION

We found that the internal controls set by First Transit, Inc. are adequate based on established guidelines and that actual fares received are properly reported to the ICTC.
OBJECTIVE

Review that transit vehicles property of the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) are used for the contracted IVT transit service as well as are maintained in a secure location when not in service, and are being serviced as scheduled.

PROCEDURES

Perform a site visit of the First Transit, Inc. Bus and Maintenance Yard located at 792 East Ross Road in the City of El Centro. Observed and evaluated the condition of every ICTC owned vehicle based on vehicle list provided by ICTC.

OBSERVATIONS

When not in operation the transit vehicles are maintained inside the fenced and gated bus yard. There is only one entrance and exit point and the gate is locked once all vehicles are in. There are several outdoor lights that light up the parked vehicles and around the Maintenance Shop. The Maintenance Shop has cameras inside as well as an alarm system that is activated by the last person to leave the Bus Yard and deactivated by the morning dispatcher. There were no cameras noted in the Bus Yard area. Each transit vehicle is equipped with several cameras outside and inside the vehicle and activated when in service.

Each transit vehicle was observed prior to the start of the service day. Each vehicle number and description was compared to the vehicle list provided by ICTC. Each vehicle was inspected inside and outside for any visible damage, farebox placement, and overall working condition. Of the sixteen transit vehicles used for the IVT-Transit service, one was inside the Maintenance Shop for the scheduled service and another one is out of service waiting for the transmission to be repaired. No other issues were noted with the remaining fourteen transit vehicles.

Service files for each transit vehicle are maintained in an office inside the Maintenance Shop under the custody of the Maintenance Manager. They contain records of all maintenance and services performed to each transit vehicle.

CONCLUSION

It appears that First Transit, Inc. is properly maintaining the ICTC owned vehicles in a secure location and servicing them as scheduled or as required.
## Exhibit C

**IMPERIAL COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**AND**

**FIRST TRANSIT, INC.**

**IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT SERVICE PROGRAM**

**STATEMENT OF FIXED RATE, FAREBOX REVENUE AND NET SUBSIDY**

**JULY 1, 2014 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2015**

---

**El Centro Shuttle - Blue Line Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Base Cost</th>
<th>Farebox</th>
<th>Net Subsidy</th>
<th>Fuel Escalator</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Net Cost and Total Paid to First Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July, 2014</td>
<td>$25,699</td>
<td>$1,072</td>
<td>$24,626</td>
<td>$167</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$24,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 2014</td>
<td>24,847</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>22,365</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>23,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2014</td>
<td>24,851</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>23,017</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>23,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2014</td>
<td>27,652</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>25,726</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2014</td>
<td>23,387</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>21,853</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2014</td>
<td>26,785</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>25,960</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2015</td>
<td>25,100</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>24,210</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2015</td>
<td>24,262</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>22,920</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2015</td>
<td>26,797</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>25,866</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>26,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2015</td>
<td>26,822</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>25,941</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>26,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2015</td>
<td>25,125</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>24,630</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2015</td>
<td>26,821</td>
<td>1,999</td>
<td>24,822</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$308,150</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,214</strong></td>
<td><strong>$291,936</strong></td>
<td><strong>$167</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,009</strong></td>
<td><strong>$294,112</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contract Specifications**

Paragraph 8.1.2.4

For Base Cost and Base Subsidy

- **$331,904**  
  - **$16,595**  
  - **$315,309**

Over (Under) Contract Requirements

- **$23,754**  
  - **$382**  
  - **$23,373**

Farebox Ratio Actual: 5.2%

Farebox Ratio Contract: 5.0%
### STATEMENT OF FIXED RATE, FAREBOX REVENUE AND NET SUBSIDY

**JULY 1, 2014 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2015**

#### El Centro Shuttle-Green Line Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Base Cost</th>
<th>Farebox</th>
<th>Net Subsidy</th>
<th>Fuel Escalator</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Net Cost and Total Paid to First Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July, 2014</td>
<td>$25,705</td>
<td>$1,092</td>
<td>$24,613</td>
<td>$166</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$24,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 2014</td>
<td>24,862</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>24,116</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2014</td>
<td>24,842</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>24,141</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>24,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2014</td>
<td>27,676</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>26,885</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2014</td>
<td>23,413</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>22,751</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2014</td>
<td>26,812</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>25,954</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2015</td>
<td>25,129</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>24,352</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2015</td>
<td>24,288</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>23,227</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2015</td>
<td>26,819</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>25,962</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>26,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2015</td>
<td>26,846</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>26,036</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>26,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2015</td>
<td>25,158</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>24,490</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2015</td>
<td>26,834</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>25,758</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$308,384</td>
<td>$10,099</td>
<td>$298,285</td>
<td>$166</td>
<td>$999</td>
<td>$299,451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contract Specifications**

- **Paragraph 8.1.2.4**
  - For Base Cost and Base Subsidy
    - Base Cost: $331,904
    - Base Subsidy: $16,595
    - Total: $315,309

- **Over (Under) Contract Requirements**
  - $23,520
  - $6,496
  - $17,024

- **Farebox Ratio Actual**: 3.3%

- **Farebox Ratio Contract**: 5.0%
## IMPERIAL COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND FIRST TRANSIT, INC.
### IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT SERVICE PROGRAM
### STATEMENT OF FIXED RATE, FAREBOX REVENUE AND NET SUBSIDY
### JULY 1, 2014 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2015

El Centro Shuttle (Blue and Green Line) Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Base Cost</th>
<th>Farebox</th>
<th>Net Subsidy</th>
<th>Fuel Escalator</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Net Cost and Total Paid to First Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July, 2014</td>
<td>$51,404</td>
<td>$2,165</td>
<td>$49,240</td>
<td>$333</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$49,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 2014</td>
<td>49,709</td>
<td>3,228</td>
<td>46,481</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>47,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2014</td>
<td>49,692</td>
<td>2,535</td>
<td>47,158</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>48,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2014</td>
<td>55,328</td>
<td>2,716</td>
<td>52,612</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2014</td>
<td>46,800</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>44,604</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2014</td>
<td>53,597</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>51,914</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2015</td>
<td>50,230</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>48,561</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2015</td>
<td>48,551</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>46,147</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2015</td>
<td>53,616</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>51,828</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>52,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2015</td>
<td>53,668</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>51,978</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>52,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2015</td>
<td>50,282</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>49,120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2015</td>
<td>53,655</td>
<td>3,075</td>
<td>50,580</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$616,534</td>
<td>$26,312</td>
<td>$590,221</td>
<td>$333</td>
<td>$3,009</td>
<td>$593,563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contract Specifications**
- **Paragraph 8.1.2.4**

- **For Base Cost and Base Subsidy**
  - **$663,808**
  - **$33,190**
  - **$630,618**

- **Over (Under) Contract Requirements**
  - **$ (47,274)**
  - **(6,878)**
  - **(40,396)**

- **Farebox Ratio Actual** 4.2%
- **Farebox Ratio Contract** 5.0%
## EXHIBIT F

**IMPERIAL COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**
**AND**
**FIRST TRANSIT, INC.**
**IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT SERVICE PROGRAM**
**STATEMENT OF FIXED RATE, FAREBOX REVENUE AND NET SUBSIDY**
**JULY 1, 2014 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2015**

---

### Brawley Shuttle - Gold Line Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Base Cost</th>
<th>Farebox</th>
<th>Net Subsidy</th>
<th>Fuel Escalator</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Net Cost and Total Paid to First Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July, 2014</td>
<td>$22,185</td>
<td>$807</td>
<td>$21,378</td>
<td>$146</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$21,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 2014</td>
<td>21,301</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>20,540</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2014</td>
<td>21,305</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>20,433</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>20,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2014</td>
<td>22,866</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>21,925</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2014</td>
<td>18,466</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>17,579</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2014</td>
<td>21,990</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>21,278</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2015</td>
<td>20,228</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>19,508</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2015</td>
<td>19,356</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>18,576</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2015</td>
<td>22,015</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>20,575</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>20,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2015</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>21,214</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>21,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2015</td>
<td>20,228</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>19,421</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2015</td>
<td>20,793</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>19,880</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$252,734</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,426</strong></td>
<td><strong>$242,308</strong></td>
<td><strong>$146</strong></td>
<td><strong>994</strong></td>
<td><strong>$243,447</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contract Specifications

Paragraph 8.1.3.2

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Base Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Base Subsidy</td>
<td><strong>$252,437</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,097</strong></td>
<td><strong>$242,339</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Over (Under) Contract Requirements

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over (Under) Contract Requirements</td>
<td><strong>$297</strong></td>
<td><strong>$329</strong></td>
<td><strong>(31)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Farebox Ratio

- **Farebox Ratio Actual**: 4.1%
- **Farebox Ratio Contract**: 4.0%
## IMPERIAL COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

AND

FIRST TRANSIT, INC.

IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT SERVICE PROGRAM

STATEMENT OF FIXED RATE, FAREBOX REVENUE AND NET SUBSIDY

JULY 1, 2014 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2015

### Imperial Valley Transit - Countywide Service Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Base Cost</th>
<th>Farebox</th>
<th>Net Subsidy</th>
<th>Fuel Escalator</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Net Cost and Total Paid to First Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July, 2014</td>
<td>$299,291</td>
<td>$77,066</td>
<td>$222,225</td>
<td>$3,212</td>
<td>$6,092</td>
<td>$231,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 2014</td>
<td>259,728</td>
<td>59,288</td>
<td>200,440</td>
<td>2,805</td>
<td>4,784</td>
<td>208,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2014</td>
<td>269,499</td>
<td>67,297</td>
<td>202,202</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>202,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2014</td>
<td>282,382</td>
<td>75,104</td>
<td>207,278</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>207,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2014</td>
<td>239,491</td>
<td>55,424</td>
<td>184,068</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,295</td>
<td>194,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2014</td>
<td>257,785</td>
<td>48,199</td>
<td>209,586</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td>210,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2015</td>
<td>256,711</td>
<td>54,282</td>
<td>202,428</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>210,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2015</td>
<td>239,847</td>
<td>50,453</td>
<td>189,393</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>189,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2015</td>
<td>273,471</td>
<td>60,990</td>
<td>212,481</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>214,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2015</td>
<td>266,797</td>
<td>57,582</td>
<td>209,216</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,608</td>
<td>212,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2015</td>
<td>260,308</td>
<td>54,845</td>
<td>205,463</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>208,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2015</td>
<td>265,255</td>
<td>50,772</td>
<td>214,484</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>217,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,170,565</td>
<td>$711,302</td>
<td>$2,459,263</td>
<td>$6,294</td>
<td>$41,412</td>
<td>$2,506,969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contract Specifications**

Paragraph 8.1.1.4

For Base Cost and Base Subsidy

$3,131,869 | $532,418 | $2,599,451

**Over (Under) Contract Requirements**

$38,696  | $178,884 | $(140,188)

**Operating Costs**

$3,218,271

**Depreciation**

$(516,492)

**Adjusted Operating Costs**

$2,701,779

**Farebox Ratio Actual**

26.3%

**Farebox Ratio Contract**

17.0%
## All First Transit Services Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Base Cost</th>
<th>Farebox</th>
<th>Net Subsidy</th>
<th>Fuel Escalator</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Net Cost and Total Paid to First Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July, 2014</td>
<td>$372,879</td>
<td>$80,037</td>
<td>$452,916</td>
<td>$3,691</td>
<td>$6,092</td>
<td>$462,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 2014</td>
<td>330,738</td>
<td>63,277</td>
<td>394,016</td>
<td>2,805</td>
<td>5,423</td>
<td>402,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2014</td>
<td>340,496</td>
<td>70,704</td>
<td>411,200</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>412,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2014</td>
<td>360,577</td>
<td>78,761</td>
<td>439,338</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>439,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2014</td>
<td>304,758</td>
<td>58,508</td>
<td>363,266</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,295</td>
<td>373,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2014</td>
<td>333,372</td>
<td>50,595</td>
<td>383,967</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>385,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2015</td>
<td>327,169</td>
<td>56,671</td>
<td>383,840</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>392,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2015</td>
<td>307,753</td>
<td>53,637</td>
<td>361,390</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>361,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2015</td>
<td>349,103</td>
<td>64,219</td>
<td>413,322</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,731</td>
<td>416,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2015</td>
<td>342,465</td>
<td>60,058</td>
<td>402,524</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,358</td>
<td>406,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2015</td>
<td>330,818</td>
<td>56,814</td>
<td>387,632</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>390,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2015</td>
<td>339,703</td>
<td>54,760</td>
<td>394,463</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>397,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$4,039,833</td>
<td>$748,041</td>
<td>$4,787,874</td>
<td>$6,773</td>
<td>$45,414</td>
<td>$4,840,061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Combined Contract Specifications**

For Base Cost and Base Subsidy

- **$4,048,114**
- **$586,977**
- **$3,461,137**

**Over (Under) Contract Requirements**

- **$ (8,281)**
- **$161,064**
- **$1,326,736**

**Operating Costs**

- **$4,092,020**

**Depreciation**

- **(516,492)**

**Adjusted Operating Costs**

- **$3,575,528**

**Farebox Ratio Actual**

- **20.9%**

**Farebox Ratio Contract**

- **17.0%**
Imperial County Transportation Commission & First Transit, Inc.

IVT-ACCESS Paratransit Service Program

For the Year Ended June 30, 2015
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INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS’ REPORT

Imperial County Transportation Commission
1405 N. Imperial Avenue Suite 1
El Centro, California

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the Imperial County Transportation Commission’s Management, solely to assist the specified party in evaluating the specific First Transit, Inc. IVT-ACCESS paratransit service contract items for the year ended June 30, 2015. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of those specified parties in this report. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

Our procedures and findings are as follows:

1. We reviewed the transit service contract, including contract modifications, between the Imperial County Transportation Commission and First Transit, Inc. for the provisions of specific transit services to be provided.

2. We reviewed documents provided by the Imperial County Transportation Commission and First Transit, Inc. to verify that expenditure and fare amounts reported to the Imperial County Transportation Commission Administration for the specific transit services were presented fairly and accurately. We found that First Transit, Inc. is in compliance with the contract terms and reporting properly as agreed per contract(s). See Exhibit B as a reference for this review.

3. We reviewed on a test basis fuel expenditures reported for all specific transit services provided and noted if these expenditures were in accordance to the fuel related terms included in the service contract. We found that First Transit, Inc. is in compliance with the contract terms and these expenditures are within budget and reported accordingly.

4. We reviewed First Transit’s internal controls over cash handling procedures and tested their fare collection process and related activities. We found that the internal controls set by First Transit, Inc. are adequate based on established guidelines. See Exhibit A as a reference for this review.
We were not engaged to, and did not, conduct an audit, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the accounting records. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the management, the Imperial County Transportation Commission, the County of Imperial Board of Supervisors and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Hutchinson and Bloodgood LLP

February 17, 2016
ACCOUNTANTS’ COMMENTS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this engagement pertaining to the service contract between the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) and First Transit, Inc. was to provide an independent assessment of compliance with certain contract requirements during the period July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015 and to assess the adequacy of First Transit Inc.’s internal controls over cash handling and reporting procedures.

FARE REVENUES

The service contract for the IVT-ACCESS Paratransit service provided by First Transit, Inc., states that the farebox recovery ratio of fare revenue divided by operating costs shall be maintained at or above ten percent (10.0%).

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015 the actual farebox recovery ratio for the IVT-ACCESS Paratransit service was over five percent (5.4%); ($72,130 fare revenue divided by $1,334,912 operating costs, adjusted for depreciation). See Exhibit B.

The farebox recovery ratio was not met for this year.

ICTC SUBSIDY

The contract modification, dated December 11, 2013, states that the compensation for the IVT-ACCESS Paratransit service for the period of July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015 is identified as $1,612,176 less the farebox 10.0% for a net subsidy not to exceed $1,450,959 with a marketing budget of $80,609.

Actual costs for the year reported to ICTC were $1,414,241 in operational expense, $1,445 in additional fuel expenses, and $19,704 in marketing expenses for a combined total of $1,435,391. See Exhibit B.
EXHIBIT A

IMPERIAL COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
AND
FIRST TRANSIT, INC.
IVT-ACCESS PARATRANSIT SERVICE PROGRAM
INTERNAL CONTROLS OVER CASH HANDLING PROCEDURES
FOR YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015

OBJECTIVE

Review established internal control procedures over cash handling and perform a walkthrough observation of the fare collection cycle and related processes.

PROCEDURES

Reviewed First Transit, Inc. established guidelines over cash handling. Interviewed management and staff associated with the fare collection cycle. Observed cash count of total fares contained in farebox and confirmed amount collected with amount counted and amount reported.

OBSERVATIONS

It was noted that empty fareboxes are placed inside the transit vehicle under dual custody. Also, at the end of the day, each full farebox is removed, also under dual custody, and locked inside a vault. All cash fares are counted the following day by two staff members in a locked room. Once cash is counted it is placed in sealed deposit bags and kept under key until ready to be deposited at the bank.

During the performance of this review it was noted that transit operator’s report logs do not contain a column on which they could keep track of any overages or shortages in fares received. It was noted that it is common for passengers not to have the correct change and overpay but transit operators have no way of keeping track of this on their report logs. It is recommended to modify these reports with a section for any fare overages or shortages noted by transit operator. This would have an impact on reducing variances noted in the Farebox Accounting Report prepared by First Transit, Inc. It is noted that actual fares and not projected fares are those fares reported to the ICTC as fares received.

CONCLUSION

We found that the internal controls set by First Transit, Inc. are adequate based on established guidelines and that actual fares received are properly reported to the ICTC.
## IVT-ACCESS Paratransit Service Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Base Cost</th>
<th>Farebox</th>
<th>Net Subsidy</th>
<th>Fuel Escalator</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Net Cost and Total Paid to First Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July, 2014</td>
<td>$120,627</td>
<td>$6,610</td>
<td>$114,017</td>
<td>$673</td>
<td>$1,431</td>
<td>$116,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 2014</td>
<td>$115,613</td>
<td>$6,234</td>
<td>$109,379</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>110,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2014</td>
<td>$123,853</td>
<td>$6,846</td>
<td>$117,007</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td>117,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2014</td>
<td>$124,315</td>
<td>$7,279</td>
<td>$117,036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2014</td>
<td>$110,945</td>
<td>$5,326</td>
<td>$105,619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2014</td>
<td>$116,282</td>
<td>$5,473</td>
<td>$110,808</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>112,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2015</td>
<td>$108,796</td>
<td>$4,819</td>
<td>$103,978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2015</td>
<td>$110,279</td>
<td>$5,566</td>
<td>$104,713</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>105,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2015</td>
<td>$125,528</td>
<td>$6,618</td>
<td>$118,910</td>
<td></td>
<td>535</td>
<td>119,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2015</td>
<td>$121,485</td>
<td>$5,905</td>
<td>$115,580</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,867</td>
<td>125,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2015</td>
<td>$118,357</td>
<td>$5,789</td>
<td>$112,568</td>
<td></td>
<td>795</td>
<td>113,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2015</td>
<td>$118,160</td>
<td>$5,666</td>
<td>$112,494</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>115,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,414,241</strong></td>
<td><strong>$72,130</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,342,110</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,445</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,704</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,363,260</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contract Specifications

**Paragraph 8.1.4**

For Base Cost and Base Subsidy $1,612,176 $161,218 $1,450,958

### Over (Under) Contract Requirements

$ (197,935) $ (89,087) $ (108,848)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>$1,435,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>(100,479)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted Operating Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,334,912</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Farebox Ratio Actual** 5.4%

**Farebox Ratio Contract** 10.0%
Imperial County Transportation Commission & First Transit, Inc.

IVT-RIDE Transit Service Report

For the Year Ended June 30, 2015
TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS’ REPORT

ACCOUNTANTS’ COMMENTS

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Exhibit A – Internal Controls over Cash Handling Procedures

Exhibit B – Transit Vehicles in Custody of Service Provider

Exhibit C – Statement of Fixed Rate, Farebox Revenue and Net Subsidy – IVT-Ride – Brawley Service Line

Exhibit D – Statement of Fixed Rate, Farebox Revenue and Net Subsidy – IVT-Ride – Calexico Service Line

Exhibit E – Statement of Fixed Rate, Farebox Revenue and Net Subsidy – IVT-Ride – Imperial Service Line

Exhibit F – Statement of Fixed Rate, Farebox Revenue and Net Subsidy – IVT-Ride – West Shores Service Line

Exhibit G – Statement of Fixed Rate, Farebox Revenue and Net Subsidy – IVT-Ride – Combined Services
INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS’ REPORT

Imperial County Transportation Commission
1405 N. Imperial Avenue Suite 1
El Centro, California

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the Imperial County Transportation Commission’s Management, solely to assist the specified party in evaluating the specific First Transit, Inc. IVT-Ride transit services contract items for the year ended June 30, 2015. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of those specified parties in this report. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

Our procedures and findings are as follows:

1. We reviewed the transit service contract, including contract modifications, between the Imperial County Transportation Commission and First Transit, Inc. for the provisions of specific transit services to be provided.

2. We reviewed documents provided by the Imperial County Transportation Commission and First Transit, Inc. to verify that expenditure and fare amounts reported to the Imperial County Transportation Commission Administration for the specific transit services were presented fairly and accurately. We found that First Transit, Inc. is in compliance with the contract terms and reporting properly as agreed per contract(s). See Exhibits C through G as references for this review.

3. We reviewed on a test basis fuel expenditures reported for all specific transit services provided and noted if these expenditures were in accordance to the fuel related terms included in the service contract. We found that First Transit, Inc. is in compliance with the contract terms and these expenditures are within budget and reported accordingly.

4. We reviewed First Transit’s internal controls over cash handling procedures and tested their fare collection process and related activities. We found that the internal controls set by First Transit, Inc. are adequate based on established guidelines. See Exhibit A as reference for this review.

5. We reviewed that transit vehicles owned by the Imperial County Transportation Commission are utilized as part of the transit service assigned for, are maintained in a secure location and are serviced accordingly by First Transit, Inc. See Exhibit B as reference for this review.
We were not engaged to, and did not, conduct an audit, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the accounting records. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the management, the Imperial County Transportation Commission, the County of Imperial Board of Supervisors and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Hutchinson and Bloodgood LLP

February 17, 2016
ACCOUNTANTS’ COMMENTS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this engagement pertaining to the service contract between the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) and First Transit, Inc. was to provide an independent assessment of compliance with certain contract requirements during the period July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015, to assess the adequacy of First Transit Inc.’s internal controls over cash handling and reporting procedures and document the performance of our observation of the transit vehicles owned by ICTC under the custody of First Transit, Inc.

FARE REVENUES

The service contract for each of the services provided by First Transit, Inc. states that the farebox ratio of fare revenue divided by operating costs shall be maintained at or above ten percent (10.0%) for the Brawley, Calexico and Imperial IVT-Ride transit service line and five percent (5.0%) for the West Shores IVT-Ride transit service line.

For the IVT-Ride Brawley the actual farebox recovery ratio was over four percent (4.8%); ($7,732 fare revenue divided by $160,492 operating costs). See Exhibit C.

For the IVT-Ride Calexico the actual farebox recovery ratio was over six percent (6.7%); ($21,309 fare revenue divided by $318,986 operating costs). See Exhibit D.

For the IVT-Ride Imperial the actual farebox recovery ratio was over four percent (4.3%); ($6,341 fare revenue divided by $148,609 operating costs). See Exhibit E.

For the IVT-Ride West Shores the actual farebox recovery ratio was over two percent (2.5%); ($1,348 fare revenue divided by $54,034 operating costs). See Exhibit F.

For fiscal year ended June 30, 2015 the combined actual farebox ratio for all IVT-Ride transit services was over five percent (5.4%); ($36,730 fare revenue divided by $682,121 operating costs). See Exhibit G.

The farebox recovery ratio for all four IVT-Ride services was not met for this year.
ICTC SUBSIDY

The service contract, dated September 24, 2014, states that the compensation for the IVT-Ride Brawley service line for the period of January 1, 2015 through June 30, 2015 is identified as $181,108 less the farebox of 10% for a net subsidy not to exceed $162,997, with a marketing budget of $9,055. Actual costs for the year reported to ICTC were $152,387 in operational expense, and $8,105 in marketing expenses for a combined total of $160,492. See Exhibit C.

The service contract, dated September 24, 2014, states that the compensation for the IVT-Ride Calexico service line for the period of October 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015 is identified as $325,527 less the farebox of 10% for a net subsidy not to exceed $292,974, with a marketing budget of $16,276. Actual costs for the year reported to ICTC were $306,340 in operational expense, and $12,646 in marketing expenses for a combined total of $318,986. See Exhibit D.

The service contract, dated September 24, 2014, states that the compensation for the IVT-Ride Imperial service line for the period of October 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015 is identified as $162,101 less the farebox of 10% for a net subsidy not to exceed $145,891, with a marketing budget of $8,105. Actual costs for the year reported to ICTC were $144,382 in operational expense, and $4,227 in marketing expenses for a combined total of $148,609. See Exhibit E.

The service contract, dated September 24, 2014, states that the compensation for the IVT-Ride West Shores service line for the period of December 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015 is identified as $54,619 less the farebox of 5% for a net subsidy not to exceed $51,888, with a marketing budget of $2,731. Actual costs for the year reported to ICTC were $51,267 in operational expense, and $2,766 in marketing expenses for a combined total of $54,034. See Exhibit F.
OBJECTIVE

Review established internal control procedures over cash handling and perform a walkthrough observation of the fare collection cycle and related processes.

PROCEDURES

Reviewed First Transit, Inc. established guidelines over cash handling. Interviewed management and staff associated with the fare collection cycle. Observed cash count of total fares contained in farebox and confirmed amount collected with amount counted and amount reported.

OBSERVATIONS

It was noted that empty fareboxes are placed inside the transit vehicle under dual custody. Drivers observe that boarding passengers place money inside the farebox and keep a log of boarding passengers separated by fare type. At the end of the day, each full farebox is removed, also under dual custody, and locked inside the vault. All cash fares are counted the following day by two staff members in a locked room. Once cash is counted it is placed in sealed deposit bags and kept under key until ready to be deposited at the bank.

During the performance of this review it was noted that variances are generated when comparing the number of passengers to the projected fare they are required to pay. Some passengers do not have the correct fare and this results in most of them paying more than the required fare. Frequently it results in positive fare variances since the passengers that overpay is larger than those that underpay. It is recommended to perform a cost benefit analysis of upgrading fareboxes to those that can make change, accept only U.S. currency and are able to accept other forms of payment. Actual fares and not projected fares are those fares reported to the ICTC as fares received.

CONCLUSION

We found that the internal controls set by First Transit, Inc. are adequate based on established guidelines and that actual fares received are properly reported to the ICTC.
OBJECTIVE

Review that transit vehicles property of the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) are used for the contracted IVT transit service as well as are maintained in a secure location when not in service, and are being serviced as scheduled.

PROCEDURES

Perform a site visit of the First Transit, Inc. Bus and Maintenance Yard located at 792 East Ross Road in the City of El Centro. Observed and evaluated the condition of every ICTC owned vehicle based on vehicle list provided by ICTC.

OBSERVATIONS

When not in operation the transit vehicles are maintained inside the fenced and gated bus yard. There is only one entrance and exit point and the gate is locked once all vehicles are in. There are several outdoor lights that light up the parked vehicles and around the Maintenance Shop. The Maintenance Shop has cameras inside as well as an alarm system that is activated by the last person to leave the Bus Yard and deactivated by the morning dispatcher. There were no cameras noted in the Bus Yard area. Each transit vehicle is equipped with several cameras outside and inside the vehicle and activated when in service.

Each transit vehicle was observed prior to the start of the service day. Each vehicle number and description was compared to the vehicle list provided by ICTC. Each vehicle was inspected inside and outside for any visible damage, farebox placement, and overall working condition. No issues were noted with the nine transit vehicles used for the IVT-Ride transit service.

Service files for each transit vehicle are maintained in an office inside the Maintenance Shop under the custody of the Maintenance Manager. They contain records of all maintenance and services performed to each transit vehicle.

CONCLUSION

It appears that First Transit, Inc. is properly maintaining the ICTC owned vehicles in a secure location and servicing them as scheduled or as required.
### IVT Ride Brawley Service Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Base Cost</th>
<th>Farebox</th>
<th>Net Subsidy</th>
<th>Fuel Escalator</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Net Cost and Total Paid to First Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July, 2014</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2014</td>
<td>7,007</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2015</td>
<td>20,794</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>19,599</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,339</td>
<td>24,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2015</td>
<td>19,970</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>18,712</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2015</td>
<td>21,084</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>19,643</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>21,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2015</td>
<td>27,932</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>26,564</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>26,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2015</td>
<td>27,556</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>26,431</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2015</td>
<td>28,045</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>26,698</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>27,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 152,387</td>
<td>$ 7,732</td>
<td>$ 144,655</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 8,105</td>
<td>$ 152,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contract Specifications**

**Paragraph 8.1.1.1**

For Base Cost and Base Subsidy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ 181,108</th>
<th>$ 18,111</th>
<th>$ 162,997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Over (Under) Contract Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ (28,721)</th>
<th>$ (10,379)</th>
<th>$ (18,342)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Farebox Ratio Actual

4.8%

Farebox Ratio Contract

10.0%
## IVT Ride Calexico Service Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Base Cost</th>
<th>Farebox</th>
<th>Net Subsidy</th>
<th>Fuel Escalator</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Net Cost and Total Paid to First Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July, 2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2014</td>
<td>15,233</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,233</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>17,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2014</td>
<td>39,035</td>
<td>4,792</td>
<td>34,243</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,586</td>
<td>37,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2014</td>
<td>34,110</td>
<td>1,839</td>
<td>32,270</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,309</td>
<td>36,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2014</td>
<td>42,153</td>
<td>1,807</td>
<td>40,346</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2015</td>
<td>31,290</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>29,436</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2015</td>
<td>29,390</td>
<td>2,118</td>
<td>27,272</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2015</td>
<td>32,513</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>30,293</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>32,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2015</td>
<td>27,961</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>25,680</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>25,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2015</td>
<td>26,701</td>
<td>2,139</td>
<td>24,563</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2015</td>
<td>27,954</td>
<td>2,258</td>
<td>25,696</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>26,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>306,340</td>
<td>21,309</td>
<td>285,031</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,646</td>
<td>297,678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contract Specifications

**Paragraph 8.1.2.1**

For Base Cost and Base Subsidy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base Cost</th>
<th>Farebox</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$325,527</td>
<td>$32,553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over (Under) Contract Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base Cost</th>
<th>Farebox</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$(19,187)</td>
<td>$(11,244)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Farebox Ratio Actual 6.7%

Farebox Ratio Contract 10.0%
## STATEMENT OF FIXED RATE, FAREBOX REVENUE AND NET SUBSIDY

### JULY 1, 2014 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2015

### IVT Ride Imperial Service Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Base Cost</th>
<th>Farebox</th>
<th>Net Subsidy</th>
<th>Fuel Escalator</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Net Cost and Total Paid to First Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July, 2014</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2014</td>
<td>6,702</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2014</td>
<td>22,626</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>21,227</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>22,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2014</td>
<td>21,485</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>20,793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2014</td>
<td>12,927</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>12,265</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2015</td>
<td>13,450</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>12,852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2015</td>
<td>12,958</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>12,437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2015</td>
<td>13,501</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>12,897</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>14,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2015</td>
<td>13,580</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>12,979</td>
<td></td>
<td>313</td>
<td>13,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2015</td>
<td>13,281</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>12,695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2015</td>
<td>13,872</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>13,193</td>
<td></td>
<td>674</td>
<td>13,867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

$ 144,382 $ 6,341 $ 138,041 $ - $ 4,227 $ 142,267

### Contract Specifications

**Paragraph 8.1.3.1**

For Base Cost and Base Subsidy

|               | $162,101 | $16,210 | $145,891 |

Over (Under) Contract Requirements

|               | $(17,719) | $(9,869) | $(7,850) |

**Farebox Ratio Actual**

4.3%

**Farebox Ratio Contract**

10.0%
## IVT Ride West Shores Service Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Base Cost</th>
<th>Farebox</th>
<th>Net Subsidy</th>
<th>Fuel Escalator</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Net Cost and Total Paid to First Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July, 2014</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2014</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2014</td>
<td>6,901</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>6,685</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>8,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2015</td>
<td>9,061</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>8,842</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2015</td>
<td>6,741</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>6,524</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2015</td>
<td>6,983</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>6,829</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2015</td>
<td>6,781</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>6,570</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>6,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2015</td>
<td>6,634</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>6,468</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2015</td>
<td>6,644</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>6,478</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>7,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 51,267</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,348</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 49,919</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ -</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,766</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 52,685</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contract Specifications**

Paragraph 8.1.4.1

For Base Cost and Base Subsidy

$ 54,619 $ 2,731 $ 51,888

Over (Under) Contract Requirements

$ (3,352) $ (1,383) $ (1,969)

**Farebox Ratio Actual**

2.5%

**Farebox Ratio Contract**

5.0%
### All IVT-Ride Combined Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Base Cost</th>
<th>Farebox</th>
<th>Net Subsidy</th>
<th>Fuel Escalator</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Net Cost and Total Paid to First Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July, 2014</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2014</td>
<td>61,661</td>
<td>6,191</td>
<td>67,852</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,016</td>
<td>72,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2014</td>
<td>55,594</td>
<td>2,531</td>
<td>58,126</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,309</td>
<td>62,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2014</td>
<td>61,981</td>
<td>2,684</td>
<td>64,664</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>66,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2015</td>
<td>74,595</td>
<td>3,866</td>
<td>78,461</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,339</td>
<td>83,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2015</td>
<td>69,060</td>
<td>4,114</td>
<td>73,174</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2015</td>
<td>74,080</td>
<td>4,418</td>
<td>78,498</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,339</td>
<td>83,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2015</td>
<td>76,254</td>
<td>4,460</td>
<td>80,714</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>81,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2015</td>
<td>74,173</td>
<td>4,016</td>
<td>78,189</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2015</td>
<td>76,515</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td>80,964</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,697</td>
<td>83,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$654,377</td>
<td>$36,730</td>
<td>$691,107</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$27,744</td>
<td>$718,851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined Contract Specifications

Base Cost and Base Subsidy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$723,355</th>
<th>$69,605</th>
<th>$653,750</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Over (Under) Contract Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$(68,978)</th>
<th>$(32,874)</th>
<th>$37,357</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Operating Costs

$682,121

Farebox Ratio Actual

5.4%
V. REPORTS

A. ICTC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
B. SCAG REPORTS
C. CALTRANS REPORTS
**Memorandum**

**Date:** March 14, 2016  
**To:** ICTC Commission  
**From:** Mark Baza, Executive Director  
**Re:** Executive Director’s Report

The following is a summary of the Executive Director’s Report for the Commission Meeting on March 23, 2016.

1. **ICTC Budget Workshop:** The ICTC Budget Workshop is scheduled for May 25, 2016 at 5 p.m. and will be held at the County Administration building in Conference Room C/D immediately before the Commission meeting. Light refreshments will be available.

2. **Save the Date - Imperial Valley General Assembly and Economic Summit:** The Imperial Valley General Assembly and Economic Summit will be held on May 18-19, 2016. Location to be determined.

3. The following are the FY 2015-16 Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) list of projects. The table describes the status of projects and their planned request for allocations (RFA). *It is recommended that RFA should be submitted prior to May of the FY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Total Project Cost (in thousands)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brawley</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>S. Palm Ave. Rehab</td>
<td>$734</td>
<td>3/4/16 submittal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brawley</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Sidewalk Rehab-Various</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>Design in May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calipatria</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>S. International Ave. Sidewalk</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>ROW in Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Ross Ave. Rehab</td>
<td>$571</td>
<td>Design in March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holtville</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Walnut Ave.</td>
<td>$562</td>
<td>E-76 rcvd 1/28/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holtville</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Cedar Ave. Sidewalk</td>
<td>$136</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Various Roads</td>
<td>$1,102</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>N. Center St. Pavement Rehab</td>
<td>$372</td>
<td>PE RFA submitted 2/25/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Federal Triennial Review:** Every three years, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) conducts an intensive review of practices and procedures to determine compliance with twenty-one (21) areas for the continued use of federal transit grant funding. The FTA review team visited ICTC on February 9th and 10th, 2016. The FTA review team visited transfer terminals and the bus operations yard, and talked with staff from ICTC, Brawley, Imperial and El Centro and Imperial Valley Transit (IVT). The final draft report is anticipated within 30 days. The review was comprehensive and positive feedback was received on meeting many of the programmatic requirements, with minor direction for improvements.
5. **Funding for Phase II of the Calexico West Port of Entry Project in the President’s FY17 Budget** – 
*Press Release (Summary)*: “(February 9, 2016) – Rep. Juan Vargas (CA-51) announced the inclusion of 
$248 million for the Calexico West Land Port of Entry (LPOE) reconfiguration and expansion project in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 budget released today. If approved, the funding would be sufficient to complete the project.” As previously noted, Congress authorized $98 million for Phase 1. The U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) began construction for Phase 1 in December 2015 with completion scheduled for January 2018.

6. **State Route 86 (Northbound) Border Patrol Checkpoint**: ICTC has initiated discussions with management and staff with Customs and Border Protections (CBP) Border Patrol regarding the potential to add a second inspection lane at this very busy checkpoint. Coordination efforts will follow with Border Patrol, Caltrans and the region to determine feasibility, costs and funding of required improvements within Caltrans right-of-way.

7. **ICTC High Desert Pathways to Commercialization Project**: ICTC is partnering with Antelope Valley Transit Authority (AVTA), Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVQMD), and the Imperial County Air Pollution Control District (ICAPCD) to submit a grant under the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Pilot Commercial Deployment program. The project proposed will deploy a mixture of 23 zero emission battery electric buses. ICTC will acquire 6 of the 23 vehicles for a cost of $2,700,000. The vehicles will operate in the cities of Brawley and El Centro on the established circulator routes. The project requires a 25% matching amount which totals $675,000. ICTC is partnering with the ICAPCD, which has agreed to match ICTC’s cash match amount of $337,500, covering the required 25% match dollar amount. The grant is competitive and is expected to be awarded in the April/May 2016 time frame with potential implementation Fall 2017. David Salgado, Project Manager.

8. **Imperial County Transportation Commission Unmet Transit Needs (UTN) Hearing**: The annual Unmet Transit Needs (UTN) hearing was held on Thursday, February 11, 2016 at 3:30pm. The Second UTN meeting to present alternatives and possible recommendations was held on March 16, 2016 at 3:30 p.m. Both meetings were held at the City of Brawley Council Chambers located at 383 Main Street in the City of Brawley. Free bus transportation to the meetings was provided from the 7th and State St. Transit Transfer Terminal in the City of El Centro. The results of the ICTC UTN process will be submitted for approval at the April 27, 2016 ICTC meeting. David Salgado, Project Manager.

9. **Imperial County Regional Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Masterplan**: The Imperial County Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Regional Masterplan Project is underway. The consultant selected to carry out the study is Ryan Snyder and Associates. The project is funded by the Community Based Transportation Planning (CBTP) program administered by Caltrans. The local match was provided by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) from the Sustainability Grant program. The community outreach and public workshop component of the project has been completed. The final plan is scheduled for approval in March 2016. David Salgado, Project Manager.

10. **Imperial–Mexicali Binational Alliance (IMBA)**: An IMBA meeting was held on March 10, 2016 at the Barbara Worth Country Club in Imperial County. Presentations were made by US Consulate General Jason Vorderstrasse regarding High Level Economic Dialogue and by IID Director Benson regarding Water and Energy. Virginia Mendoza, Project Manager.

11. **Calexico East Commercial Vehicle Port of Entry Expansion Project**: ICTC submitted the Calexico East Commercial Vehicle Port of Entry Expansion Project under the California Sustainable Freight Action Plan: Pilot Project Ideas. The project is a proposed public-private partnership for the construction costs of the freight elements of the Calexico East Expansion that include: bridge expansion, commercial vehicle primary inspection booths and road construction totaling $30 million. The California Environmental Protection Agency Air Resources Board has reviewed the project ideas submitted and presented pilot project concepts at the Sustainable Freight Action Plan workshop held on February 1, 2016. The concepts presented in the workshop included “Advanced Technology Truck Fast Lane (Border)”. Additionally in December 2015, Safer Community Foundation, Inc. in partnership with the County of Imperial and ICTC.
submitted the expansion proposal to Customs and Border Protection through their “559 Donation Authority.”

12. **IVT RIDE Update:** The IVT Ride El Centro Service Area Request for Proposals (RFP) has been approved by Caltrans Procurement and was released to the public on February 8, 2016. Proposals were due on March 11, 2016 to ICTC. David Salgado, Project Manager

13. **IVT MedTrans Update:** The IVT MedTrans Request for Proposals (RFP) has been approved by Caltrans Procurement and was released to the public on February 19, 2016. Proposals are due on April 1, 2016 to ICTC. David Salgado, Project Manager

14. **Transit Vehicle Procurement Update:** ICTC has submitted an order for six smaller 25ft. cutaway transit vehicles to be operated on the fixed route services with lower ridership. Those vehicles will be purchased under the CalACT statewide cooperative purchasing agreement. All 6 vehicles will replace a mixture of leased and First Transit owned vehicles to eventually make the entire fixed route fleet owned by ICTC. The receipt of the vehicles should take place over the coming months with project completion scheduled for February 2016. ICTC is also currently working with a vendor to receive a quote for the five (5) 25ft. cutaway transit vehicles for the IVT RIDE – El Centro service, and, the IVT MedTrans projects as well.

15. **Regional Mobility Hubs Strategy for Imperial and San Diego:** This project funded by Caltrans will develop a Regional Mobility Hubs Implementation Plan for San Diego County and Imperial Valley. This project will be led by SANDAG in collaboration with ICTC. The focus of the plan will be to develop recommended improvements, conceptual designs, and implementation strategies for different mobility hub station place types for both regions. Consultant work is underway with preparation for a full range of stakeholder outreach. Virginia Mendoza, Project Manager

   Mobility hubs provide an integrated suite of transportation services, supporting amenities, and urban design enhancements that reduce the need for single occupant vehicle trips by increasing first mile/last mile access to high-frequency transit stations. Mobility hubs are places of connectivity where different modes of transportation - walking, biking, ridesharing, and public transit – come together seamlessly at concentrations of employment, housing, shopping, and/or recreation. Hub features can include: bikeshare, carshare, neighborhood electric vehicles, bike parking, dynamic parking management strategies, real-time traveler information, real-time ridesharing, demand based shuttle or jitney services, bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements, wayfinding, urban design enhancements, and supporting systems like mobile applications, electric vehicle charging, smart intersections, and a universal payment system to make it easy to access a wide range of travel.

   Mobility hubs can help maximize the capital investment in transit services and support the emphasis on smart growth and transit-oriented development. The project and Consultant team hosted an agency workshop in Imperial County on December 2, 2015. The meeting covered the study purpose, roundtable discussion of criteria for locating mobility hubs, amenity priorities, and what are potential locations. The Consultant team is planning a public outreach event in the first or second quarter of 2016.

16. **The San Diego State University / Imperial Valley College Transit Shuttle Analysis:** The Transit Shuttle Analysis will assess the feasibility of an inter-college shuttle service in Imperial County. ICTC and SCAG staffs worked together with Imperial Valley College and San Diego State University staff to complete the consultant selection process. SCAG staff completed the contract agreement with the selected consultant AECOM. Student surveys and campus workshops at SDSU-Calexico and IVC were held on Wednesday, November 18, 2015 and Thursday, November 19, 2015. The existing conditions analysis has been completed. A second round of outreach is scheduled for April 18th and 19th at both SDSU-IV and IVC campuses. The 3rd Technical Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for April 19, 2016 at the ICTC office. Virginia Mendoza, Project Manager

17. **Community of Niland Bus Stop Bench and Shelter Request:** The ICTC submitted a formal request to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 11 requesting their assistance in identifying a location for a bus stop bench and shelter in the Community of Niland along State Route 111 (SR-111).
Caltrans and ICTC are finalizing a preferred location and any improvements necessary for installation of the bench and shelter.

18. **FALL 2015 SCAG “GO HUMAN” Campaign:** As a part of the SCAG Active Transportation Safety and Encouragement Campaign community outreach and advertising will kick off Fall 2015. SCAG is launching the “GO HUMAN” campaign with the goals of reducing traffic collisions in Southern California and encouraging the public to walk and bike more. ICTC has participated in the ongoing steering committee meetings with SCAG in order to help facilitate the planning and outreach efforts to occur in the Imperial County region. The City of El Centro was selected to have a demo project implemented in the city as a part of the “GO HUMAN” campaign. The event will be held concurrently with the “le Tour de 8th” bike ride and will include multiple bicycle and pedestrian “pop-up” style temporary improvement demonstrations. Those interested in participating in the “GO HUMAN” campaign please contact: Julia Lippe-Klein at lippe-klein@scag.ca.gov.

19. **California-Baja California Binational Region:** A Fresh Look at Impacts of Border Delays: Building upon previous Caltrans, SANDAG, and ICTC studies, this project will refine the economic models developed to assess economic impacts of delays at the land ports of entry (POEs) between the San Diego and Imperial Counties region and Baja California, Mexico, on the border region economies. It will also estimate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of passenger and commercial vehicles due to northbound and southbound border delays at the six California POEs, and propose strategies to reduce GHG emissions at the border region. Lastly, extensive outreach to government agencies, local border communities, and private sector stakeholders will be conducted. Extensive data collection and modeling work has been conducted on these areas by ICTC, SANDAG and other agencies, this project will build upon that work.

The critical economic link between San Diego and Imperial Counties, and Baja California border region has local, regional, statewide, and national importance in both the U.S. and Mexico, and as such, the economic impacts of delays at the border have been shown to be significant. Additionally, the GHG emissions impacts of these delays to border communities are unknown. This study will primarily address these two concerns. The project will be funding is provided by Caltrans, SANDAG, and in-kind contributions from ICTC.

20. **California's Road Use Charge Pilot:** In 2014, Legislature passed Senate Bill 1077 (SB 1077) directing California to conduct a pilot program to study the feasibility of a road charge as a replacement for the gas tax to pay for road maintenance and repairs. A 15-member technical advisory committee (TAC), composed of representatives from diverse interests, is now working to study the potential for a road charge and outline the parameters of the pilot program. The TAC will craft the parameters of the road charge pilot program by the end of 2015. Beginning no later than January 1, 2017, thousands of California drivers will make history by volunteering to participate in the road charge pilot program to test new approaches. The pilot program will be implemented by the California State Transportation Agency. The outcomes of the road charge pilot program will be reported back to the TAC, the California Transportation Commission (CTC), and the Legislature no later than June 30, 2018. The CTC will provide recommendations on the pilot program to the Legislature in December 2018. The Legislature will then decide whether and how to enact a full-scale permanent road charge program.

21. **Meetings attended on behalf of ICTC:**
- February 24, 2016 – Imperial County Transportation Update and Kickoff for the major I-8 repaving project in El Centro
- February 25, 2016 – Regional Safety Summit at Caltrans District 11
- February 26, 2016 – SANDAG Borders Committee in San Diego
- March 3, 2016 – SCAG Regional Council Meeting in Los Angeles
- March 8-9, 2016 – Mobility 21 Sacramento Advocacy Trip
- March 10, 2016 – Imperial Mexicali Binational Alliance (IMBA) Meeting
- March 10-11, 2016 – IVEDC Renewable Energy Summit
- March 16, 2016 – Unmet Transit Needs Second Meeting in the City of Brawley
- March 17, 2016 – California Transportation Commission Meeting and STIP Hearing in Orange County
- March 18, 2016 – County Transportation CEO’s Meeting in Los Angeles
General Assembly & Economic Summit

Save-the-Date

May 18 – May 19, 2016

For more information, please contact Cynthia Mancha
(760) 353-8332 or email: cynthia@ivedc.com.
2016 RTP/SCS DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

The 60-day public review and comment period for the Draft 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 RTP/SCS) and the plan’s Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) ended on Feb. 1. SCAG received a total of 158 verbal and written comment submissions on the Draft 2016 RTP/SCS and 81 comment submissions on the Draft PEIR. Comments included both support and opposition for specific transportation projects as well as concerns on environmental factors and housing affordability in the region, among others. SCAG staff will present a summary report on the public comments received, including an approach to addressing comments in the plan, at the Joint Regional Council and Policy Committee meeting on Thursday, March 3.

REGISTER FOR SCAG’S 2016 REGIONAL CONFERENCE AND GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN LA QUINTA

Join SCAG for the 51st Annual Regional Conference and General Assembly, May 5-6, at the La Quinta Resort & Club. This year’s event theme, “Power of the Past, Force of the Future,” builds upon the release of the 2016 RTP/SCS as well as last year’s celebration of the agency’s 50-year anniversary. This exciting and dynamic event brings together state and local elected officials, CEOs, business and civic leaders, transportation and environmental stakeholders, local government staff and others. Early bird registration and sponsorship information is available on the conference website: http://www.scag.ca.gov/ga2016

SCAG PREPARES REGION FOR AHSC GRANTS

On Feb. 8 – 9, the Strategic Growth Council conducted two well-attended informational workshops for the competitive Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) grant program in Riverside and Los Angeles, respectively. SCAG hosted the Los Angeles workshop at its headquarters and provided staff at both locations to assist interested applicants. Workshop participants included parties interested in learning more about the program and those planning to submit applications in this current funding cycle. The AHSC program is intended to fund projects that reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through more compact infill development patterns, integrating affordable housing, encouraging active transportation and mass transit usage and protecting agricultural land from sprawl development. SCAG sees this program as an important funding source to implement its Sustainable Communities Strategy and has created a Cap-and-Trade Technical Assistance Team to help position the region for future funding. For more information, please contact Kristen Pawling at pawling@scag.ca.gov.

RANDALL LEWIS HEALTH POLICY FELLOWSHIP FORUM ON APRIL 28

Join Partners in Better Health and SCAG in recognizing healthy communities’ efforts throughout the Southern California region at the annual Randall Lewis Health Policy Fellowship Forum, April 28, 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m., at the Ontario Convention Center. The Randall Lewis Health Policy Fellowship is an internship program for graduate students in public health, urban planning and public policy. Ten Southern California universities currently participate in the program and fellows work for one academic year with local governments on health policy and policy implementation which supports the Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. This year’s program includes an opportunity to interact with the 20 current fellows who are working in cities and government associations throughout the region on local health policy and policy implementation. The event is free, but RSVP is required at http://bit.ly/1L3QR4t. For additional information, please contact Rye Baerg at baerg@scag.ca.gov.
STATE HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY RELEASES DRAFT 2016 BUSINESS PLAN

The California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) recently released its Draft 2016 Business Plan for a 60-day public review and comment period, ending on April 18, 2016. The Draft includes a significant change to the initial operating segment. Whereas previously the initial operating segment was proposed to connect Merced to the San Fernando Valley by 2022, it is now proposed to connect San Jose to north of Bakersfield by 2025. High-speed rail service would therefore not reach the SCAG region until completion of the full Phase 1 system in 2029. However, the Draft 2016 Business Plan proposes an additional $2.1 billion to enhance the segment from Los Angeles Union Station to Anaheim to allow direct high-speed rail service to Anaheim (one-seat ride), which was not assumed in the previous business plan. These enhancements incorporate commitments from the Memorandum of Understanding with CHSRA and Southern California transportation agencies approved by the Regional Council in 2012, which provides for $1 billion in early investments in the SCAG region. The intention is to put in place much of the infrastructure required for high-speed train service, including tracks and grade separations, which would have independent utility and provide near-term benefits to commuter, passenger and freight rail in the corridor. According to the Draft 2016 Business Plan, additional details on specific investments will be identified as the CHSRA completes the environmental documents for this section by December 2017. SCAG staff will present draft comments to the Transportation Committee for approval at its next meeting on April 7, 2016.

SUSTAINABILITY PLANNING GRANTS UPDATE

SCAG is pleased to update that the agency has successfully contracted 70 of the 75 total Sustainability Planning Grants approved by the Regional Council in 2013 and 2014. At present, 69 grant projects have had Requests for Proposals (RFPs) released, have selected consultants and have had contracts executed (this includes contracts resulting from Memoranda of Understanding between SCAG and four member cities). Five grant projects have decided to not proceed. Thirty-two grant projects have been completed, 31 projects are scheduled to be completed by the end of June 2016 and the remaining 7 grant projects are scheduled to be completed by the end of FY 2016-2017.

TOOLBOX TUESDAY INTRODUCES NEW REVISION SOFTWARE

On Feb. 2, SCAG held a Toolbox Tuesday training session on REVISION, a new free web application developed by SCAG and the UCLA Lewis Center for Regional Policy Studies. REVISION is a regional mapping and analysis application that integrates public and private data for sustainable communities planning and trend visualization. With a range of metrics related to accessibility, livability, employment and health, REVISION helps both professional planners and stakeholders without a technical background monitor the progress of the SCAG’s Sustainable Communities Strategy. For more information about REVISION and future training sessions, visit http://revision.lewis.ucla.edu. Toolbox Tuesdays provide free classes for staff of SCAG-member local governments and other partners and offer a range of practical skills and knowledge on timely planning issues. For more information about future Toolbox Tuesdays workshops, please visit: http://sustain.scag.ca.gov/Pages/ToolboxTuesdayTraining.aspx.

SCAG’S CLEAN CITIES COALITION RECEIVES RENEWED DESIGNATION

On Jan. 29, the SCAG Clean Cities Coalition, a program that supports locally-based and government partnership efforts to expand the use of alternative fuel vehicles in the region, was re-designated by the U.S. Department of Energy for another three-year cycle. SCAG staff gave a presentation on the Clean Cities Coalition’s recent achievements and goals for the next cycle to the co-directors of the national program and other Department of Energy staff. EEC Vice-Chair Mayor Pro Tem Carmen Ramirez from the City of Oxnard and EEC member Councilwoman Sandra Genis from the City of Costa Mesa also participated, representing SCAG policy makers. They joined diverse stakeholders including representatives from South Coast Air Quality Management District, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), the City of Los Angeles Department of Water & Power and the California Fuel Cell Partnership. The Clean Cities program leadership commented that they were impressed with the commitment demonstrated by the attendees in a fuel-neutral approach to increasing the penetration of alternative fuel vehicle technologies. They were also impressed by the extensive area and diverse fleets covered by the coalition.
U.S. CENSUS WORKSHOP HELD ON BLOCK BOUNDARIES

On Feb. 18, SCAG hosted a training workshop for the 2020 Census Block Boundary Suggestion Project, presented by the U.S. Census Bureau and the UC Berkeley Statewide Database. The Block Boundary Suggestion Project is an important part of the geographic preparations for the 2020 Census and allows counties the opportunity to provide input about the features that will be designated as boundaries for census tabulation blocks. It also allows counties to suggest block boundary changes that may be of use in the post-2020 Census redistricting process or for other data tabulation purposes. Approximately 50 practitioners participated in the workshop.

SCAG GIS SERVICES PROGRAM UPDATE

As a service to its member jurisdictions, SCAG distributes laptops, ArcGIS software, spatial data and training through the agency’s GIS Services Program. The cities of Avalon and Signal Hill will receive these GIS resources in March, bringing the total for the GIS roll-out to 20 jurisdictions this year. In addition, SCAG recently provided GIS training to staff from Apple Valley, Cudahy, Huntington Park, Loma Linda and South Gate. In the coming months, staff will be holding various GIS trainings throughout the region with venues in Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino counties. For more information on SCAG’s GIS Rollout Program, please contact Javier Aguilar at aguilar@scag.ca.gov.

SCAG STAFF PRESENTS AT WESTERN REGIONAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION MEETING

In mid-February, SCAG staff was invited to present at the 2016 Western Regional Science Association (WRSA) 55th Annual Meeting on the Island of Hawaii. Founded in 1961, the Western Regional Science Association is an international multidisciplinary group of university scholars, government and private-sector practitioners dedicated to the scientific analysis of regions. This year’s meeting brought more than 300 professionals with 200 papers from around the world and SCAG staff made two paper presentations: The Influence of the Built Environment on Asthma Hotspots (Simon Choi) and Analyzing the Impact of Transit Oriented Development on Gentrification and Displacement– Incorporating Margins of Error of the American Community Survey (John Cho).
SAVE THE DATE

27TH ANNUAL DEMOGRAPHIC WORKSHOP

THE CONTINUED RISE OF THE MILLENNIALS?

MONDAY, JUNE 13, 2016
8:00a.m. - 3:00p.m.

California Science Center
Loker Conference Center
700 Exposition Park Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90037

www.scag.ca.gov/demographics

Presented by USC Price Sol Price School of Public Policy
The Southern California Association of Governments and the University of Southern California Sol Price School of Public Policy are pleased to invite you to the 27th Annual Demographic Workshop at the California Science Center on Monday, June 13, 2016. This year’s program, “The Continued Rise of the Millennials?” provides new insights and research on this important demographic group and what that means for the region’s future, including housing, employment and services. The program will include guest speakers and panels related to this topic and will be attended by over 150 thought leaders, business representatives and city officials.

**MONDAY, JUNE 13, 2016 // 8a.m. – 3p.m.**
Continental breakfast served at 7:30am.

Register online at www.scag.ca.gov/demographics
Early bird registration (ends May 31): $75/person
Registration (after May 31): $100/person
Student registration: $50/person

Continental breakfast and lunch included

For more information, contact John Cho
(213) 236-1847 or choj@scag.ca.gov

7 hours of CM credit is available for this event

www.scag.ca.gov/demographics
February 29, 2016

Christopher Calfee, Senior Counsel
Governor’s Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Comments on the “Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA” to Implement SB 743

Dear Mr. Calfee:

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and the County Transportation Commissions (CTCs) undersigned would like to express our sincere appreciation for the extensive efforts put forth by the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) staff in developing this latest proposal in support of the draft CEQA Guidelines update, pursuant to SB 743. We thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

As the Metropolitan Planning Organization representing 6 counties and 191 cities in Southern California, SCAG is responsible for implementing SB 375 in our region. In April 2012, SCAG’s Regional Council adopted the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, a transformational plan for Southern California. SCAG is now in the final stages of developing the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, which is focused on further achieving regional sustainability objectives and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

SCAG recognizes the importance of SB 743 for the effective implementation of SB 375. The development of an alternative metric to evaluate CEQA transportation impacts that serves to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, supports development of multimodal networks, and encourages mixed-use transit oriented development, will also serve to facilitate implementation of the 2016 RTP/SCS. SCAG recognizes that the proposed transition to a VMT based metric will facilitate implementation of many of the sustainability strategies outlined in the RTP/SCS and will support regional investments, particularly in active transportation and transit.

OPR’s extensive outreach efforts, which most recently included a well-attended stakeholder meeting at the SCAG offices on February 18, 2016, have provided our local stakeholders the opportunity to gain a better understanding of the Revised Proposal and to offer timely
and meaningful input. We very much appreciate the exemplary diligence OPR has demonstrated throughout this process to maximize participation by our regional and local stakeholders in developing the revised CEQA Guidelines through the several meetings and workshops conducted by OPR in support of this effort over the past two years. We also commend the responsiveness of OPR staff in engaging our stakeholders in meaningful discussions.

OVERALL CONCERNS

Despite OPR staff’s efforts, SCAG still has serious concerns if the current version of the Revised Proposal document is adopted. It is important to note that the ability of our RTP/SCS to meet both state and federal statutory requirements is dependent upon implementation of the Plan as a whole, including the addition of highway and roadway capacity to meet the existing and projected future transportation mobility needs of millions of residents living and working in our region.

The 2016 RTP/SCS presents a balanced and integrated land use and transportation plan for the Southern California region that respects local input from our member cities and counties, and is consistent with respecting local control over land use issues as required by state laws, including SB 375. SB 743 and its implementation through the CEQA Guidelines will greatly facilitate the region’s ability to plan for and implement transit supportive development patterns and encourage built environment conditions that support increased active and public transportation. However, the highway capacity improvement projects included in the 2016 RTP/SCS are also an integral component of the Plan, and any VMT impact that individual projects may produce, either direct or induced, is balanced at the regional level by a wide array of other projects and strategies that serve to reduce VMT and meet regional GHG reduction targets. Therefore, it is imperative that OPR’s proposal be modified to assure that individual capacity improvement transportation projects that are identified in the RTP/SCS, sales tax measures, or STIP be grandfathered and not be evaluated or required to comply with a new project-specific VMT metric in isolation of the integrated regional plan of which they are a part.

Implementation of the current version of the Revised Proposal, with the proposed new VMT and induced demand impact analysis requirement, creates new litigation risks for transportation projects that have already been included in the approved 2012 RTP/SCS (and evaluated in the accompanying certified Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)), and those that are included in the pending 2016 RTP/SCS and PEIR. Imposition of new project-level VMT and traffic inducement CEQA impact analyses jeopardizes the integrity of our transportation plan, and could create unwarranted new legal risks for voter-approved, federally-approved, and state-approved transportation capacity investment projects. For these reasons, we strongly urge OPR to limit the new Guidelines to approving the suggested VMT impact metric aimed at streamlining the CEQA process for infill projects by SB 743 to the Transit Priority Areas at the present time, or at minimum, extend the opt-in period for non-Transit Priority Areas and the grandfathered projects identified in the RTP/SCS, sales tax measures, or STIP.
ADOPTIONAL SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Below are additional specific comments as related to the induced demand analysis, mitigation requirements for capacity improvements projects, fair share allocation, RTP/SCS consistency, and grace period.

Induced Demand Analysis

- Induced demand is a major new CEQA impact concept, and the following is a partial list of issues that should be comprehensively addressed in a workshop setting prior to issuing this revision to the CEQA Guidelines. We would like to invite OPR staff to lead the workshop, and we appreciate our continued collaboration with OPR toward achieving successful implementation of the revised Guidelines.
  - Requiring induced demand and related VMT analysis for individual projects will increase the risk of litigation due to the general infeasibility of providing the required mitigation measures in many areas, thereby mandating the preparation of a large number of separate EIRs for a multitude of individual projects.
  - Recalibrate the fair share of VMT threshold so that the fair share is apportioned to capacity only projects.
  - Develop models that adequately assess the regional effects of VMT.
  - OPR should provide clarification regarding what specifically constitutes induced demand with respect to VMT. The addition of a definitions section in the Technical Appendix may allow the opportunity to provide more precise descriptions of some of the terms used in the document.
  - Freight corridors documented in the California Freight Mobility Plan should be exempted from the induced growth analysis requirement. This is consistent with Executive Order B-32-15, which highlights competitiveness as one of the pillars of sustainable freight and a sustainable economy. In addition, special consideration should be given to projects that promote dedicated freight corridors or zero/near-zero vehicle technology.
  - More direction is needed regarding how to determine the CEQA baseline for induced impact analysis.
  - Clarification is needed on the approach to be used for analyzing induced demand by project type.
  - Providing the option for use of a programmatic approach to project-level induced growth evaluation, including the use of tiering from previously adopted EIRs, such as the 2012 or the pending 2016 RTP/SCS PEIR, would relieve local jurisdictions of the significant and costly burden of having to perform separate analyses for each individual transportation project.
  - Grandfather in projects in the 2016 RTP/SCS, sales tax measures, or in the STIP.

Mitigation Requirements for Capacity Improvement Projects

- Many of the mitigation measures suggested in the Technical Advisory are clearly in line with regional and local priorities including active transportation, first/last mile connectivity, transit supportive development patterns, transit expansion, and
complete streets. We particularly appreciate the suggestion of a fee-based mitigation option, though we would welcome more guidance on the suggestion. Nevertheless, many of the recommended VMT mitigation measures included in the Technical Advisory are not feasible options in some areas, particularly suburban, rural, and other non-transit amenable locations. In addition, capacity improvement projects that are not of a scale large enough to impact regional VMT performance should be considered for exemption from this requirement.

- The Draft Guidelines should clearly state that only capacity increasing transportation projects would require mitigation.
- Additional guidance regarding the presentation of feasible mitigation options for projects in suburban and other outlying non-TPA areas is recommended. Many of the options presented in the Technical Advisory are not feasible for highway improvement projects.

**Fair Share Allocation**

- The ‘fair share’ VMT allocation methodology presented in the Technical Advisory could prove to be more beneficial as a tool for estimating the VMT threshold of a capacity increasing project by revising the allocation calculation to make it more responsive to the multitude of factors that affect a project’s VMT impact.
  - Clarification is needed regarding the appropriate methodology for calculating ‘fair share’ VMT at the project-level.
  - The ‘fair share’ allocation methodology should be revised to take into account the scale of a project including, for example, lane miles, costs, and facility type.
  - The ‘fair share’ allocation methodology should be applicable only to projects that increase highway capacity.
  - The ‘fair share’ methodology should be crafted not to penalize fast growing areas or roadway projects that provide much needed connectivity and accessibility.
  - However, the data and assumptions required to determine the statewide VMT cap and allocation are fluid, which would result in the need to constantly monitor and adjust the fair share allocations. The development of a programmatic approach to VMT allocation may reduce the uncertainties introduced by the currently recommended project-oriented ‘fair share’ methodology.

**RTP/SCS Consistency**

- The land use assumptions and data being used in support of the 2016 RTP/SCS for the SCAG region are to be adopted at the jurisdictional level. Any interpretation of RTP/SCS data at a geographic scale smaller than the jurisdictional level should not be used for purposes of determining consistency with the RTP/SCS.
  - Language is needed in the revised Guidelines that clearly states that RTP/SCS consistency is to be determined at the discretion of the lead agency and is to be based on the aggregation of TAZ data to the jurisdictional level.
  - Cities and counties control local land use decisions under the California constitution and other statutes, such as General Plan laws. SB 375, which creates the statutory framework for reducing GHG from the land use and transportation sectors, specifically calls out and respects local control over land
use decisions. Successful collaborative planning efforts have allowed our region to meet and exceed GHG reduction targets. As a result, we strongly urge the guidelines allow for flexibility among the local region to address and resolve issues as best fits the local context.

**Grace Period Extension**

- It is beneficial that OPR has included a 2-year opt-in period to allow less prepared jurisdictions the opportunity to gradually develop the resources needed for successful implementation of the revised Guidelines. To further promote successful implementation in non-TPA areas, an extension of the process to allow for technical and policy workshops, and refinements of the proposal, is required in addition to an eventual proposed grace period to allow more time to absorb lessons learned from the initial implementation is recommended. It is imperative that local jurisdictions have adequate tools and resources in place to implement any new analytical requirements established by the revised Guidelines before Guideline revisions are adopted or implemented.

  For example, the VMT averaging approach suggested for unincorporated areas and incorporated cities for various types of land uses requires the availability of VMT data for these sub-areas of a region, and further requires the creation of average VMT for existing land use categories within a region. These VMT methodologies should be developed, and tested, before any Guideline revisions are proposed or adopted.

  - OPR should consider granting an extension of the 2 year ‘opt-in’ period to allow suburban localities and other non-TPA areas adequate time to resolve issues regarding the limited availability of feasible mitigation options in these areas.

  - Reconvening stakeholders approximately 18 months after initial implementation of the revised Guidelines in the TPAs is recommended so that OPR will be able to report on lessons learned to stakeholders, and to establish a strong foundation of implementation experience which can be used to evaluate how best to proceed to further improve implementation.

  - We strongly encourage OPR to grandfather capacity projects that are approved and/or identified in the 2016 RTP/SCS, sales tax measures, and the STIP, and that OPR focus the CEQA streamlining measures in support of SB 743 in the Transit Priority Areas at the present time, which will help promote transit-oriented infill development in those locations while also providing a strong foundation for achievement of both the regional transportation sustainability goals of the 2016 RTP/SCS and the statewide GHG reduction goals of SB 375. At a minimum, the opt-in period should be extended for implementation in non-Transit Priority Areas.

In summary, it is our contention that the most efficient means for preventing sprawl, and the concomitant greenhouse gas emissions it produces, is to incentivize compact development, and focusing implementation of the revised CEQA Guidelines to the Transit Priority Areas, at least until such a time that a more complete understanding of the implications that may be presented by a more expansive implementation of the revised Guidelines is obtained. We support our region’s and our state’s mutual goal of sustainable development and
greenhouse gas reduction, but feel strongly that to succeed we must have the ability to implement the projects that were authorized in the regional transportation plans and sales tax measures. In order to deliver on the commitments made in these plans, it is critical that the opt-in period be extended for non-Transit Priority Areas and that capacity projects identified in these plans be grandfathered.

SCAG and the CTCs undersigned look forward to continuing to assist OPR in the development of the CEQA Guidelines Update pursuant to SB 743 to ensure that the revision does not place undue burdens to our member jurisdictions and delays in project implementation. Please keep us apprised of the status of this initiative, and let us know of any means by which we may be able to further assist OPR staff to ensure the successful implementation of the revised CEQA Guidelines in the SCAG region.

If you have any question, please contact Ms. Huasha Liu, Director, Land Use and Environmental Planning, at (213) 236-1838.

Sincerely,

Hasan Ikhrata
Executive Director
Southern California Association of Governments

Mark Baza
Executive Director
Imperial County Transportation Commission

Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Darrell Johnson
Chief Executive Officer
Orange County Transportation Authority

Anne Mayer
Executive Director
Riverside County Transportation Commission

Raymond Wolfe, Ph.D.
Executive Director
San Bernardino Associated Governments

Darren Kettle
Executive Director
Ventura County Transportation Commission
SAVE THE DATE

May 5-6, 2016

SCAG’s 2016 Regional Conference and General Assembly promises to be both stimulating and exciting, and will feature a number of truly unique activities and experiences! We are hard at work ensuring that the conference exceeds your expectations.

Take advantage of the conference’s early bird registration while it lasts. Early bird pricing of $250 ends April 1, so grab your spot at this rate while it lasts!

Register at scag.ca.gov/ga2016

We look forward to seeing you in La Quinta!
March 2, 2016

The Honorable Ander Crenshaw
Chairman
House Appropriations Committee
Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government
B-300 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable José E. Serrano
Ranking Member
House Appropriations Committee
Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government
1016 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

RE: Calexico West Land Port of Entry Phase II Reconfiguration and Expansion Project

Dear Chairman Crenshaw and Ranking Member Serrano,

On behalf of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), I would like to offer this letter of support for the inclusion of $248 million in funding for the Calexico West Land Port of Entry (LPOE) Phase II Reconfiguration and Expansion Project in the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations bill, as proposed by the President’s FY 2017 Budget. This funding will ensure completion of the project, which will improve crucial domestic supply chains, strengthen our national security, reduce the Port’s carbon footprint, and facilitate economic growth not only for the County of Imperial and the State of California, but for the entire nation as a whole.

For our region to remain competitive both domestically and internationally, we need the direct flow of goods through the ports to not be hindered by any means. The Calexico West LPOE project includes new pedestrian processing, personal occupancy vehicle (POV) inspection facilities, as well as new administration facilities. Phase I of the Expansion project is currently underway and is expected to be completed in 2018. Phase II will consist of the balance of the project, including additional site-work, an expanded pedestrian processing facility, administrative offices, and six additional northbound POV inspection lanes. The completion of this project guarantees the economic activity of the border will not be lost or delayed.

SCAG respectfully asks that you include the $248 million in funding to complete Phase II of the Calexico West LPOE Reconfiguration and Expansion project in order to realize the many benefits and improvements of this project. Many thanks in advance for your thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

Hasan Ikhrata
Executive Director
Date: March 17, 2016
To: ICTC Commissioners
From: Laurie Berman, Caltrans District 11, District Director
Re: District Director’s Report

The following is the California Department of Transportation, District 11 report for the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) meeting of March 23, 2016:

1. **Project Updates:**

   Please see map at end of report for project level detail.

2. **Traffic Operations:**

   **SR-78/Hovley Road, Brawley**

   The project’s been modified to add additional guardrails and vehicle detection. Portable changeable message signs will be posted two weeks ahead and after signal activation to alert drivers about the roadway change (see message below). Robust outreach is planned a week ahead and the week following signal activation – date to be determined.

   **Before activation:**
   
   NEW
   SIGNAL
   AHEAD
   MARCH
   XX

   **After activation:**
   
   CAUTION
   NEW
   SIGNAL
   AHEAD
SR-115/Worthington Road, Holtville

Caltrans initiated a traffic investigation to review field conditions, collision history and traffic collision reports for the intersection of SR-115/Worthington Road in Holtville. The investigation analysis resulted in the recommendation of signing and pavement marking enhancements. The last remaining items, including Flashing Beacons with new Stop Ahead signs, guide signs and pavement markings, were all completed March 12-13.

3. **Communications:**

Caltrans District 11 hosted the 2016 Imperial Transportation Update/Interstate 8 Update Project Groundbreaking Ceremony on Wednesday, Feb. 24 at Noon. The event took place in front of the new El Centro Maintenance Station at 1102 Montenegro Street in El Centro in Imperial County. Featured speakers were Caltrans District 11 Director Laurie Berman, Imperial County Transportation Commission Executive Director Mark Baza and California Highway Patrol Captain Menteck. The event provided an update to the media about transportation projects and related issues in Imperial County covering FY 16/17. Spanish and English interviews were provided to the attending media: El Sol del Valle reporter Felix Meza, Imperial Valley Press reporter Edwin Delgado, Adelante Valle reporter Arturo Bojorquez, KSEH-TV (ENTRAVISION-Yuma-Spanish), KECY-TV (Televisa, ABC and FOX-Yuma). The interviews ran throughout the day and were posted in the on-line editions of the newspapers.
4. **Maintenance:**

The first three segments of the *Interstate 8 Continuously Reinforced Concrete Pavement Project* began construction or will begin construction fairly soon:

- **Segment 1**, is near El Centro from 0.6 mile west of Anderholt Road Overcrossing to 0.5 mile east of the East Highline Canal Bridge, was awarded to Coffman Specialties, Inc. on November 18, 2015. Construction began the first week of February. Construction is expected to be completed early 2018.

- **Segment 2**, 26 miles east of El Centro from 0.8 mile west of State Route (SR) 98/I-8 separation to 0.6 mile east of the All American Canal, was awarded to Coffman Specialties, Inc. on December 15, 2015. Construction began early March 2016 and is schedule to be completed in the spring of 2019.

- **Segment 3**, near Winterhaven from 0.7 mile west of SR 186/I-8 separation to 0.3 mile east of Fourth Avenue Overcrossing, was awarded to Security Paving Company, Inc. December 22, 2015. Construction is expected to begin the mid-March 2016 and be completed in the spring of 2018.

The other 2 segments are scheduled to begin construction in February 2017. These 2 segments are:

- **Segment 4**, near El Centro from 0.6 mile west of I-8/SR-111 separation to 0.6 mile west of Anderholt Road overcrossing and from 0.5 mile east of the East Highline Canal Bridge to 0.8 mile west of I-8/SR-98 separation.
• **Segment 5**, near Winterhaven from 0.7 mile west of Ogilby Road Overcrossing to 0.7 west of the I-8/SR-186 separation.

5. **Planning Studies:**

There are a number of on-going planning studies in Imperial County, one of which is highlighted below.

Completed *Interstate 8 Transportation Concept Report* (TCR).

The document can be viewed at the following link:

6. **Local Assistance:**

*Division of Local Assistance Listserver Subscription*

Sign up to Division of Local Assistance Listserver to receive significant updates to changes or additions to Local Assistance web pages, including changes to the Local Assistance Procedures Manual and Local Assistance Program Guidelines or the issuance of Office Bulletins and Local Programs Procedures or Call for Projects.

http://lists.dot.ca.gov/mailman/listinfo/dla-website-updates-announce
New Signal Ahead on SR-78 and Hovley Road

SIGNAL FOR SAFETY

Motorists are reminded to drive safely, obey all laws and to pay special attention to vehicles crossing at intersections.
VI. ACTION CALENDAR

A. APPLICATION FOR FTA SECTION 5311 PROGRAM FUNDS
   FY 2015-16
March 17, 2016

James Predmore, Chair
Imperial County Transportation Commission
1405 N. Imperial Ave Suite 1
El Centro, CA 92243

SUBJECT: Application for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5311 Program Funds FY 2015-16

Dear Commission Members:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5311 program provides an annual source of rural grant funding to offset operational costs within an identified rural area for mass transit purposes as specified by the Legislature. The rural grant program is administered by Caltrans, who has issued a call for projects, for grants that are due by April 15, 2016.

The Commission previously approved the annual FY 2015-16 Budget and Finance Plan on June 24, 2015. FTA 5311 Rural Transit Grant Funds in the amount of approximately $261,436 are to be applied to IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT, the countywide transit system and IVT ACCESS, the regional ADA complimentary paratransit service and the IVT GOLD LINE – Brawley Circulator Route.

The IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT, IVT ACCESS, and IVT GOLD LINE budget fund #7416001-531075 includes the following for FY 2015-16:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost</td>
<td>$5,693,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Fares Anticipated</td>
<td>$803,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less LTF/STAF (State) Revenue</td>
<td>$2,659,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 5307 (Federal urban) grant revenue</td>
<td>$1,968,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 5311 (Federal rural) grant revenue</td>
<td>$261,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET COST</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CITIES OF BRAWLEY, CALExico, CALIPATRIA, EL CENTRO, HOLTVILLE, IMPERIAL, WESTMORLAND, IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT AND COUNTY OF IMPERIAL
The Management Committee met on March 9, 2016 and forwards this item to the Commission for their review and approval after public comment, if any:

1. Adopt the attached resolution authorizing the Executive Director to sign the FTA 5311 FY 2015-16 grant application and all supporting documentation, and, submit the application to Caltrans.

Sincerely,

MARK BAZA
Executive Director

BY: [Signature]

Kathi Williams
Senior Transit Planner

Attachment

MB/ksw/ds
RESOLUTION ______OF
THE IMPERIAL COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (ICTC)

AUTHORIZING THE FILING OF APPLICATIONS FOR FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING, WITH THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR ASSISTANCE AS AUTHORIZED BY 49 U.S.C. CHAPTER 53, TITLE 23 UNITED STATES CODE; UNDER FTA SECTION 5311, FOR USE WITHIN THE REGIONAL COUNTY-WIDE TRANSIT SYSTEM

WHEREAS, the U. S. Department of Transportation is authorized to make grants to states through the Federal Transit Administration to support operating assistance projects for non-urbanized public transportation systems under Section 5311 of the Federal Transit Act (FTA C 9040.1F); and

WHEREAS, the California Department of Transportation (Department) has been designated by the Governor of the State of California to administer Section 5311 grants for transportation projects for the general public for the rural transit and intercity bus; and

WHEREAS, ICTC desires to apply for said financial assistance to permit the continued operation of transit service in ICTC’s rural service area; and

WHEREAS, ICTC will program the FTA 5311 funds in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP); and

WHEREAS, ICTC has the requisite combination of state and local funding sources committed to provide the required local share; and

WHEREAS, ICTC has sufficient funds to operate the vehicles and equipment utilized or purchased under this project or operate the service, as applicable; and

WHEREAS, ICTC has, to the maximum extent feasible, coordinated with other transportation providers and users in the region (including social service agencies); and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AND ORDERED that the ICTC does hereby authorize:

1. That the Executive Director or his designee, to file and execute applications on behalf of ICTC with the Department to aid in the financing of capital/operating assistance projects pursuant to Section 5311 of the Federal Transit Act (FTA C 9040.1F), as amended.

2. That the Executive Director or his designee is authorized to execute and file all certification of assurances, contracts or agreements or any other document required by the Department.

3. That the Executive Director or his designee is authorized to provide additional information as the Department may require in connection with the application for the Section 5311 projects.
4. That the Executive Director or his designee is authorized to submit and approve requests for reimbursement of funds from the Department for the Section 5311 project(s).

By: ________________________________
   Chairman

ATTEST:

By: ________________________________

CRISTI LERMA
Secretary to the Commission
VI. ACTION CALENDAR

B. IMPERIAL COUNTY SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL REGIONAL MASTER PLAN
March 17, 2016

James Predmore, Chair
Imperial County Transportation Commission
1405 N. Imperial Ave Suite 1
El Centro, CA 92243

SUBJECT: Imperial County Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Regional Master Plan

Dear Commission Members:

Since February 2014 the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), in close coordination with regional partners and Caltrans, have been working with a consultant team to develop an Imperial County Regional Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Master Plan. The goal for developing the plan is to provide a tool for the Imperial County Region to be more competitive in the Active Transportation Planning (ATP) Grant Process, which provides funding for SRTS projects and other non-motorized bicycle and pedestrian projects.

The plan was funded by a Caltrans Community Based Transportation Planning Grant (CBTP) and a SCAG Sustainability Grant. The total budget for the project is $193,000. The consultant team was selected through SCAG’s open Request For Proposal (RFP) process. The project and grant management has been administered cooperatively by SCAG and ICTC. The selected consultant was Ryan Snyder and Associates.

The Imperial County SRTS Master Plan developed approximately 50 individual SRTS school projects throughout the Imperial region. Each plan was developed through local stakeholder outreach, input, and feedback. Each school district hosted a community stakeholder meeting to gather feedback regarding each school's most important site for improvement. All public participants and stakeholders were provided a short educational presentation of the SRTS program from the consultant team prior to giving comment and completing the workshop activities.

Most school districts received a plan for each school within their district. The plans also include cost estimates which are broken down by the different improvement elements and their costs. The feedback from the stakeholders at each school site was a vital component of the planning process and is incorporated as part of the plan development in the form of surveys and brief in-class student travel tallies. At the workshops the consultant also did a mapping exercise which allowed the stakeholders to identify on the map the areas where children walk and where improvements are most needed.
The DRAFT final document includes planning components for funding and implementation, transportation demand management benefits, design guidance and all relative survey data and results. The final plan will be available on the ICTC website and for a fee can be printed at the ICTC main office. ICTC will also hold, and make available, the completed surveys, informal classroom survey results, and all other related outreach and documents such as sign-in sheets and meeting exercise documents. The first twenty (20) pages of the document are provided as back-up to the agenda as they provide the background for the plans development and completion.

The Management Committee met on March 9, 2016 and forwards this item to the Commission for their review and approval after public comment, if any:

1. Approve the Imperial County Safe Routes to School Regional Master Plan.

Sincerely yours,

MARK BAZA
Executive Director

BY: [Signature]

Kathi Williams
Senior Transit Planner

MB/ksw/ds
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1. Introduction

Imperial County has embarked on an effort to improve transportation safety at all of its public schools. A California State Department of Transportation (Caltrans) grant, in partnership with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), was awarded to the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) to create a countywide Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Plan (the Plan). The Plan includes results of public workshops where local stakeholders identified safety issues and other barriers that discourage more students from walking or bicycling to the schools in Imperial County. It also includes a plan for each school to make engineering improvements to the most important location as was identified by stakeholders. These improvements range from intersection modification to new sidewalks or bikeways. This Plan details work completed thus far and future steps.

The Plan provides a roadmap for physical improvements and programs for implementation of physical modifications to the street and an enactment of programs. There are two primary purposes for SRTS plans:

1. To make it safer for students to walk and bicycle to school
2. To increase the number of students walking and bicycling to school

In addition to safety benefits, there are health benefits for students who walk and bike to school. Environmental benefits result as fewer parents drive their children to school every day. Additionally, as children and families adopt more active lifestyles, their quality of life increases, they have more free time from driving less, and community relationships are strengthened. All of these benefits combine to create more livable neighborhoods surrounding schools where children walk or bike to school.

The Imperial County Public Health Department (ICPHD) served as a key partner in the process to develop and implement the Plan. The Plan follows earlier efforts by ICPHD to spearheaded SRTS efforts in Imperial County over the last several years. Previous efforts by ICPHD include:

• Completed SRTS surveys at selected schools.
• A SRTS workshop conducted by the California Department of Public Health as part of National Walk to School Day in 2013.
• Supporting the San Pasqual Valley Unified School District in producing a SRTS Plan in 2011 to use as the basis for funding applications and the beginning of programs.

As part of the current Plan, the schools conducted surveys to obtain information from parents about their children’s trip to and from school, including perceptions of safety, traffic conditions, and parents’ opinions regarding whether walking and bicycling to school is appropriate for their child.

The Plan was initiated in March of 2015 when a consultant team was brought on to conduct the core work. The consultant team coordinated the Plan development, including contacting each of the school districts and schools, setting up and facilitating workshops together to gather key information, circulating surveys, and developing the SRTS Plan.

A nationally certified SRTS instructor from the consultant team facilitated the SRTS workshops in each school district. The workshops began with a presentation that described why SRTS is important, along with a sampling of engineering devices that can be applied to make walking and bicycling safer. The presentation also included information about the programmatic components: education, encouragement, enforcement and evaluation. After the presentation, stakeholder attendees drew on large-scale maps of their schools and the surrounding areas. Each group marked common walking and cycling routes to their school and identified key issues and locations needing improvement. They identified general safety issues, as well as location-specific safety issues. The groups then identified their number one location-specific concern at each of
the schools. These led to the creation of SRTS plans for each school. As part of the workshops the
SRTS instructor also collected information regarding the types of education, encouragement and
enforcement programs the schools currently carry out, and might like to enact in the future. Attendees also discussed the importance of forming SRTS committees to manage the programs.

Following the workshop, the consultant team conducted fieldwork for each of school’s number
one location-specific concern to provide engineering recommendations. This can be found under
the “Existing Conditions and Engineering Recommendations” section in each school’s SRTS plan.

This Plan contains a program for a “5 E” approach to making walking and bicycling safer and
more attractive to Imperial County’s students and parents. The 5Es include the following:

- **Engineering**—to make physical improvements to the routes that students use to walk or
  bicycle to school

- **Education**—to teach students safe walking and bicycling habits, to teach parents the
  importance of safe driving habits, and to emphasize health and environmental benefits

- **Encouragement**—to promote walking and bicycling to school so more students choose to do
  so

- **Enforcement**—to ensure that rules and laws of the road are followed, as well as safe pick-up
  and drop-off practices are adhered to at the schools

- **Evaluation**—to track the Plan to assess its success and to modify it accordingly.

Experience shows that this approach yields successful results in both making our communities
safer to walk and bicycle in, and increasing the number of students doing so.
2. Planning Context

Some of the improvement locations listed in this Plan coincide with work conducted for other planning efforts. This Plan compliments and expands upon these previous efforts to create a well-connected network for pedestrians and bicyclists throughout the County.

Following is a brief summary of each of the County’s respective non-motorized transportation studies.

**City of Brawley Non-Motorized Transportation Plan (NMTP) (2013)**

The City of Brawley’s NMTP serves as a guiding document for a comprehensive pedestrian and bicycle network and an update to the existing 2002 Bicycle Master Plan. The purpose is to improve the overall safety and enhance multi-modal connections through a well-established pedestrian and bicycle network.

For an estimated cost of $6,137,500, 46 miles of bikeways are proposed to emphasize connectivity to key destinations, including schools, activity centers and residential areas. This includes 6 miles of Class I bike paths, 22.5 miles of Class II bike lanes, and 17.5 miles of Class III bike route facilities. The plan also proposes pedestrian networking improvements, including sidewalk infill projects, intersection improvements, streetscape enhancements, suggested routes to schools, and traffic calming recommendations. The cost estimates for these pedestrian improvements total to $6,064,000.

**Imperial County Bicycle Master Plan (2012)**

The County of Imperial’s Bicycle Master Plan aims to create an integrated network of bicycle facilities and programs for the unincorporated areas of the County. The purpose of this Plan is to expand on the existing network spelled out in the 2003 Countywide Plan in order to qualify for state and federal funding for implementation.

The Plan recommends approximately 270 miles of on-street bikeways (Class II bike lanes and Class III bike routes), 63.8 miles of off-street Class I bike paths, and 102.9 miles of Class III bike routes along shoulders of state highways. The Plan provides a detailed prioritization strategy for implementation and estimates a total cost for the bikeway network (not including the Class III bike routes along state highways) to be $68,291,000. At full build out, the County of Imperial will have over 435 miles of proposed bikeways to improve connections between key destinations, as well as the incorporated cities and the more rural unincorporated areas of the County.

**San Pasqual Unified School District’s Fort Yuma Safe Routes to School Project (2011)**

The San Pasqual Valley Unified School District produced a Safe Routes to School (SRTS) plan in 2011 called the “Fort Yuma Safe Routes to School Project”. This project proposes a comprehensive “5E” approach—engineering, education, encouragement, enforcement and evaluation—to make walking and bicycling safer and more attractive around the school. A SRTS Committee was formed to carry out the programs.

**City of El Centro Bicycle Master Plan (2010)**

The 2010 City of El Centro Bicycle Master Plan is an update to the 2000 Master Plan. The purpose of this Plan is to create continuous and interconnected bicycle facility links to the County of Imperial’s regional and proposed network. It serves as the basis for applying for federal funding for the implementation of the Plan.
The Plan examines existing facilities, bicycle needs assessment, recommended bicycle network, funding costs and a phased implementation strategy. This Plan recommends the implementation of 20.60 miles of bicycle facilities for an estimated cost of $5,181,521. The plan includes 5.9 miles of Class I bike paths, 5.5 miles of Class II bike lanes, and 9.2 miles of Class III bike route facilities. Developers will construct an additional 27.3 miles of bike routes. These facilities will provide strong connections to local destinations and surrounding areas.

**County of Imperial Bicycle Master Plan (2003)**

The previous County of Imperial Bicycle Master Plan includes summaries of the existing and proposed bicycle facilities for the Holtville Bicycle Master Plan (2008), City of Imperial Bicycle Master Plan (2003), Calexico Bicycle Master Plan (2002), Westmorland Bicycle Master Plan (2002), and Calipatria Bicycle Master Plan. The City of Holtville has prioritized approximately 10.35 miles of bikeways at an estimated cost of $932,460. A complete document for the cities of Imperial, Calexico, Westmorland, and Calipatria were not available for review as of the publication of this report.
3. Evaluation

In the first months of the planning process, baseline surveys were taken to learn about existing commute to school patterns. As the Plan’s programs unfold, they should show increases in the number of students walking and bicycling. Since engineering improvements (physical modifications made to streets and intersections) will likely be made after this planning effort ends, initial increases in bicycling and walking will result from the programs alone. Further increases can be expected once the physical improvements are made. The Table B.1, the Baseline Commute to School Tally in Appendix B shows the results of a school tally conducted in the classrooms, where teachers ask their students how they got to school.

A more in depth parent survey was circulated. This questionnaire used the survey instrument, described in Appendix A, created by the National Center for Safe Routes to School. These surveys were passed out by teachers to each student to take home to their parents to gather information about current commute to school patterns, and the attitudes parents hold regarding permitting their children to walk or bicycle to school. This gave us further information regarding barriers preventing parents from allowing their children to walk or bicycle, as well as what might be done to alleviate those barriers. The results of this survey are displayed in the Appendix B. These surveys were conducted in English and Spanish.

Summary of Results from Parent Surveys

To be filled out when data is received.
4. Ongoing Programs

The recommendations that follow are the result of school and community outreach, background research, fieldwork, and experience for what makes effective Safe Routes to School programs. Throughout the outreach process, each school identified specific programs for education, encouragement, and enforcement that would work best for it. What follows here are programs the County could consider offering and implementing citywide, with the opportunity for each school to tailor the programs to its needs.

"Using a comprehensive “5 E” approach will allow the County to have the greatest impact and encourage more students to walk and bike to school. The Education programs will teach students, parents, and neighbors safe walking, bicycling, and driving habits, as well as the health and environment benefits of SRTS. The Encouragement programs aim to engage students, parents, school staff, and neighbors to promote walking and cycling to and from school. The Enforcement efforts seek to ensure that traffic laws and drop-off and pick-up procedures are followed. Evaluation tracks the program to assess what is effective and what might be modified. The Engineering improvements make physical changes to streets and intersections to remedy safety issues, and create a more comfortable environment for people walking and bicycling.

4.1. General Guide to Program Development

As the County develops each program, staff should keep in mind the following concepts recommended by the Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center (PBIC):

1. **Make walking and bicycling “try-able.”** Give people a chance to try walking and bicycling instead of driving. This could be by organizing a group ride to school or providing route maps for a citywide walk event, etc.

2. **Communicate the behavior you want to see.** Bumper stickers, banners, signs, pamphlets, and public service announcements can all convey messages to encourage travel by foot or bicycle.

3. **Reward behavior.** Provide incentives and gifts to motivate people to try walking and bicycling for a trip. These strategies are especially effective for school children.

4. **Make it convenient.** Design pedestrian and bike-friendly places throughout the city; prioritize improvements to key destinations.

5. **Institutionalize support for walking and bicycling.** Strong policies that support walking and bicycling will help guide programs and ensure ideas have staying power.

6. **Capitalize on other agendas.** Make walking and bicycling part of the solution to a wider range of issues the community faces, such as obesity, health, environmental concerns, and economic development.
4.2. Education

Educational programs should be tailored to specific audiences in order to effectively address the behaviors the programs seek to modify. For example, a child bicyclist will need different education on how to ride compared to an adult bicyclist. Similarly, different messaging will resonate with teen drivers than adult drivers. The most common audiences that will benefit from education programs include:

- Road users—bicyclists, pedestrians (children, teens, adults, parents, neighbors, seniors), and drivers (young, adult, older)
- Commuters and employers
- Officials and policy makers—engineers, planners, council members, law enforcement
- Students
- Teachers
- Neighbors
- Visitors

For each group, the County should consider when and how the audience should receive the information, and the demographic factors that may affect how the audience understands and perceives the information. Descriptions of educational campaigns and programs that were prioritized during the SRTS outreach process are detailed below.

Table 4.2. Education Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Implementation Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle rodeo</td>
<td>A bicycle safety clinic featuring bike safety inspections and a safety lecture, followed by a ride on a miniature “chalk street” course where young cyclists are shown where and how to apply the rules.</td>
<td>Work with Imperial County Sheriff’s Department, IUSD, each school, and IUSD School Police to sponsor at least annual bicycle rodeos for each school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and bicycle safety skills course for adults</td>
<td>Adults often do not know current regulations or protocols for safe walking or bicycling. These skills are important for parents to pass on to their children.</td>
<td>Work with organizations such as the League of American Bicyclists, Imperial County Sheriff’s Department, and IUSD School Police to offer regularly scheduled multilingual skills courses in walking and bicycling for adults at local parks and the civic center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and bicycle safety skills course for youth</td>
<td>These courses provide hands-on learning for young children on how to walk safely and ride a bicycle. Pedestrian skills training should be targeted to first and third graders, and bicycle skills training for third and fifth graders.</td>
<td>Work with organizations such as the League of American Bicyclists, Imperial County Sheriff’s Department, and IUSD School Police to offer regularly scheduled, multilingual skills courses in walking and bicycling for adults at local parks and/or each school. Work with IUSD to institutionalize bicycle and pedestrian skills course training at each school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Implementation Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety training</td>
<td>Training on personal safety prepares students to address any issues on their way to school, where they feel unsafe due to crime, harassment or violence.</td>
<td>Work with the Imperial County Sheriff’s Department and IUSD School Police to understand what materials exist around personal safety to train and distribute to students and parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print and media campaign with safe walking, bicycling, and driving messages</td>
<td>Promote educational messages such as “STOP! It could be someone you love in the crosswalk” or “Use the other pedal and slow down” into media coverage, events, street banners, maps, posters, stickers, guides, etc. Consider distributing “neighborhood slow zone” signage for residents to place in their yards, and flyers to schools. Messaging should be multilingual.</td>
<td>The County can develop or adapt nationally recognized media campaign materials, including flyers, stickers, and talking points, and distribute to the schools. Communication channels include messages from the principal through tele-parent (automatic calls), parent meetings, the family center, flyers, coffee with the principal, back to school night, parent-teacher meetings, school marquis, a monthly newsletter, and social media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe driving tips</td>
<td>Information about safe driving in Cudahy and around schools.</td>
<td>Create and/or adapt existing materials on safe driving to distribute to community members and parents who are dropping off or picking up their children at school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe walking and bicycling tips</td>
<td>Information about safe walking and bicycling.</td>
<td>Create and/or adapt existing materials on safe walking and bicycling to distribute to community members and parents. Materials are available through the National Center for Safe Routes to School, FHWA, and others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3. Encouragement

These programs generate excitement about walking and bicycling, and help spread the message that walking and bicycling is not only beneficial for health, social, and economic reasons, but enjoyable as well. Encouragement strategies are especially important when working with youth. Coordinating with individual schools to select prizes that are appropriate and customized will enhance encouragement programs. In addition to youth, parents should also be targeted in order to increase their involvement in SRTS.

Table 4.3. Encouragement Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Implementation Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Caught being good”</td>
<td>Law enforcement officers distribute “tickets” to students that are “caught being good,” which means they were following safety rules. The “tickets” are typically coupons for discounts at local businesses or a certificate.</td>
<td>The County can approach law enforcement officials to see whether they are interested in spearheading such an encouragement program, as well as coordinate with local businesses to receive coupons that appeal to youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Walk-to-School Day</td>
<td>International Walk to School Day, held in October each year, joins children and adults from around the world to celebrate walking and bicycling to school.</td>
<td>Generally, the County can help provide support to schools by providing incentive items, law enforcement support along pre-determined walking routes, and meeting locations throughout the county, as well as participating in the event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open streets events</td>
<td>Local streets are closed to vehicle traffic for a short period of time, so residents and visitors can experience this public space in a new way. CicLAvia in Los Angeles helps residents get used to walking and bicycling in a safe environment without cars.</td>
<td>The County can work with organizations to organize an open streets event in the community and encourage attendance. Volunteers are needed to support the event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent awards</td>
<td>Distribute awards to parents that support the SRTS program.</td>
<td>Provide the schools with certificates to recognize parents who have been exemplary volunteers to support SRTS. Recognize key school and parent staff at City Council meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and walk</td>
<td>A pre-determined parking lot acts as the meeting area for families who drive and then park and walk the remaining distance to school.</td>
<td>Work with local businesses to create agreements that allow their parking lots to serve as park and walk meeting locations. Distribute this information to the schools and promote the opportunity throughout the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal, mayor, and/or teacher-led walks</td>
<td>Key community leaders, such as the mayor, council members, principals and teachers, can lead regular walks in the community outside of school hours to encourage walking.</td>
<td>The County can organize staff to help lead walking events and/or a separate walk as part of existing events, such as the Imperial Valley Expo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Implementation Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student or classroom competitions with prizes</td>
<td>Contests encourage children either to begin walking and bicycling to school or to increase their current amount of physical activity by making it fun and rewarding. Competitions can be between students (e.g., student with most miles walked), or between classrooms (e.g., classroom with the most students walking to school). Generally, children track their progress and get a small gift or a chance to win a prize after they reach a certain goal.</td>
<td>The implementation of student or classroom competitions is typically school-driven. There are many existing templates for tracking progress. These include templates for punch cards that are marked whenever a child walks and programs such as “Fire up your Feet” which track information online. The County can support a citywide competition and provide materials for competitions, such as pedometers, reflectors, stickers, and plaques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk and roll Wednesdays</td>
<td>Designated day where students are encouraged to ride their bicycles or walk together to school and/or for short trips.</td>
<td>The County can promote a regular walking and bicycling day of the week or month for the community, and advertise it through available channels (at school, town hall, council meetings, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking school bus/ bicycle train</td>
<td>A walking school bus consists of groups of students accompanied by adults who walk a pre-planned route to school. Bicycle trains work like walking school buses. Adults, or older students, can lead the ride to school along a route that others can join on.</td>
<td>The implementation of walking school buses and bicycle trains is typically parent and school-driven. The County can support walking school buses and bicycle trains by volunteering to lead walks/rides, providing police support along pre-determined routes, and reviewing routes for any safety concerns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4. Enforcement

Enforcement programs help deter unsafe behaviors of drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists, and encourage all road users to obey traffic laws and share the road safely. The Imperial County Sheriff’s Department, local school police, and other law enforcement agencies will need to be involved in the execution of these programs.

Table 4.4. Enforcement Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Implementation Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corner captains</td>
<td>Adult volunteers stand at corners along routes to school so they can monitor students walking and</td>
<td>The County can alert neighbors along key routes to school to participate in the corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deter any activity that may be harmful to students.</td>
<td>captain program by coming out to their front yard during the morning walk to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing guards</td>
<td>Crossing guards promote safe behaviors at crosswalks by helping children safely cross the</td>
<td>The County already has a crossing guard program, which could be expanded to cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>street at key locations and reminding drivers of the presence of pedestrians.</td>
<td>additional intersections near each school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement presence</td>
<td>Provide an enforcement presence that discourages dangerous behaviors on and off the school</td>
<td>The County can work with the Sheriff’s Department and local school police to target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>campus. This may mean issuing warnings to drivers breaking traffic laws. Drivers who have made a</td>
<td>enforcement based on areas of most concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minor error will often respond to a warning from an officer by being more careful. Drivers who</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>continue to violate traffic laws need to be ticketed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood watch</td>
<td>Neighborhoods work with police to observe motor vehicle speeds and report crimes.</td>
<td>The County can provide regular updates to the local Neighborhood Watch group about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>any activity, and on the Safe Routes to School program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian decoy program</td>
<td>This program is used in areas where drivers are not yielding to pedestrians in marked crosswalks.</td>
<td>The County can share this idea with the Imperial County Sheriff’s Department, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plainclothes police officers cross the street, while another officer monitors driver behavior from</td>
<td>collect data from observational surveys to understand appropriate locations for law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a distance. The officer then will issue a warning or citation and educational materials depending</td>
<td>enforcement to monitor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on the situation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Implementation Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radar enforcement</td>
<td>Strict enforcement of speed laws in school zones can improve the safety for children walking and bicycling to school. A ‘zero tolerance’ policy for speeders in school zones, and an increase in fines for drivers who violate the posted school zone speed limit, are both potential approaches.</td>
<td>The County can work with the Sheriff’s Department and local school police to target enforcement based on areas of most concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed trailers, active speed monitors, and photo enforcement</td>
<td>Speed trailers and active speed monitors display the speed of oncoming vehicles. Both devices help officers track motorist speed, display current speed to motorist, and create awareness of the posted speed limit.</td>
<td>The County can work with the Sheriff’s Department to use and/or purchase equipment to monitor and enforce speed, and target areas of known speeding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student safety patrol (valet)</td>
<td>Student safety patrols enhance enforcement of drop-off and pick-up procedures at school by increasing safety for students and traffic flow efficiency for parents.</td>
<td>The school typically spearheads a student safety patrol or valet system. The County can assist by providing vests for participating students, as well as information material about setting up successful valet programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5. Future Evaluation

Evaluation of this program will consist of periodic surveys to determine how commute to school patterns have changed, as well as to assess what is working and what may need modifying. Annual student tallies like the baseline tallies conducted for this Plan will inform the County and schools if fewer students are arriving by car and more are walking or bicycling, and by how much.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Implementation Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian counts</td>
<td>Counting numbers of bicyclists and pedestrians around the County can help staff prioritize improvements. These counts can also be included in travel demand models. The Southern California Association of Governments developed a count methodology that is now available for use by local jurisdictions.</td>
<td>The County should conduct a pedestrian and bicycle count at least every other year and preferably annually. The County can work with organizations to organize and administer a count. The counts typically require volunteers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent attitudinal surveys</td>
<td>Survey questions, such as “what deters you from bicycling?” or “what mode do you use for short trips?” aim to understand attitudes toward walking, bicycling, and common concerns with letting students walk or bicycle to school.</td>
<td>The National Center for Safe Routes to School has a standard parent survey form that the County should distribute to schools annually for administration. The County should collect completed forms, analyze data, and submit results to the schools and the National Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student tallies</td>
<td>This survey asks what mode a respondent used for a certain trip. Mode of travel surveys are commonly done in schools as part of SRTS to find out how many children walked, bicycled, were driven, etc.</td>
<td>The National Center for Safe Routes to School has a standard student tally form that the County should distribute to schools annually for administration. Or, the schools can use a simple “how did you get to school today” raise your hand tally. Ideally, this should be done every year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6. Engineering (Conceptual)

Imperial County aspires to have streets that enhance quality of life available to all residents and provide safe and comfortable means of travel by foot, bicycle, transit, and vehicle. The pedestrian and bicycle engineering treatments included in this Plan will certainly help the County towards this goal. However, the recommendations included here are specific to the trip to and from school, with an eye toward students safely walking and bicycling to school. The County will continue to actively engage the community to ensure safety of all street users is a priority.

The recommendations included here are summarized in the following section “SRTS Plans by School”.
5. SRTS Plans by School

Comments from SRTS workshops were brought along when fieldwork was conducted so that the resulting plans address the issues raised. The fieldwork also identified new issues, which the plans address at each of the following schools:

**Brawley Elementary School District**
- Barbara Worth Junior High School
- J.W. Oakley Elementary School
- Miguel Hidalgo Elementary School
- Myron D. Witter Elementary School
- Phil D. Swing Elementary School

**Brawley Union High School District**
- Brawley Union High School
- Desert Valley High School

**Calexico Unified School District**
- Aurora High School
- Blanche Charles Elementary School
- Calexico High School
- Cesar Chavez Elementary
- De Anza 9th Grade Academy
- Dool Elementary
- Enrique Camarena Junior High School
- Jefferson Elementary
- Kennedy Gardens Elementary
- Mains Elementary
- Rockwood Elementary
- William Moreno J.H.S.

**Calipatria Unified School District**
- Bill Smith Jr. Middle School
- Calexico Community School
- Calipatria High School
- Fremont Primary School
- Grace Smith Elementary School

**Central Union High School District**
- Central High School
- Desert Oasis High School
- Southwest High School

**El Centro Elementary School District**
- Ballington Academy for the Arts and Sciences
- De Anza Magnet School
- Desert Garden Elementary School
- Harding Elementary School
- Hedrick Elementary School
- Imagine Imperial Valley
- John F. Kennedy Middle School
- Lincoln Elementary School
- Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary School
- McKinley Elementary School
- San Pasqual Elementary School
- Sunflower Elementary School
- Woodrow Wilson Junior High School

**Heber Elementary School District**
- Dogwood Elementary School
- Heber Elementary School

**Holtville Unified School District**
- Emmett S. Finley Elementary School
- Holtville Middle School
- Holtville High School

**Imperial Unified School District**
- Ben Hulse Elementary School
- Frank Wright Middle School
- Imperial Avenue Holbrook High School
- Imperial High School
- T.L. Waggoner Elementary School

**San Pasqual Valley Unified School District**
- San Pasqual Elementary School
- San Pasqual Middle School
- San Pasqual Valley High School

**Seeley Union School District**
- Seeley Elementary School

**Westmorland Union Elementary School District**
- Westmorland Elementary School
The planned physical improvements along school routes are described in the following pages. The design section at the end of this Plan provides definitions and guidance on these improvements. All bulb-outs and curb extensions will include perpendicular curb ramps and truncated dome tactile devices for the sight-impaired. All pedestrian signals will include audible signals for the sight-impaired.

For each school, a planned list of improvements was created. The list gives the County and local jurisdictions projects that they can seek funds for. The County and local jurisdictions may want to change the list over time, as the list is conceptual. Engineering will need to be conducted prior to construction.

Maps on the following pages illustrate common routes that students take to get to school. The proposed improvements were planned along these routes. The crossing improvements are numbered and shown on the map with their corresponding numbers.

Shade from trees also serves as an important factor to encourage more walking and bicycling. It is encouraged to plant native, drought-tolerant shade trees along walking and bicycling routes, where appropriate. Shade trees are important given the county has half the days of the year over 90 degrees.