ORANGE LINE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY MEETING

Wednesday, September 8, 2004

Cerritos Sheriff’s Station/Community Center
Community Meeting Room
18135 Bloomfield Avenue
Cerritos

Buffet Dinner – 6:00 p.m.
Meeting – 6:30 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Introduction of Attendees
4. Public Comments
5. Approval of Minutes of August 11, 2004
6. Membership and Financial Status
7. Treasurer’s Report
8. Selection of Environmental Planning Services Consultant (RFP 04-001)
9. Selection of Development Partner (RFP 04-002)
10. Rail~Volution Conference
11. Communication Items to the Board
12. Adjournment
MINUTES OF THE
ORANGELINE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (OLDA)

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 11, 2004

CALL TO ORDER

City of Bellflower Councilmember Scott Larsen called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

City of Cudahy Mayor Frank Gurulé led the assembly in the salute to the flag.

INTRODUCTION OF ATTENDEES

W. Michael McCormick – Councilmember, City of Vernon
Robert A. Lopez – Associate Planner, City of Cerritos
Ryan Carey – Planning Assistant, City of Cerritos
Gene Daniels – Councilmember, City of Paramount
Bruce Barrows – Lockheed Martin Corporation
Sharad Mulchand – Transportation Planning Manager, LA County MTA
Fred Freeman – Councilmember, City of Los Alamitos
Frank Gurulé – Mayor, City of Cudahy
John Brooks – Senior Analyst, City of Palmdale
Albert Perdon – OLDA Executive Director
Scott A. Larsen – Councilmember, City of Bellflower
Steve Lefever – Director of Community Development, City of South Gate
Jack Joseph – Deputy Executive Director, GCCOG
Pamela Mendoza – Administrative Assistant, City of Cerritos
Richard Marcus – Manager, OCTA
Keith McCarthy – Councilmember, City of Downey
Bob Hughlett – Mayor, City of Cerritos
Samuel Peña – Vice Mayor, City of Maywood
John Lyon – Councilmember, City of Artesia
Juan "John" Nogues – Mayor, City of Huntington Park
Yvette Abich – Legal Counsel, Colantuono & Levin
Kevin Chun – Deputy City Administrator, City of Bellflower
Dennis O’Connor – Western Regional Manager, STV L.A. Consultant
Betsy Lindsay – President & CEO, Ultra Systems
Bob Motschall – General Manager, Ultra Systems
Torrey Contreras – Advance Planning/Redevelopment Manager, City of Cerritos

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

City of Bellflower Councilmember Scott Larsen opened public comments for those in the audience who wished to address the Authority. There was no response and the public comment portion of the meeting was closed.
In response to an inquiry from City of Bellflower Councilmember Scott Larsen, Mr. Perdon provided information regarding the RFP evaluation process.

MOTION: City of Los Alamitos Councilmember Fred Freeman moved to accept the recommended actions as listed in the Agenda Report dated August 11, 2004. City of Paramount Councilmember Gene Daniels seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

FIRST AMENDED JOINT EXERCISE OF POWERS AGREEMENT

Legal Counsel Yvette Abich presented the First Amended Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement noting it enables cities that have taken action or in the future will take action to join the Authority, and yet who are currently not listed in the existing Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement, to become voting members of the Authority. In addition, she noted three criteria for consideration towards board membership.

Mr. Perdon added that interest in the Orangeline is growing and meetings are being planned with north Los Angeles County cities. A mechanism was needed to enable additional cities to join the Authority in the future.

City of Downey Councilmember Keith McCarthy inquired regarding possible legal issues connected with listing cities that are not currently participating. Ms. Abich noted that those cities listed have expressed a desire to join the Authority in the future.

Discussion ensued regarding presentation of changes in the future.

City of Bellflower Councilmember Scott Larsen suggested that the list be comprised of two sections "A" and "B", indicating those cities that are already members and those that have expressed an interest in joining. However, preference for leaving the list "as is" was indicated.

MOTION: City of Cerritos Mayor Bob Hughlett moved to approve the Agreement and to have it circulated among the member cities for adoption of the relevant resolution. City of Cudahy Mayor Frank Gurulé seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

ADDITION OF NEW MEMBER CITIES

Having approved the above item, Mr. Perdon recommended the addition of the City of Los Alamitos and the City of Palmdale as Members of the Authority.

MOTION: City of Paramount Councilmember Gene Daniels moved to approve the addition of the City of Los Alamitos and the City of Palmdale as Members of the Authority. City of Vernon Councilmember Michael McCormick seconded the motion.

Ms. Abich and Mr. Perdon responded to an inquiry from City of Downey Councilmember Keith McCarthy regarding clarification of acceptance on condition of adoption of the First Amended Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement by Authority members.

The above motion carried unanimously.
ORANGELINE/BELLFLOWER WEST BRANCH GREENWAY PROJECT STATUS

City of Bellflower Deputy City Administrator Kevin Chun presented a report on the status of the Greenway project. He addressed preliminary plans presented to the MTA and noted that the MTA expressed concerns because permanent structures were included within the right-of-way for recreational purposes and it desires to use that right-of-way for mass-transit purposes. Around that time, the City of Bellflower also began participating in OLDA because it felt that working with OLDA presented two important benefits. First, the Orangeline MAGLEV System is beneficial technology and is something that is believed will be accepted by the MTA and will allow Bellflower to improve the right-of-way the way it wants to. Secondly, the Orangeline is beneficial in that it would be an elevated structure which would allow the City to use the entire right-of-way for recreational purposes.

Mr. Chun addressed current conditions of the right-of-way, benefits of the Orangeline, compatibility challenges, preliminary plans, potential Orangeline station area, relation of the system and rights-of-way to the 91 Freeway and scope of work by TRI-USA.

Discussion followed regarding increasing the percentage of green area for the City, review of the City's General Plan, intersection of route to the 91 Freeway and acreage available to the City of Cerritos for open-space.

Staff was directed to receive and file the report.

STATUS REPORT ON FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION LEGISLATION

Mr. Perdon presented the report noting that Congress has not yet reached an agreement on the transportation reauthorization bill. He noted that there is doubt as to whether the bill will pass this year. He added that meetings with federal representatives are being planned in Washington, D.C. in conjunction with the annual meeting of the High Speed Ground Transportation Association.

MOTION: City of Downey Councilmember Keith McCarthy moved to receive and file the Agenda Report dated August 11, 2004. City of Cudahy Mayor Frank Gurulé seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

MEMBERSHIP IN THE HIGH SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. Perdon reported the annual meeting of the High Speed Ground Transportation Association will be held in mid-September in Washington, D.C. and will provide important opportunities for networking. He suggested that the Authority join the Association for the annual membership fee of $500. He added that the Association is the only broad-based advocacy group that is focused specifically and solely on high-speed train development.

MOTION: City of Cerritos Mayor Bob Hughlett moved to approve Authority membership in the High Speed Ground Transportation Association. City of Los Alamitos Councilmember Fred Freeman seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Hughlett requested distribution of information regarding the upcoming conference.
COMMENTS ON CALIFORNIA HIGH SPEED TRAIN PEIR/EIS

Mr. Perdon and Mr. McCarthy presented comments to be submitted to the California High Speed Rail Authority. These included comments on maximizing benefits and equity for ALL Californians, reconsideration of MAGLEV technology, alignments and decision-making, details of which are included in the Agenda Report dated August 11, 2004.

MOTION: City of Cudahy Mayor Frank Gurulé moved to approve the letter to the California High Speed Train PEIR/EIS. City of Paramount Councilmember Gene Daniels seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF WARRANTS

Mr. Perdon requested that the Board approve payment of an invoice from Transrapid-USA in the amount of $22,500 for professional services rendered for the Orangeline/Bellflower Greenway Project. Funding for this payment will be provided by grant funds from the City of Bellflower.

MOTION: City of Cerritos Mayor Bob Hughlett moved to approve payment of the invoice from Transrapid-USA in the amount of $22,500. City of Huntington Park Mayor, Juan "John" Noguez seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

COMMUNICATION ITEMS TO THE BOARD

Mr. Perdon provided information regarding recent and upcoming events of interest to the Board. He referenced a recent article in the City of Maywood Community Newsletter regarding the MAGLEV system.

MOTION: City of Los Alamitos Councilmember Fred Freeman moved to receive and file the report. City of Cudahy Mayor Frank Gurulé seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Orangeline Development Authority, the meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m. The next meeting will be held September 8, 2004 at 6:30 p.m.

Secretary

Attest:

Chairperson

Approved: September 8, 2004
The Orange Line Development Authority is a joint exercise of powers agency formed to pursue deployment of the Orangeline maglev system in Southern California. The Authority is composed of the following public agencies:

- City of Artesia
- City of Bell
- City of Bellflower
- City of Cerritos
- City of Cudahy
- City of Downey
- City of Huntington Park
- City of Los Alamitos
- City of Maywood
- City of Palmdale
- City of Paramount
- City of South Gate
- City of Vernon

Chairman
Hector De La Torre
Mayor, City of South Gate

Secretary
Art Galluccio
City Manager, City of Cerritos

Executive Director
Albert Perdon, PE

Supporting Agencies
Gateway Cities Council of Governments
Southern California Association of Governments
City of Garden Grove
City of Huntington Beach
City of Long Beach
City of Stanton

To date, thirteen cities have adopted the Orangeline Development Authority Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement, effectively forming a joint powers authority (JPA). This total includes twelve of the twenty cities along the southern segment of the Orangeline corridor; the thirteenth city is Palmdale, the joining of which established a new northern segment for the Orangeline. (See the map on the next page.)
In total, twenty-six cities (including Los Angeles County) are featured in the maps above. Three cities have passed a resolution supporting formation of the Orangeline Development Authority, but have not yet joined the JPA.

FINANCIAL STATUS

In August 2004, staff sent out invoices for member contributions to all of the Orangeline Member Cities. These contributions for fiscal year 2004-2005 will be applied toward administrative and consulting costs during the predeployment phase of the Orangeline. To date, no payments from member cities have yet been received.

RECOMMENDATION

The following is recommended to the Orangeline Development Authority:

1. Review and discuss the information provided; and

2. Receive and file.
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

AGENDA REPORT

TO: Members of the Orangeline Development Authority

FROM: Albert Perdon, Executive Director

DATE: September 8, 2004

SUBJECT: TREASURER'S REPORT

Attached is a copy of the Treasurer's Report for the Orangeline Development Authority. This report outlines the debit and credit transactions that have occurred within the Authority's account since the August 11, 2004, Board meeting. In the future, this report will be included under the consent calendar. Treasurer Jack Joseph will make an oral presentation regarding the details of this report.

RECOMMENDATION

The following is recommended to the Orangeline Development Authority:

1. Review and discuss the information provided; and
2. Receive and file.

Attachment
**TREASURER'S REPORT**  
**ORANGE LINE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY**  
August 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance (8-1-04)</td>
<td>$139,379.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transrapid (Bellflower Greenway Study)</td>
<td>22,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cerritos (Public Notice regarding Conflict of Interest Code)</td>
<td>270.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Member Stipends (August Meeting)</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>23,607.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Balance (8-31-04)</td>
<td>$115,708.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

Jack M. Joseph  
Treasurer
The Orange Line Development Authority is a joint exercise of powers agency formed to pursue deployment of the Orange Line maglev system in Southern California. The Authority is comprised of the following public agencies:
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DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
AGENDA REPORT

TO: Members of the Orange Line Development Authority

FROM: Albert Perdon, Executive Director

DATE: September 8, 2004

SUBJECT: SELECTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING SERVICES CONSULTANT (RFP 04-001)

BACKGROUND

On April 30, 2004, the Authority issued Request for Proposals (RFP) 04-001 for Environmental Planning Services. The purpose of this procurement was to secure consultant support in assessing and documenting the potential positive and adverse impacts of the Orangeline corridor development project. The work includes the preparation of economic and environmental impact documents (EIR/EIS) and other tasks pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The Request for Proposal was posted on the Authority website for downloading by prospective proposers. Notification of the RFP availability was done through a targeted internet e-mail distribution to the planning, engineering and development industry. Thirty-nine firms downloaded the RFP or one or more of the RFP amendments.

A pre-proposal conference was held on May 24, 2004, for this RFP and for RFP 04-002 - Development Partner - described in a separate report. Sixty-four registered attendees participated in the pre-proposal conference.

The Authority’s Request for Proposals generated a high level of competition from among the best environmental planning firms in the country. Excellent proposals were submitted in response to the RFP from the following five teams representing thirty-two firms in total.

1. EIP Associates, Los Angeles, California
   a. James Transportation Group - Sacramento
   b. John Eells Consulting Services - San Rafael
   c. Consensus Planning Group, Inc. - Irvine, Los Angeles
   e. Harris Miller Miller & Hanson, Inc. - Burlington, MA; Sacramento
   f. Terry A. Hayes LLC - Culver City
   g. Ninyo & Moore, Inc. - Los Angeles, Irvine
   h. Discovery Works, Inc. - Irvine
   i. Font Design, Inc. - Irvine
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2. HDR Engineering, Inc. – Omaha, Nebraska; Lake Forest, Los Angeles
   a. ATS Consulting, LLC – Los Angeles
   b. Consensus Planning Group – Irvine, Los Angeles
   c. Keyser Marston Associates – Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco
   d. Leighton Consulting, Inc.
   e. Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc. – Los Angeles
   f. The Robert Group – Los Angeles
   g. Urban Reinventions – Pasadena
   h. Weston Solutions – West Chester, PA; Carlsbad, Sherman Oaks

3. Myra L. Frank - Jones and Stokes – Sacramento, Los Angeles
   a. Korve Engineering, Inc. – Oakland, Los Angeles
   b. Harris Miller Miller & Hanson, Inc. – Burlington, MA; Sacramento
   c. ATS Consulting, LLC – Los Angeles
   d. TV LIN International – San Francisco, Brea
   e. Ninyo & Moore – Los Angeles, Irvine

4. P&D Environmental, Division of P&D Consultants, Inc. - Orange
   a. LSA Associates, Inc. – Irvine, Riverside
   b. Lea + Elliott – San Francisco, Los Angeles
   d. Hernandez Kroone & Associates – San Bernardino
   e. Sharon Browning & Associates –

5. UltraSystems – Irvine
   a. STV Incorporated – New York, NY; Upland, Los Angeles
   b. Kleinfelder, Inc. – Irvine
   c. ATS Consulting, LLC – Los Angeles
   e. Forma Designs, Inc. – Irvine
   f. Katherine Padilla & Associates –

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PANEL

A Proposal Evaluation Panel was formed to evaluate and score the proposals. The Panel consisted of the following members:

1. John Brooks, Senior Analyst, City of Palmdale
2. Kevin Chun, Assistant City Administrator, City of Bellflower
3. Torrey Contreras, Advance Planning/Redevelopment Manager, City of Cerritos
4. Sharad Mulchand, Senior Transportation Planner, LACMTA
5. Albert Perdon, Executive Director, Orangeline Development Authority
6. Dick Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

The Panel reviewed the written proposals and found that all proposers were highly qualified, responsible and responsive. The Panel determined that all proposers should be interviewed to complete the evaluation process. Interviews were held on September 1 and 2, 2004.

The Panel based its evaluation of the proposals upon the following evaluation criteria, as established in the RFP.
| Prior Successful Performance of Similar Work | 40% |
| Understanding of the Work and the Challenges to be Overcome | 20% |
| Capability and Commitment to Perform the Work and to Support the Authority in Achieving its Mission | 40% |

Following the interviews, the Panel met to complete its scoring of the proposals. Each Panel member individually scored each proposal. The scores from each Panel member were then added and averaged for each Proposal.

The Panel completed its work by reviewing the scoring results to confirm that the scores were consistent with the Panel's ranking of the proposals. Results of the evaluation are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposer</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. HDR Engineering</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Myra L. Frank – Jones &amp; Stokes</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. UltraSystems</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. P&amp;D Environmental</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. EIP Associates</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the key factors that set the top-ranked proposer apart from the other proposers were the following:

1. **Superior prior successful performance of similar work**
   a. The firm's performance in successfully meeting client needs is evidenced by its over 85 years experience and a current staff of 3,400. Not all of other proposers have been in business this length of time or have the backing of such large a staff.
   b. The proposed project manager has 30 years experience and has managed completion of EIR/EIS documents for the Alameda Corridor, Metro Red Line, LA-Long Beach Blue Line, San Fernando Valley East-West Corridor, and numerous other projects. Proposed project managers from other teams had equal or less experience, or experience not as comparable to the Orangeline. The Myra Frank project manager managed completion of the SCAG LAX-March Maglev project environmental input to the FRA maglev demonstration program EIS.
   c. The proposed team included very strong sub-consultants with extensive, proven successful experience in corridor development and economic analyses, and very mature, experienced senior staff. Other firms also had strong team members, but some were not as experienced as the top ranked firm.

2. **Superior understanding of the work and the challenges to be overcome**
   a. The firm’s proposal clearly articulated the team’s understanding of the challenges and outlined the best strategy for getting the project through the environmental review process.
   b. The firm recognized unique features of the Orangeline and presented an approach geared to these features. Some of the other proposers used a more conventional approach typical of most transit or highway projects.
c. The firm outlined an approach to expedite the environmental review process, while ensuring adequate community input, and included an outreach program as an integral part of the proposal. Some firms did not include an outreach component.

3. Superior capabilities and commitment to perform the work and to support the Authority in achieving its mission

a. Senior-level staff is committed to the project. Capability and commitment of the project manager is very high. The firm and its team members have the depth and breadth of resources to carry out most if not all of the work. The firm’s proposal gave attention to the importance of credibility and integrity in the preparation of the environmental documents.

b. The team included experienced experts in urban revitalization and real estate development/redevelopment capable to assess the impacts and opportunities for station-area development. Other firms did not address this component of the program as well.

While the top ranked firm clearly demonstrated to the Evaluation Panel its team’s outstanding capabilities and superior proposal, all firms submitted excellent qualifications and anyone of the firms could most likely perform some or all of the work in an acceptable manner. The ability to call upon one or more of the lower ranked firms, should the need arise, would be advantageous to the Authority.

Each of the proposers submitted a cost proposal in a separate sealed envelope. These envelopes have not been opened. The cost proposals will only be opened following approval to negotiate an agreement with one or more firms.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

The Board has several options, including the following.

Option 1 is to authorize staff to negotiate an agreement with the highest ranked/scoring firm. If this option is approved by the Board, staff would return to the Board with a proposed agreement for Board consideration and possible action. This option would likely result in the Authority achieving its objective of engaging the services of a qualified team of environmental planning services firms.

Option 2 is to exercise Option 1 described above, and in addition select for negotiations and award of contracts in the form of Master Agreements that provide for potential future task orders, the remaining firms to serve as a “bench”. This option gives the Authority additional flexibility and enables a quicker and more efficient response to the possible need for additional services as the project grows. This option provides the Authority with flexibility to bring in one or more teams or team members that could be helpful in addressing critical issues, especially when time is of the essence. By creating a bench from which the Authority is able to draw services as they are needed, the Authority would be better equipped to respond to the needs of member cities or of the bond markets and other funding partners who may have specific needs and expectations that are not easily discernible at this point in time.
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**Option 3** is to reject the proposals and re-issue the RFP now or at a later date. This option is not recommended. Five responsive, competitive proposals were submitted from highly qualified, responsible firms. A re-issuance of the RFP would likely not result in an improved response, and may in fact result in a lower response from qualified firms. Additionally, time is of the essence. Re-issuing the RFP would delay momentum in moving the project forward and jeopardize efforts to secure funds and position the Authority to initiate technical studies and community outreach.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The following is recommended to the Board:

1. Review and discuss the information provided; and

2. Approve Option 2, the recommended option, to negotiate an agreement with the highest ranked/scoring firm and have the remaining firms serve as a "bench".

3. Authorize staff to negotiate agreements with each of the firms, with the intent that the agreements will be brought back to the Board for approval prior to execution.
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

AGENDA REPORT

TO: Members of the Orange Line Development Authority

FROM: Albert Perdon, Executive Director

DATE: September 8, 2004

SUBJECT: SELECTION OF DEVELOPMENT PARTNER (RFP 04-002)

BACKGROUND

On April 30, 2004, the Authority issued Request for Proposals (RFP) 04-002 for a Development Partner. The purpose of this procurement was to secure a development partner that will assist the Authority and its member cities in performing all the tasks necessary to plan, build, operate, maintain and fund the Orangeline, and to help member cities achieve their general and specific land use plans for future growth and development.

The Request for Proposal was posted on the Authority website for downloading by prospective proposers. Notification of RFP availability was done through a targeted internet e-mail distribution to the planning, engineering and development industry. Sixty-eight firms downloaded the RFP, or one or more of the RFP amendments.

A pre-proposal conference was held on May 24, 2004 for this RFP and for RFP 04-001 - Environmental Planning Services - described in a separate report. Sixty-four registered attendees participated in the pre-proposal conference.

The Authority’s Request for Proposals generated four formal responses. Three of the responses were in letter form indicating the interest of the proposer to serve as the Authority’s development partner, or as a member of the team selected by the Authority to serve as development partner. One of the proposers submitting a letter proposal to serve as a development partner subsequently withdrew its proposal.

The fourth and final proposal that was submitted fully met the requirements set forth in the RFP. Excluding the proposal that was withdrawn, proposals were received from the following firms representing 40 private and public entities in total.

1. KCI Industries, Inc. – Hunt Valley, Maryland (letter proposal to provide strategic planning services in the area of federal environmental analyses)

2. TEMS (Transportation Economics & Management Systems, Inc.) – Frederick, Maryland (proposal to provide support services in the area of ridership estimating and economic analysis)
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3. Maglev, Inc. – Pittsburgh, PA (representing the following Shareholder and contributing members)
   a. Carnegie Mellon University
   b. City of Pittsburgh
   c. Bombardier, Inc.
   d. Fred J Gurney, CEO, Maglev, Inc.
   e. Michael Baker, Jr., Inc.
   f. Duquesne Light Company
   g. PA Representative
   h. Pennsylvania Department of Transportation
   i. Pittsburgh Building and Construction Trades Council
   j. Port Authority of Allegheny County
   k. PricewaterhouseCoopers (Contributing Accountant)
   l. Richard Cessar
   m. Reed Smith LLP
   n. Tri-State Conference on Manufacturing
   o. United Steel Workers of America
   p. USX Corporation
   q. Wheeling Pittsburgh Steel Corporation

4. Lockheed Martin Corporation Integrated Systems and Solutions – Santa Maria, CA
   a. Arcadis G&M, Inc. – Arnhem, the Netherlands; Fullerton,
   b. Aztec Engineering – South Pasadena, Corona, Irvine
   c. CDM – Cambridge, MA; Irvine, Woodland Hills, Ontario, Sacramento
   d. Earth Tech, Inc. – Long Beach, San Diego, Colton, Sacramento, San Jose
   e. Hensel Phelps – Greeley, Colorado; Irvine, San Jose
   f. HNTB Corporation – Kansas City, Missouri; Santa Ana, Los Angeles
   g. IABG, GmbH – Ottobrunn, Germany
   h. MACTEC – Alpharetta, GA; Los Angeles, Irvine, San Diego, Sacramento
   i. Meyer, Mohades Associates, Inc. – Los Angeles
   j. J.L. Patterson Associates, Inc. – Orange; Bellevue, WA
   k. Shapery Enterprises – San Diego, CA
   l. Transrapid International-USA, Inc. – Washington, D.C., a subsidiary of Transrapid International GmbH & Co. KG (TRI-KG) – Berlin (parent companies: Siemens and ThyssenKrupp)
   m. VLG Engineering – Orange County
   n. Paco Group – Alexandria, Virginia
   o. Max Boeigl – Neumarkt, Germany
   p. Situs – Orange
   q. Gruen Associates – Los Angeles
   r. Wedbush Morgan Securities – Los Angeles
   s. Brown, Winfield & Canzoneri, Inc. – Los Angeles

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PANEL

A Proposal Evaluation Panel was formed to evaluate and score the proposals. The Panel consisted of the following members:

1. John Brooks, Senior Analyst, City of Palmdale
2. Kevin Chun, Assistant City Administrator, City of Bellflower
3. Torrey Contreras, Advance Planning/Redevelopment Manager, City of Cerritos
4. Sharad Mulchand, Senior Transportation Planner, LACMTA
5. Albert Perdon, Executive Director, Orangeline Development Authority
6. Dick Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

The Panel reviewed the written proposals and found that the proposal submitted by Lockheed Martin Integrated Systems & Solutions on behalf of the Lockheed Martin Team (LMTeam) is responsive to the RFP. The Panel determined that the proposals submitted by the other firms were not responsive, although the firms submitting these proposals could bring value to the Authority. The Panel interviewed the LMTeam on September 1, 2004.

The panel based its evaluation of the LMTeam proposal upon the following evaluation criteria, as established in the RFP.

| Prior Successful Performance of Similar Work | 40% |
| Understanding of the Work and the Challenges to be Overcome | 20% |
| Capability and Commitment to Perform the Work and to Support the Authority in Achieving its Mission | 40% |

Following the interview, the Panel met to complete its scoring of the proposal. Panel members individually scored the proposal on a scale of zero to 100. The total scores from each Panel member were then added and averaged. The LMTeam proposal received a score of 95 out of a possible score of 100.

The Proposal Evaluation Panel believes that the LMTeam is well qualified to serve as the Authority's development partner, based on the evaluation of the proposal and interview presentation. The evaluation identified the following key aspects of the LMTeam proposal and the value that the LMTeam would bring to the Authority.

1. Prior successful performance of similar work
   a. The LMTeam includes members that have directly participated in building the only operational maglev system in the world – TRI, Max BoegI and IABG
   b. Key members of the LMTeam have participated in the Southern California Maglev planning studies; Lockheed Martin is currently supporting the Southern California Association of Governments in developing the West Los Angeles-to-Ontario maglev project.
   c. Lockheed Martin is serving as prime contractor providing systems integration services for a $10 billion railway infrastructure modernization program for Rail Track, a United Kingdom train management consortium – a project of similar scale and complexity to the Orangeline.
   d. LMTeam members have worldwide experience in high-speed train system development, including firms actively involved in high-speed rail/maglev projects in the Netherlands, Germany, China and a number of U.S. cities.
   e. LMTeam members have extensive experience, locally and throughout the world, in land development and redevelopment, in the financing and underwriting of public and private infrastructure projects, in urban design and transit-oriented development.
2. Superior understanding of the work and the challenges to be overcome
   a. The LMTeam proposal and interview presentation clearly articulated the
team’s understanding of the challenges and outlined a strategy for achieving
the goals of the program
   b. The LMTeam proposal demonstrated understanding of the need to define the
unique conditions of each segment of the project and to work with each
community in locating stations and in exploring the opportunities for transit
oriented development based on each city’s needs and vision.
   c. The LMTeam understands the benefits of early community input and the
challenge of developing consensus among the stakeholder groups that will be
impacted by or that have an interest in the project.
   d. The LMTeam understands the funding challenges and opportunities and
presented a credible approach for securing the funds needed to plan, build
and operate the Orangeline; their approach identified a number of potential
funding sources that have been successfully used in prior projects.

3. Superior capabilities and commitment to perform the work and to support
   the Authority in achieving its mission
   a. Lockheed Martin has assembled an outstanding team that includes firms with
successful experience in all aspects of the Orangeline project, including firms
directly involved in the development of the world’s first operational maglev
system.
   b. The LMTeam believes it can achieve revenue operations in 2010, ahead of the
2011 goal established by the Authority, assuming funding, environmental,
right-of-way and legal issues do not slow the project significantly.

The Proposal Evaluation Panel members are unanimous in their belief that the LMTeam
would be a very strong, capable and committed partner to assist the Authority in advancing
the Orangeline project through the planning and deployment phases, and in supporting the
efforts of current and future member cities in stimulating investment and creating new
development as envisioned in their community plans.

VALUE OF THE PROPOSAL

One requirement of the RFP was that the proposers describe the value that their offer to
serve as the Authority’s development partner would bring to the Authority and its current
and future member cities. The intent of this requirement was to determine the level of
proposer commitment to the project, and the proposer’s level of confidence that the project
could be accomplished. This requirement was also intended to assess if the proposers
recognize and value the public investment that has already been made in the Orangeline,
and also recognize the value that a partnership with the Authority brings to their internal
corporate bottom line objectives. The RFP was intended to determine if proposers are
willing to assume a share of the financial risk in moving the Orangeline project forward,
rather than relying on government funds to cover their cost and profit requirements.

The LMTeam responded to this requirement as follows:

1. The LMTeam brings a consortium of firms that perform over $1 billion per year in
   transportation projects.
2. The LMTeam brings internal corporate commitments of over $300 million in research
   and development.
3. The international partners bring over $1 billion of investment in maglev
development and knowledge.
4. Lockheed Martin alone has invested over $6 million in maglev and has a continuing
internal investment of over $1 million per year.
5. Lockheed Martin has a teaming agreement in place with Transrapid that provides
the Authority with a low-risk solution to the application of maglev to the corridor.
6. The LMTeam’s combined lobbying capabilities of over 100 representatives will
promote the Orangeline in conjunction with the Authority’s advocates.

In addition to the above, the proposal indicates:

“Our team has collectively and individually committed to contribute both
$750,000 to the Orangeline project to assure the completion of Phase 1.”

The Phase 1 studies would include a detailed analysis of the commercial viability of the
Orangeline as a privately funded enterprise, following up on the initial maglev feasibility
studies completed by IBI Group in December 2001 and in July 2002. IBI concluded that
the project segment from Union Station to Anaheim/Santa Ana could be successfully
developed as a privately-funded enterprise with a present net value of cash flow after debt
service of up to $1 billion. Potential viability of the Palmdale-to-Los Angeles segment was
also confirmed.

CONSIDERATION OF OTHER PROPOSALS

While the remaining proposals were not fully responsive to the RFP, the interest
demonstrated by the firms has value to the Authority.

Staff believes that the proposals submitted by the three other firms should be held in
abeyance pending the Board’s action on the recommendations contained in this report. The
Authority could consider these proposals in the future. These firms could provide
specialized services to the Authority or serve as part of the development partner team
selected by the Board. Prior to making any decision regarding these proposals, the
Authority should complete its action pertaining to the LMTeam proposal.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

The Board has several options, including the following.

Option 1 is to reissue the RFP to seek additional proposals. This option is not
recommended. There is a possibility that additional proposers might come forward if the
RFP is reissued; however, there is no guarantee that the Authority would receive additional
proposals or better proposals, and the current proposal could be withdrawn. Just as
important is the fact that time is of the essence. The Authority needs to maintain
momentum in advancing the project or risk losing a competitive advantage over other
projects locally, across the country and throughout the world.

Option 2 is to authorize staff to negotiate an agreement with Lockheed Martin. If this
option is approved by the Board, staff would return to the Board with a proposed agreement
for Board consideration and possible action. If the Board selects this option, staff
recommends that the Executive Director be authorized to form a Contract Negotiating
Committee whose members would include city managers of member cities or their
designees. Additionally, staff recommends that the Board form a Board Contracts Committee to provide policy guidance to the staff Contract Negotiating Committee and to bring forth policy recommendations to the full Board for its review and possible approval.

**Option 3** is to reject all proposals. This option is not recommended for the following reasons. The Authority needs the support of a development partner to achieve the goal of deploying the Orangeline. The procurement process led to an excellent proposal from a consortium of highly respected and responsible firms led by Lockheed Martin, a major U.S. corporation with the ability and commitment to undertake the role of development partner. The firm's proposal brings significant value to the Authority.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The following is recommended to the Board:

1. Review and discuss the information provided; and

2. Approve Option 2, the recommended option, to authorize staff to negotiate a development partner agreement with Lockheed Martin.

3. Direct the Executive Director to form a staff Contract Negotiating Committee to negotiate a development partner agreement with Lockheed Martin. In addition, form a Board Contracts Committee to provide policy guidance to the Contract Negotiating Committee and to make policy recommendations for Board consideration.
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

AGENDA REPORT

TO: Members of the Oragneline Development Authority

FROM: Albert Perdon, Executive Director

DATE: September 8, 2004

SUBJECT: RAIL~VOLUTION CONFERENCE


The conference offers more than 60 workshops covering a wide range of topics. Numerous “Mobile Workshops” are included in the program. Topics included in the program agenda that are of relevance to the Authority’s Oragneline development program include:

- Building a Sustainable City
- Defining and Quantifying the Benefits of Transit Oriented Development
- Physical Activity and Density–What the Experts Say
- Transportation Funding and Land Use Control
- The LA Transportation Story: From Trolleys to Freeways and Back Again
- Commuter Rail and Station Area Planning
- Giving Gentification a New Name
- Thinking Outside the Box to Make Housing Affordable
- The Relationship Between Property Values and Rail
- It All Starts with Developers
- Innovative Parking Solutions
- Infill Development – Just How Difficult Is It?
- Overcoming the Fear of Density

Staff encourages Board members to review the full program for Rail~Volution 2004, which can be downloaded from the internet at www.railvolution.com or at www.railvolution.com/workshops.html#mondaymorning.

RECOMMENDATION

The following is recommended to the Board:

1. Receive and file this report.
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

AGENDA REPORT

TO: Members of the Orangeline Development Authority

FROM: Albert Perdon, Executive Director

DATE: September 8, 2004

SUBJECT: COMMUNICATION ITEMS TO THE BOARD

Staff will give an oral report on communication items arising subsequent to preparation of the agenda packet.