



STATE OF UTAH

Office of the Legislative Auditor General

W-315 UTAH STATE CAPITOL COMPLEX • PO BOX 145315 • SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84114-5315
(801) 538-1033 • FAX (801) 538-1063

Audit Subcommittee of the Legislative Management Committee
President Michael G. Waddoups, Co-Chair • Speaker David Clark, Co-Chair
Senator Patricia W. Jones • Representative David Litvack

JOHN M. SCHAFF, CIA
AUDITOR GENERAL

May 8, 2010

Utah Legislative Audit Subcommittee
W315 State Capitol Complex
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5315

Subject: Utah Transit Authority (UTA) Follow-Up

Dear Subcommittee Members,

Our office has reviewed the Utah Transit Authority's response to your letter, dated February 11, 2010. The Audit Subcommittee's letter to UTA Board of Trustees chair Larry Ellertson asked for a description of steps taken to strengthen board independence and oversight since the 2008 *Performance Audit of the Utah Transit Authority*. Our analysis of the materials provided by UTA, including clarifications provided by UTA staff, leads us to conclude that the specific recommendations included in Chapter VII have been satisfied. Those recommendations were as follows:

1. We recommend that the Legislature clarify its intent that service on a transit district Board of Trustees be limited to three terms by adding language requiring "a two-year hiatus before being eligible to serve on the Board of Trustees again."
2. We recommend that the UTA Board of Trustees verify compliance with its policies by requiring and requesting internal audits.
3. If the Legislature is concerned about the level of oversight and accountability they provide to the UTA Board of Trustees, we recommend they consider some of the strategies used by other states (such as having the Governor and the Legislature appoint some board members or establishing farebox recovery goals).

Below is a summary of the self-reported actions taken by UTA, and the effect of specific actions taken by the Legislature that we feel are most significant. The full letter provided by UTA is attached. We have not verified the information.

1. The Legislature enlarged the size of the UTA Board of Trustees from 15 to 19 members. New positions are appointed by the President of the Senate, the Speaker

of the House, and the Governor. The Transportation Commission appointee became a voting member.

2. Since the audit, nearly half of the UTA Board of Trustees are new to the board.
3. The Legislature limited service on the board to 12 years.
4. UTA increased opportunities for external input into its budget process through the annual publication of a draft budget on the agency website, and now holds public meetings to obtain feedback from the public. UTA then publishes the final annual budget on its website.
5. UTA established an audit committee that met with internal audit staff three times in 2008 to set the work plan and procedures for the internal audit function.
6. The UTA internal auditor has hired additional staff and reports each year to the Board of Trustees on the department's accomplishments.
7. UTA uses clearly defined weighted board goals that are tied to the at-risk compensation that the General Manager can distribute to staff. UTA believes that this has increased accountability of the staff to the board.

Our review of the steps taken by UTA to address the audit recommendations in Chapter VII of the 2008 *Performance Audit of the Utah Transit Authority* leaves us satisfied that those recommendations have been implemented.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John M. Schaff', written in a cursive style.

John M. Schaff, CIA
Auditor General

JMS:CTO

Attachments:

- (1) February 11, 2010 letter from the Audit Subcommittee
- (2) March 11, 2010 letter from Larry Ellertson.



STATE OF UTAH

Office of the Legislative Auditor General

W315 UTAH STATE CAPITOL COMPLEX • PO BOX 145315 • SALT LAKE CITY UT 84114-5315
(801) 538-1033 • FAX (801) 538-1063

Audit Subcommittee of the Legislative Management Committee
President Michael G. Waddoups, Co-Chair • Speaker David Clark, Co-Chair
Senator Patricia W. Jones • Representative David Litvack

JOHN M. SCHAFF, CIA
AUDITOR GENERAL

February 11, 2010

Larry Ellertson
Chair, Board of Trustees
Utah Transit Authority
3600 S 700 W
Salt Lake City, Utah 84119

Dear Mr. Ellertson:

The Audit Subcommittee of the Legislative Management Committee is considering whether to direct the Auditor General to conduct in-depth follow-up audit to a portion of the 2008 *Performance Audit of the Utah Transit Authority*. We are concerned about board independence and oversight issues discussed in Chapter VII of the audit report.

We would like to give the UTA an opportunity to respond to our concerns before deciding whether to approve another audit. Please describe any steps the board has taken during the last two years to strengthen its independence and oversight as recommended by the audit or on your own initiative.

This item is scheduled to be addressed at our next Audit Subcommittee meeting. Please provide a written response within 30 days so the Auditor General can review it prior to the meeting.

Sincerely,

David Clark, Speaker
Utah State House of Representatives

Michael G. Waddoups, President
Utah State Senate

cc: John English
John Schaff

March 11, 2010

David Clark
 Speaker
 Utah State House of Representatives

Michael G. Waddoups
 President
 Utah State Senate
 Office of the Legislative Auditor General
 W315 Utah State Capitol Complex
 P.O. Box 145315
 Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5315

Gentlemen:

In conjunction with your letter of February 11, 2010. Regarding the 2008 Performance Audit, dated January 11, 2008 (the "2008 Audit") of the Utah Transit Authority ("UTA"), we have reviewed the issues of Board Independence and Oversight and provide the following review and comment.

I. Board Independence and Oversight

A. Board Independence

The 2008 Audit criticized the Board's independence and indicated that one way to promote independent thinking is to make sure there is sufficient turnover among the members of the Board. (*See* 2008 Audit, Chapter VII, page 89.) UTA's Board make-up has changed significantly since 2008. Since 2008, UTA's Board has been enlarged to include three new legislative/gubernatorial appointees and one Utah Department of Transportation Commission member. In addition, since 2008, UTA has received eight (8) new Board members. Indeed, of the 19 member Board, thirteen have served less than five (5) years on the UTA Board. All Board members are extremely well qualified and have rich backgrounds that lead to a forceful discussion with and strong leadership of UTA management.

1. Term Limits.

The 2008 Audit was critical of an instance wherein the local appointing entity – the Salt Lake Council of Mayors failed to appoint a replacement Board member, when the Board member's term limits had expired. The 2008 Audit recommended that the Legislature clarify its intent regarding Board member term limits. (*See* 2008 Audit, Chapter VII, page 96). During the 2009 Legislative Session, the Legislature revised UTA's enabling legislation to clarify its intent related to Board member term limits. The Utah Legislature extended the term of Board members and clarified the fact that no Board member could serve more than 12 years. *See* Utah Code Ann. §17B-2a-807(5). UTA has no Board members who have served more than 12 years. As such, the Legislature has addressed this 2008 Audit recommendation.

2. Legislative appointees to the Board

One of the suggestions of the legislative auditors in the 2008 Audit for improving Board independence included allowing the Governor and the Legislature the ability to make appointments to the Board. In the 2008 Legislative session, a bill was passed that authorized the appointment of three (3) additional Board members, one appointed by the Governor, one appointed by the President of the Senate and one appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. See Utah Code Ann. §17B-2a-807. All three (3) of those appointments have been made to the Board. Each of the Board members appointed are highly qualified. As such, the Legislature similarly addressed this 2008 Audit suggestion.

The Utah Department of Transportation Commission appointee, who was a non-voting Board member at the time of the 2008 Audit, became a voting member during the 2009 legislative session.

3. New Board Members

The 2008 Audit was concerned about the ability of Board members to be independent and bring “fresh thinking and innovative ideas” to the Board. In addition to the three (3) new Board members appointed by the Legislature and the Governor, UTA has five (5) new Board members, for a total of eight (8) new Board members. In 2008, the municipalities within Davis County appointed P. Bret Millburn and J. Stephen Curtis, both of whom are elected officials within their appointing jurisdictions. Also, in 2008, Salt Lake County appointed Charles G. Henderson to the UTA Board. In 2009, the municipalities within Salt Lake County appointed Dama Barbour and Ben Southworth to serve on the UTA Board, both of whom are also elected officials. Meghan Z. Holbrook was also appointed in 2009 by the Chair of the UDOT Transportation Commission. Below is a brief summary of the qualifications of each recently appointed Board member.

Justin Allen – Trustee Allen is the Government Affairs Director for the Salt Lake Board of Realtors. Trustee Allen has a degree from BYU. Trustee Allen was appointed by the President of the Senate.

Christopher R. Bleak – Trustee Bleak is the Chief of Staff to the Speaker of the Utah House of Representatives. Trustee Bleak has a degree from the University of Utah. Trustee Bleak was appointed by the Governor.

P. Brett Millburn - Trustee Millburn serves on the Davis County Commission. Trustee Millburn is the Director of Planning and Development of the United Way of Northern Utah. Trustee Millburn also served as the Assistant to the Speaker of the Utah House of Representatives. Trustee Millburn has a degree from Weber State University.

J. Stephen Curtis - Trustee Curtis serves as the Mayor of Layton City. Trustee Curtis served a career as a Service and Public Telephone Technician at Qwest. Trustee Curtis received his education from Weber State University and Brigham Young University.

Charles G. Henderson - Henderson serves as the Vice-Chair of the Kearns Community Council. Henderson is the Director of Customer Relationship Management at Ken Garff Automotive. Trustee Henderson has a degree in Finance and Economics from Westminster College.

Dama Barbour - Trustee Barbour serves on the Taylorsville City Council. Prior to running for office, Trustee Barbour was employed as a vice-president of Real Estate and Government Relations at Harmons.

Ben Southworth - Trustee Southworth serves on the West Jordan City Council. Trustee Southworth is an entrepreneur, with a degree in Economics from the University of Utah.

Meghan Z. Holbrook - Trustee Holbrook is the appointee of the Utah Transportation Commission. Trustee Holbrook works in the Office of the President/Government Relations at Zions Bank. Trustee Holbrook has been appointed to serve on the Utah State Board of Regents, Utah State Board of Education and the Transportation Commission.

Given the turnover of the UTA Board, the Board is unlikely to run into a problem with term limits, since the majority of its Board has served less than five (5) years.

4. Board Governance of UTA

a. Annual Board Evaluation of UTA Management.

The Audit recommended that the Utah Legislature establish a minimum farebox recovery, but included no recommendations for a failure of the transit agency to meet those minimum farebox recoveries. The UTA Board has implemented a more comprehensive set of goals and goal measurements, including (1) Revenue Development; (2) Investment Per Rider; and (3) Ridership. Understanding the intent of establishing a farebox recovery, the UTA Board of Trustees has developed a measurement that incorporates fare as it relates to the subsidy tax payers contribute to UTA called "Investment Per Rider (IPR). The IPR measurement incorporates the other two factors making up farebox recovery (fare revenue and operating expenses), but also includes ridership. The Board believes this is an effective means of measuring the effectiveness of UTA services. The Board has further established consequences in the event that UTA management fails to meet the Board goals. Recent history would indicate that establishing these consequences has moved UTA to a higher level of farebox recovery and less dependence on sales tax revenue.

Every year, the Board sets annual goals for UTA in these areas and UTA's other strategic projects. The Board goals guide the work of UTA management and staff. Every year in February or March, the Finance and Operations Committee evaluates the goals set by the Board for the prior year and scrutinizes the results achieved by UTA management. In addition to the review of the Finance and Operations Committee, the full Board has the opportunity at its next Board meeting to review the results of UTA management and staff. This review is an in-depth review of UTA's strategic projects and other measurements set by the Board. The review is significant because it determines a percentage of UTA management's at-risk compensation. For instance, in 2008, the Board determined that UTA management had met 34% of the 2007 Board goals. In 2009, the Board determined that UTA management had met 100% of the 2008 Board goals. Through this process, the UTA Board has determined the consequence of not achieving the goals set by the Board.

b. Board Policies and Directives

The Board has established a series of policies that form the bedrock of all of UTA corporate policies. The board policies set specific limitations and directive for UTA management and all other UTA corporate policies and procedures. A copy of the UTA Board Policy Index is attached hereto as Exhibit A. At each

monthly meeting, the Internal/External Committee of the Board reviews its policies to determine whether revision is necessary. In addition, the Board has mandated several reports that are prepared by UTA staff on a regular reporting schedule and reviewed in committee and monthly general meetings. A copy of the UTA Board Monitoring Report Schedule is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

c. Board Directed Budgetary Process

Each year the UTA Board adopts a Budget for the following fiscal year. Prior to the 2008 Audit, the budgeting process generally occurred only through the course of Board committee meetings and full Board general meetings. Since the 2008 Audit, the Board has maximized the opportunities for external review and input. In 2008 and 2009, the Board has published a draft of the 2009 and 2010 Annual Budgets, respectively on UTA's website and elsewhere and held a series of public hearings to obtain comments on the annual budget. In addition, the Board has requested that UTA allow public comments regarding the budget to be generated and received via e-mail, the UTA website and telephonically. UTA notices each public meeting by publication in a newspaper with general circulation as well as by mailing notices directly to interested stakeholders. Upon approval by the Board, UTA publishes its annual budget on its website available for anyone to review.

B. Oversight Through Independent Audits

Independent audits of UTA are statutorily required. In addition, the Board has implemented a series of additional audits in the hopes of addressing some of the concerns raised in the 2008 Audit.

1. *Ineffective use of Internal Audit Staff*

The 2008 Audit criticized the fact that the Board was not using the internal audit staff as effectively as it should. Moreover, the 2008 Audit found that the Internal Auditor's work plans and audits were primarily generated by UTA management and staff, rather than the Board itself. It should be noted that the board approves the work plans of the Internal Auditor. In addition, an annual external independent audit is required by laws. Notwithstanding the forgoing, UTA's Board has made a concerted effort to work directly with Internal Audit Departmental staff. In 2008, UTA's Board established an Audit Committee to work directly with the Internal Audit Departmental staff. In 2008, the Audit Committee met specifically with the Internal Audit Departmental staff on no less than three (3) occasions to determine the procedures, goals and work plans of the Internal Departmental staff. In 2009, the Audit Committee met with the Internal Audit Departmental staff on at least one occasion to set the goals and work plans of the Internal Audit Departmental staff. Throughout the year, the Internal Auditor reports to the Audit Committee and receives ongoing instruction pertaining to the focus of the Internal Audit Department. Each year, the Internal Audit Departmental staff reports to the Board on its accomplishments of the goals set by the Board. In addition, the Internal Auditor has recruited, hired and trained additional staff members since the 2008 Audit.

2. *Independent Audits*

The 2008 Audit did not mention the scrutiny that UTA undergoes through extensive external independent audits.

- a. External Audits Statutorily Required. Utah law requires the Board to cause an annual outside audit to be conducted of UTA's books and records to be conducted by an independent certified public accountant. See Utah Code Ann. §17B-2a-808(2)(g). Audit services are periodically re-procured, though, over the last few years the annual outside audit has been conducted by Deloitte & Touche, LLP. The independent certified public accountant audits UTA financial statements, including assets, revenues, expenses and changes in net assets, as well as cash flows, of all of UTA's funds regardless of source. The independent auditor prepares a state compliance audit, as well as a management analysis report. The independent auditor forwards the Independent Auditor's Report and State Compliance Audit directly to the Board.

UTA management further forwards the Independent Auditor's Report, State Compliance Audit, and Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, which includes the Independent Auditor's Report to the following individuals and offices: all mayors and county council members within the public transit district, State Auditor, State Treasurer, Lt. Governor, Administrative Assistant to the Governor, State Insurance Commission, Division of Finance, Utah Energy Office, State Labor Commission, Utah Department of Transportation, Wasatch Front Regional Council, Mountainland Association of Governments, nine (9) different libraries and many other entities and individuals. The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report is located on UTA's website at all times. A copy of the most recent Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, along with the State Compliance Audit are attached hereto as Exhibit C.

- b. FTA Audits. Because UTA is a recipient of Federal Transit Administration ("FTA") operating, maintenance and capital funds and because UTA uses a portion of its local sales tax revenues for local match for FTA grant funds, UTA is audited every three (3) years by the FTA in what is known as a Triennial Review. The Triennial Review audits 23 distinct requirements¹ related to the use of FTA operating, maintenance and capital grant funds and locally generated sales tax revenues that serves as the local match portion for FTA grant funds. As part of the Triennial Review, the FTA audits UTA's internal control and processes. The FTA Triennial Review audits UTA for compliance with FTA requirements on both FTA funds and the local match funds. The FTA is conducting a Triennial Review audit in May 2010 of UTA. I would be pleased to forward to you a copy of the FTA's Triennial Review Report, if you request.
- c. Project Management Oversight Audits. UTA also receives capital grants from the FTA for certain federally funded projects, including most recently the construction of the Mid-Jordan light rail

¹ FTA Triennial Review auditors review UTA's processes, procedures and books for compliance with FTA mandates the following areas: Legal, Financial, Technical, Satisfactory Continuing Control, Maintenance, Procurement, Disadvantaged Business Enterprise, Buy America, Suspension/Debarment, Lobbying, Planning/Program of Projects, Title VI, Public Comment Process for Fare and Service Changes, Half Fare, ADA, Charter Bus, School Bus, National Transit Database, Safety and Security, Drug-Free Workplace, Drug and Alcohol program, Equal Employment Opportunity, ITS Architecture.

line. The FTA has retained a project management oversight contractor auditor (a "PMOC") to review matters much broader than just the appropriate use of FTA capital grants funds. Indeed, the PMOC, along with and side by side with the FTA review monthly financial reports, modifications to the scope of work, expenditures, rates of expenditures, contingency funds, reductions in contingency funds, milestone setting and completion and broader issues of UTA management and staff's decision-making and contractor direction. Generally, FTA's contract auditors are well qualified former contractor or contract owners who are familiar with areas that need inspection. FTA's PMOC are required to audit administrative requirements of contract, including task order, work orders, spot reports, roles and responsibilities and are required to prepare regular reports, presentations and provide reconciliation services. The PMOC has unfettered access to UTA employees, managers, internal auditors, as well as contracts, payrolls and other planning documents. A copy of the PMOC's Scope of Work, is attached hereto as Exhibit D.

- d. Locally Funded Projects Audits. UTA is also constructing a number of locally funded projects, including most recently the Airport light rail line. Because FTA PMOC auditor is only reviewing the broad scope of activities on federally funded projects, the UTA Board has implemented an independent auditor known as the Strategic Management Oversight Consultant (the "SMOC") that reports directly to the Finance and Operations Committee of the Board to review the use and expenditure of funds that are locally generated on locally-funded projects. The SMOC is designed to operate just like the FTA's PMOC and reviews similar subject matters as contained in the PMOC Scope of Work, which is attached as Exhibit D. The SMOC are highly qualified former construction management consultants. Similarly, the SMOC has unfettered access to UTA staff, contracts, payrolls and other planning documents.
- e. ISO Audits. In 2005, UTA embarked on an ambitious ISO certification objective. UTA sought ISO 14001 (Environmental) certification, as well as ISO 9001 (Quality) certification. The ISO quality and environmental management systems enforce a process of continuous improvement in a company's performance. Over 70 critical work processes and environmental aspects are controlled and improved under the ISO management systems. The process requires that UTA internally establish the policies, procedures and work rules that will allow UTA to become ISO certified. UTA ultimately was certified by QMI-SAI Global, an accreted ISO certification body, becoming the first transit agency in North America to become ISO 9001 and 14001 certified. Every year, UTA undergoes an internal ISO audit. In addition, as a condition of maintaining its ISO certifications, a certified external auditor reviews and audits UTA's ISO 14001 and 9001 certification on an annual basis. As a result of the ISO certifications, UTA has been able to significantly improve its bus reliability, fuel conservations, customer information accuracy and timeliness and reductions in water pollution and bus emission, among other things.
- f. Safety Audits. The Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") has primary safety oversight over UTA's light rail operations. UDOT conducts regular safety audits of UTA's light rail operations safety plans.

II. Conclusion

In light of the significant efforts of the Board to address the legislative auditor's concerns of Board Independence and Oversight and in light of the additional legislative oversight, we believe that a performance audit is unwarranted at this time. Should, however, the Audit Subcommittee of the Legislative Management Committee determine that a legislative performance audit is necessary, UTA management and staff would cooperate in every way.

Sincerely,

UTAH TRANSIT AUTHORITY


Larry A. Ellertson
Chair, Board of Trustees

cc: John M. English
Michael Allegra
John Schaff

Index to Policies of the Utah Transit Authority Board of Trustees

Chapter 1 Ends

- | | | |
|----|--|-------------|
| 1. | Global Directives | |
| | 1. Credo | No. 1.1.1 |
| | 2. Vision | No. 1.1.2 |
| | 3. Mission and Definitions | No. 1.1.3 |
| 2. | Operational Directives | |
| | 1. Safety | No. 1.2.1 |
| | 2. Advertising | No. 1.2.2 |
| | 3. Effective Administration of UTA | No. 1.2.3 |
| | 4. Procurement | No. 1.2.4 |
| | 5. Private Enterprise Participation | No. 1.2.5 |
| 3. | Constituency Directives | |
| | 1. Customers With Disabilities | No. 1.3.1 |
| | 2. Preservation of Mission and Purpose | No. 1.3.2 |
| | 3. Internal Communications and Partnering | No. 1.3.3 |
| | 4. Quality Transportation Services | No. 1.3.4 |
| | 5. Essential Partners | No. 1.3.5 |
| | 6. Leadership and Support | No. 1.3.6 |
| | 7. Promoting a Feeling of Community
Ownership | No. 1.3.7 |
| 4. | Planning Directives | |
| | 1. Property – Acquisition | No. 1.4.1.a |
| | Property - Encumbrance | No. 1.4.1.b |
| | 2. Planning, Designing, Funding and
Construction of Transportation
Infrastructure and Services | No. 1.4.2 |
| | 3. Funding | No. 1.4.3 |

Chapter 2 Executive Limitations

- | | | |
|----|---|-----------|
| 1. | General Manager | |
| | 1. General Manager Global Limitations | No. 2.1.1 |
| | 2. Fare Discounts | No. 2.1.2 |
| | 3. Advertising | No. 2.1.3 |
| | 4. Changes to Levels of Service and Routing | No. 2.1.4 |
| | 5. Procurement | No. 2.1.5 |
| | 6. Naming of Authority Rail Stations,
Facilities and Branding of Service | No. 2.1.6 |
| | 7. Pilot Programs and Innovative Services | No. 2.1.7 |
| | 8. Service Stabilization Fund | No. 2.1.8 |

2.	Asset Management	
1.	Asset Protection	No. 2.2.1
2.	Property	No. 2.2.2
3.	Insurance and Indemnification	No. 2.2.3
3.	Financial Matters	
1.	Compensation and Benefits	No. 2.3.1
2.	Financial Conditions & Activities	No. 2.3.2
3.	Budgeting	No. 2.3.3
4.	Operational Limitations	
1.	Safety	No. 2.4.1
2.	Review of Rates and Charges for Services	No. 2.4.2
3.	Guidelines for Labor Negotiations	No. 2.4.3
4.	Management Systems and Practices	No. 2.4.4
5.	Prioritization of Major Capital Projects	No. 2.4.5
5.	Constituency Relationships	
1.	Treatment of Customers	No. 2.5.1
2.	Treatment of Employees	No. 2.5.2
3.	Customers With Disabilities	No. 2.5.3
4.	Communication with Member Governing Councils	No. 2.5.4
Chapter 3	Board – Executive Relationship	
1.	Board/Staff Linkage	
1.	Linkage Among the Board, the Authority, and its Personnel	No. 3.1.1
2.	Board Oversight	
1.	Monitoring Policy Compliance	No. 3.2.1
3.	Board Delegation to Staff	
1.	Review of Rates and Charges for Services	No. 3.3.1
2.	Procurement	No. 3.3.2
Chapter 4	Board Process	
1.	Governance Issues	
1.	Global Governance Commitment	No. 4.1.1
2.	Governing Style	No. 4.1.2
3.	Process for Establishing Board Policies	No. 4.1.3
4.	Role of the President	No. 4.1.4
5.	Board Member Assignments	No. 4.1.5
6.	Board Committee Principles	No. 4.1.6
7.	Board Member Liaison Responsibility	No. 4.1.7
8.	Discipline of Board Member	No. 4.1.8

- 9. Board Member Attendance No. 4.1.9
- 10. Annual Certification of Board Member Code of Conduct No. 4.1.10

- 2. Board Member Relationship with the Authority
 - 1. Expense Reimbursement No. 4.2.1
 - 2. Compensation No. 4.2.2

- 3. Board Member Relationship with Outside Parties
 - 1. Written Communications Between Outside Parties and the Board of Trustees No. 4.3.1
 - 2. Media Relations No. 4.3.2

- 4. Fiduciary Duty and Legal Responsibility
 - 1. Actual and Potential Conflicts of Interest No. 4.4.1
 - 2. Duty of Care No. 4.4.2
 - 3. Duty to Preserve Electronic Communications No. 4.4.3
 - 4. Duty of Loyalty No. 4.4.4
 - 5. Duty of Confidentiality No. 4.4.5
 - 6. Open Meetings No. 4.4.6

- 5. Appeals Process
 - 1. Procurement Appeal No. 4.5.1

- 6. Board Meetings
 - 1. Public Comment in Board Meetings No. 4.6.1
 - 2. Use of Cell Phones and Pagers in Board Meetings No. 4.6.2

Schedule of Monitoring Reports

Policy	Required Report	Responsible Person	Date
<p>Bylaws Article VI Section 2-Budget Process</p> <p>1.1.1 Credo</p> <p>1.1.2 Vision</p> <p>1.3.4 Service, Quality and Value, Ends</p>	<p>Update to 5 year plan, including review of credo, vision, and other ends policies, development plans and service plans. Presented to the Planning and Development Committee then to the full Board in the General Manager's report.</p>	<p>Mike Allegra, Chief Capital Development Officer</p>	<p>Annually by July 31.</p>
<p>1.2.1 Safety, Ends Policy</p> <p>2.4.1 Safety, Executive Limitations</p>	<p>Report on collisions, avoidable accidents, security incidents, industrial accidents, regulatory citations and other safety or environmental concerns. Presented to the Board as part of the General Manager's report.</p>	<p>Jerry Benson, Chief Performance Officer</p>	<p>Biannually by March 31 and September 31 to Board</p>
<p>1.4.1a Property - Acquisitions, Ends Policy;</p> <p>1.4.1.b. Property-Encumbrance</p> <p>2.2.2 Property, Executive Limitations</p> <p>1.3.5 Community Contributions and Partnerships, Ends, Items 3 and 4.</p>	<p>Annual listing of non-transit and transit supportive properties. Triennial analysis of UTA property portfolio with recommendations for retention and reclassification. Efforts to increase efficiency of public infrastructures through transit-oriented land use and effective transit services. Presented to the Board as part of the General Manager's report.</p>	<p>Mike Allegra, Chief Capital Development Officer</p>	<p>Annual listing by July 31. Triennial portfolio analysis beginning in July 2004.</p>

Schedule of Monitoring Reports

Policy	Required Report	Responsible Person	Date
1.4.3 Funding, Ends Policy 2.3.2 Financial Conditions and Activities, Executive Limitations 2.3.3 Budgeting, Executive Limitations	Annual Budget. Monthly financial statement reporting actual and budgeted debt, revenues and expenses. Financial statements will be presented to the Finance and Operations Committee in the first meeting following 30 days after the close of the month.	Ken Montague, Support Services General Manager	Monthly financial statement. Annual budget presented for adoption by Board prior to start of calendar year.
2.3.1 Compensation & Benefits, Executive Limitations	Report comparing average UTA wages and Salaries with market averages, presented in conjunction with preparation of the annual budget.	Ken Montague, General Manager of Support Services	Annually by September 31 st .
2.4.2 Review of Rates and Charges for Services, Executive Limitations 3.3.1 Review of Rates and Charges for Service, Executive Relationship 2.1.2 Fare Discounts	Evaluation of fare structure with recommendations regarding adjustments and changes prior to development of the annual budget. Report presented to Planning & Development Committee and the Board through the GM report.	John M. English, General Manager	Reported in May every other year on even numbered years to the Board.

Schedule of Monitoring Reports

Policy	Required Report	Responsible Person	Date
2.4.3 Guidelines for Labor Negotiation, Executive Limitations	Updates to the Internal & External Committee when in negotiations. Presentation of tentative contract agreement to Internal & External Committee reporting to the full Board.	Jerry Benson, Chief Operations Officer	Periodically to Internal/External Constituencies Committee and Board during contract negotiations.
2.4.5 Changes to Levels of Service and Routing, Executive Limitations 1.2.3 Changes to Levels of Service and Routing, Ends Policy	Report of Public Hearing comments, conclusions and findings and General Manager's determination regarding proposed changes to Finance and Operations Committee.	Irene Huntsman, Public Hearing Officer	After a final determination has been made following each public hearing.
2.5.1 Treatment of Customers, Executive Limitations	Report on customer complaints and customer service programs. Reported by General Manager in Board meeting.	Ken Montague, Support Services General Manager	Bi-annually, February and August
4.1.1 Global Governance Commitment, Board Process Policy	Summary reports, as data is available, of market research, public opinion research and customer research. Reported to Internal and External Committee.	John English, General Manager	Bi-annually, June 30 th and December 31 st
1.2.2 Advertising, Ends 2.4.4. Advertising, Executive Limitations	Report on advertising content, compliance with limitations and effectiveness. Reported to Internal/External Constituencies Committee.	Andrea Packer, Chief Communications Officer	Bi-annually, April 30 th

Schedule of Monitoring Reports

Policy	Required Report	Responsible Person	Date
1.2.4 Procurement, Ends 3.3.2 Procurement, Board – Executive Relationship 4.5.1 Procurement Appeal, Executive Limitations	Report on compliance with law, procurement policies and appeals process. Reported to Finance and Operations Committee.	Ken Montague, Support Services General Manager	Annually by October 31 st
2.2.1 Asset Protection, Executive Limitations 2.2.3 Insurance and Indemnification, Executive Limitations	Report that the Authority and the Board are adequately protected from risk. Reported to the Finance and Operations Committee.	Ken Montague, Support Services General Manager	Reported in conjunction with Annual budget for adoption by Board prior to start of calendar year.
2.5.2 Treatment of Employees, Executive Limitations 1.4.2 Planning and Staffing to Meet Growth, Ends 1.3.3 Internal Communications and Partnering, Ends	Report on personnel policies, retention of employees, efforts to help them meet challenges, to increase communication, promote sense of employee ownership and provide ongoing training to employees. Reported to the Internal/External Constituencies Committee.	Jerry Benson, Chief Operations Officer	Annually by November 30 th
1.3.1 Customers with Disabilities, Ends 2.5.3 Customers with Disabilities, Executive Limitations	Report on paratransit and fixed-route use by customers with disabilities and compliance with ADA requirements. Reported to Internal/External Constituencies Committee.	Jerry Benson, Chief Operations Officer	Annually by April 30th

Schedule of Monitoring Reports

Policy	Required Report	Responsible Person	Date
<p>1.3.2 Preservation of Mission, Ends 1.3.5 Community Contributions and Partnerships, Items 1 and 2, Ends</p>	<p>Report on efforts to strengthen geo-political relationships, and participation with community leaders with regard to transit decisions. Presented to the Board as part of the General Manager's Report as pertaining to current events.</p>	<p>John M. English</p>	<p>As necessary pertaining to current events or annually by October 31st.</p>
<p>1.2.5 Private Enterprise Participation, Ends</p>	<p>Report on use of private enterprise as appropriate to meet transit needs.</p>	<p>John M. English</p>	<p>Reported in conjunction with Annual budget for adoption by Board prior to start of calendar year.</p>
<p>R2009-07-04 Resolution Amending 2009 Goals</p>	<p>Participate in listening sessions with local officials (through MPOs) to better understand their views of needs that must be addressed by the region's future transit system and their potential contributions to developing the transit system that meets these needs; and provide the Board a summary/status report in December 2009.</p>	<p>John English</p>	<p>December, 2009</p>

INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH THE STATE OF UTAH LEGAL COMPLIANCE GUIDELINES

The Board of Trustees of
Utah Transit Authority:

We have audited the financial statements of Utah Transit Authority (the "Authority") for the year ended December 31, 2008, and have issued our report thereon dated May 20, 2009. Our audit included test work on the Authority's compliance with the following general compliance requirements identified in the State of Utah Legal Compliance Audit Guide:

- Public Debt
- Cash Management
- Purchasing Requirements
- Budgetary Compliance
- Special Districts
- Other General Compliance Issues

The Authority did not receive any major or nonmajor state grants during the year ended December 31, 2008.

The management of the Authority is responsible for the Authority's compliance with all compliance requirements identified above. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on compliance with those requirements based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether material noncompliance with the requirements referred to above occurred. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence about the Authority's compliance with those requirements. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

The results of our audit procedures disclosed no instances of noncompliance with the requirements referred to above.

In our opinion, the Authority complied, in all material respects, with the general compliance requirements identified above for the year ended December 31, 2008.

This report is intended for the information and use of the Board of Trustees, operations committee, management, and the Utah State Auditor's Office and is not intended to be, and should not be, used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Deloitte & Touche LLP

May 20, 2009



Oversight Procedure 01 – Administrative Conditions and Requirements

1.0 PURPOSE

The purpose of this Oversight Procedure is to describe the administrative conditions and requirements associated with the performance of oversight by the Project Management Oversight Contractor (PMOC) for the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) of the planning, design, construction and revenue operations of major capital transit projects.

2.0 BACKGROUND

As part of its responsibility to prudently use public funds, FTA performs project oversight to ensure that major capital transit projects are executed professionally, efficiently, and in conformance with applicable statutes, regulations, and guidance and sound engineering and project management practices.

FTA performs oversight through its own staff and through its contractors, the PMOCs. While these Oversight Procedures are meant to instruct both FTA staff and its PMOCs, the PMOCs in fact perform most of the oversight. Therefore the Oversight Procedures refer to the reviewer as the PMOC.

In 2003 and 2004 FTA selected and awarded contracts to seventeen firms to perform oversight services for a period of five years. Today, PMOCs monitor projects costing from \$100 million to multiple billions of dollars.

3.0 OBJECTIVES

FTA requires project oversight that is proactive, includes investigation of issues and conditions, dialogue and problem solving with the Grantee, and provision of professional opinions and recommendations for action. Reports that support the oversight activities should be concise and provide FTA with critical input to its decision making on project advancement and funding.

4.0 REFERENCES

The following are the principal, but by no means the only, references to Federal legislation, regulation and guidance with which the PMOC should have a good understanding as related to the Grantee's project work being reviewed under this OP: See Appendix A below.

5.0 GRANTEE SUBMITTALS

NA

6.0 SCOPE OF WORK

6.1 General Administrative Requirements and Documents

6.1.1 Contracts

Every five years, FTA issues a request for proposals for project management oversight services for its major capital projects. A group of firms is selected for award of indefinite-delivery indefinite-quantity contracts for oversight services over a period of five years for a not-to-exceed contract amount. Specific assignments for oversight work are negotiated with individual firms and are authorized through task orders, and within task orders, work orders. A PMOC may be issued one or more task orders under its contract.

The contract contains the following sections:

Section A:	SOLICITATION/CONTRACT FORM
Section B:	SUPPLIES OR SERVICES AND PRICE/COST
Section C:	DESCRIPTION/SPECS./WORK STATEMENT
Section D:	PACKAGING AND MARKING
Section E:	INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE
Section F:	DELIVERIES OR PERFORMANCE
Section G:	CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION DATA
Section H:	SPECIAL CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS
Section I:	CONTRACT CLAUSES
Section J:	LIST OF ATTACHMENTS TABLE

Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINs) are primarily used for administration and accounting. CLINs tie specific types of oversight activities to be performed to work or cost categories which allow FTA to determine the cost effectiveness of the services provided.

The contract includes the following CLINs:

CLIN 0001	CONTRACT AND PROGRAM SUPPORT
CLIN 0002	PROJECT MANAGEMENT SERVICES
CLIN 0003	TECHNICAL REVIEW SERVICES
CLIN 0004	OTHER DIRECT COSTS

Work shall be directed by work order not by CLINs. When services are performed, labor hours and deliverables should be billed by work order and annotated with the CLIN and SubCLIN. SubCLINs represent the lowest level of work or cost category that FTA chooses to track program costs. They are summarized below under each CLIN description.

CLIN 0001 covers services that are required by FTA in support of the PMOC's contract and the PMO program at large.

- 0001A Administrative Tasks (Contract implementation plans, task order implementation plans, transition plans, project status reports, FTA events such as Annual Engineers' Conference, Annual PMO Conference, Quarterly PMO teleconferences, Transit Construction Roundtables, and other specialty meetings or conferences, etc.)
- 0001B Special Tasks (Update project management oversight procedures, develop technical papers, perform special studies, etc.)
- 0001C Ancillary Support (Covers unforeseeable tasks such as emergency support services and other work as directed by the Administrator)

CLIN 0002 covers Project Management Services that typically are required at regular intervals and are normally specified by FTA regional task order managers.

- 0002A Grantee Technical Capacity and Capability Reviews (project sponsor technical capacity and capability reviews, project management plan reviews, project sponsor quality assurance/quality control program reviews, safety security management plan reviews, real estate acquisition plan reviews, etc.)
- 0002B On-site Monitoring and Reporting (Recurring oversight-monthlies, quarterlies, trip reports, final monitoring report, lessons learned)
- 0002C PMO Information Management Support and Products (Information technology support and services)

CLIN 0003 covers Technical Review Services and analysis that are normally specified by FTA headquarters project engineers and technical specialists.

- 0003A Scope, Cost, Schedule Characterization Reviews (Scope, capital cost estimate, schedule analysis, value engineering and life cycle cost analysis, annual new starts reviews, etc.)
- 0003B Vehicles Procurement Reviews (Fleet management plan reviews, rail and bus vehicle technical reviews)
- 0003C Risk Assessments and Contingency Reviews (Risk assessment and mitigation reviews, contingency reviews, etc.)
- 0003D Project Execution Readiness Reviews (Design and constructability reviews, ADA level boarding review, readiness to enter PE, FD, execute FFGA, readiness to bid construction, readiness for revenue operations – testing, start-up, etc.)
- 0003E Small Starts Reviews (Small starts projects reviews – includes all technical capacity, scope, schedule, cost, etc. for small starts projects)

CLIN 0004 covers travel and other expenses such as printing.

- 0004A Travel Expenses (Non-labor travel related expenses such as transportation expenses, lodging, per diem, etc. associated with any of the above CLINs)
- 0004B Other Direct Expenses (Printing, shipping, materials, etc.)

6.1.2 Task Orders

FTA headquarters or an FTA regional office will identify a project or group of projects that could benefit from PMOC oversight. For award of initial task orders for oversight, FTA's procurement office will request proposals from all PMOCs that have indicated on the matrix in Attachment J-5 in the Request for Proposal an interest in performing the work and a lack of conflict of interest. Refer to Appendix D for the sample proposal format. Written proposals are due seven days after issuance of the request. The procurement office with the assistance of TPM-20 Office of Engineering will evaluate the proposals and select a contractor utilizing the "best value" approach.

In the interest of economy and efficiency, the procurement office will typically issue on a sole source basis follow-on task orders to the PMOC that was awarded the initial task order for a particular project, grantee or region. If the performance of the existing PMOC is unsatisfactory or if competing is deemed in the best interest of the government, the procurement office may compete follow-on task orders.

The total amount of all task orders awarded or issued by FTA in one year will not exceed the total amount available to FTA for oversight of major capital projects as documented in the TPM-20 Office of Engineering Program Plan. The Program Plan covers a twelve month period; therefore task orders will be awarded for multiple years but will be funded incrementally on a twelve months basis. Task order amounts are based on cost estimates for PMOC oversight based on activities and events in the Grantee's project schedule. A task order sample is shown in Appendix B.

The PMOC is required to submit a Task Order Implementation Plan upon receipt of the task order from FTA. This plan outlines the PMOC's proposed approach to the overall task, identifies activities to be performed, and provides a schedule and cost breakdown for the activities.

All activities performed under task orders will be authorized through work orders. Some work orders will be written broadly, for example, covering all recurring oversight activities on a project (such as monthly and quarterly meetings and supporting reports). Other work orders will be written more narrowly, for example, covering reviews (such as scope, schedule, cost, and risk) on specific dates.

6.1.3 Work Orders

A sample work order format is shown in Appendix C. A work order will be based on an approved proposal by a PMOC. Refer to Appendix D for the sample proposal format.

The work order will describe the work; it may refer to certain Oversight Procedures (OP) to guide the performance of the work. It will include a not-to-exceed cost and a defined schedule. A Work Order Implementation Plan may be required by FTA for large scope work orders or for oversight activities for which there is no associated OP.

Before issuing, the COTR verifies that the work order cost is included in the authorized task order amount. The work order will refer to applicable CLINs. The cost of each work order must be tracked

separately in project status reports and in invoices, with a breakdown by CLIN. Within the PMOC's monthly or quarterly task order status reports, the estimated versus actual for each work order should be tracked as a subset of the estimated versus actual for the entire task order.

6.1.4 Spot Reports

In the previous PMO contract, "Spot Reports" were used to report on a variety of topics. In this PMO contract, the generic spot report will be required very infrequently if at all. By and large, the spot report is replaced by specific reports such as "Project Cost Review Report" or "Grantee Technical Capacity and Capability Review Report", etc.

6.2 Roles and Responsibilities

The Grantees are the project builders and owners and are fully responsible for development and implementation of the capital transit project. They are responsible for planning, design, bidding the contract documents; supervising, administering, inspecting and accepting construction; performing testing and start up.

FTA administers grants and loans to State and local public bodies, and in public-private partnerships to private entities, to acquire, construct, and reconstruct transit facilities. FTA seeks to ensure through its oversight that FTA-funded projects related to these transit facilities are executed responsibly.

The FTA Office of Engineering within the Office of Program Management (TPM) in Washington, D.C. and the FTA Regional Offices (TROs) are responsible for oversight from the time of the Grantees' application to enter preliminary engineering (PE) through final design (FD), the Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA), construction, substantial completion, testing, start-up, and revenue operations. As a general rule, recurring oversight and reviews of the Grantee's project management capacity are conducted by TROs. Technical reviews for scope, schedule, cost, contingency and risk, etc. are usually initiated by TPM. TPM and TRO, along with TAD (Office of Procurement), administer the PMOC contracts, task orders and work orders.

PMOCs assist FTA in fulfilling its oversight responsibilities. The PMOCs' primary FTA points of contact are FTA's task order managers and FTA's work order managers. The primary FTA staff person in Procurement is the Contracting Officer (CO) and in TPM is the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR).

The PMOCs are responsible for rigorously but non-intrusively analyzing progress on projects, positively and constructively interacting with the Grantee to solve problems, and maintaining objectivity in discussions of findings, conclusions and recommendations with FTA and the Grantee. One of the most important reviews is the assessment of the Grantees' technical capacity and capability to successfully implement projects in a quality manner – to keep projects on time, on budget, in accordance with approved plans and specifications, constructible and well managed, employing value engineering, risk assessment and risk management. In addition to the Grantees' technical capacity, the PMOCs review the planning, design, construction and operations of the project; specific project components: guideway structures, stations, maintenance and storage facilities, sitework, power, signal

and communications systems; fare collection; real estate; vehicle design and manufacturing; project quality and capacity; safety; cost estimates, schedules, assessments of risk.

After PMOCs are awarded contracts, they may be awarded task orders and work orders within task orders to perform oversight. Task orders can cover all projects in a geographic area or they can be limited to the work of a particular Grantee. Task orders issued from TPM-20 can cover special studies and research, as well as technical reviews (scope, schedule, cost) for projects.

The PMOCs' main responsibilities include:

- Investigation of project conditions and core documents; site visitation; review of pertinent documents; performance of interviews in sufficient detail as to become familiar with established project goals, site conditions, design criteria, operations plans, drawings and specifications, value engineering studies, peer and constructability reviews, schedules, cost estimates, risks, bid packages, and contracts;
- Assessment of the Grantee's management of projects and technical capacity and capability;
- Assessment of the Grantee's ability to meet goals related to design capacity, scope, schedule, budget, quality, and safety both during construction and in revenue operations;
- Identification of problems and uncertainties related to the fulfillment of program requirements;
- Recommendations and proactive problem solving with the Grantee and FTA staff, and provision of professional opinions to the FTA;
- Discussion of findings, conclusions and recommendations with the Grantee and FTA;
- Provision of supporting reports and presentations to the FTA.

In the performance of the above, the PMOCs are to accomplish, among other duties, the following:

1) Communications

- a) Develop and regularly maintain contact throughout a Grantee's organization with key personnel in planning, design and construction departments as well as operations, operations planning, procurement, legal, budgeting and real estate.
- b) Develop and regularly maintain contact with FTA task order managers and work order managers at both headquarters and the region.
- c) Maintain a log of project contacts.
- d) Coordinate with other PMOCs covering the same Grantee.
- e) Remind the Grantee of its responsibility for the project; that PMOC oversight in no way relieves the Grantee of responsibility.
- f) Provide informal communication to the Grantee on the results of PMOCs' reviews and analysis after approval from FTA. Provide draft reports to FTA and receive comments from FTA before providing copies to the Grantee. Discuss draft findings with the Grantee prior to finalizing reports.

- 2) Oversight assessments, recommendations, reporting
 - a) Identify sources of information to allow the FTA to directly question the Grantee on the accuracy or completeness of their information. Present information without taking it out of context. Efficiently verify the information with trusted sources before presenting it as fact. Describe PMOC assumptions used to form conclusions and the methods used to come to those conclusions. Support PMOC statements, observations, findings, conclusions and professional opinions with project information, appropriate analysis and interpretation of the project information by qualified PMOC personnel with relevant and appropriate project development, design and construction experience.
 - b) Based on a cost-effective mix of random and planned sampling and, in certain cases, sampling 100 percent of the information, perform quantitative and qualitative checks on Grantee information.
 - c) Provide deliverables that are focused, clear, coherent, accurate, complete, objective and unbiased. Perform work in a cost-efficient manner.
 - d) Specifically cost-related
 - i) Regarding the Grantees' cost estimating methodologies, verify that current market conditions for bidding of construction contracts are taken into account;
 - ii) Provide an estimator's opinions as to whether the cost estimate information is biased.
 - iii) Describe the context of key cost assumptions and decisions by involved parties such as the Grantees, and their consultants and contractors.
 - iv) State reservations about costs in construction contractors' bids or offers; provide supported opinions regarding a construction contractor's propensity to submit change orders and claims on a project.

7.0 REPORTING, PRESENTATIONS, RECONCILIATION

For many oversight activities, the PMOC is required to provide FTA with a supporting written report of findings, analysis, recommendations, professional opinions, and a description of the review activities undertaken.

Draft reports should be submitted to the FTA work order manager via email. In addition the PMOC should post reports to an FTA website, to be identified.

After FTA approval, the PMOC may be instructed to share the report with the Grantee. In the event that differences of opinion exist between the PMOC and the Grantee regarding the PMOC's findings, the FTA may direct the PMOC to reconcile with the Grantee and provide FTA with a report addendum covering the agreed modifications by the Grantee and PMOC.

On occasion, the PMOC may be required to make presentations of project reports or other studies to FTA, the Grantee, or third party groups.

7.1 Format

Avoid repetition in the report at all cost as repetition inhibits understanding on the part of the reader. Instead, refer back to previous sections. Be concise. Provide current information and avoid long historical narratives or lists of events. Use italics and bold fonts to emphasize certain points. Use judgment to optimally portray information to aid in understanding – narratives, photographs, tables, graphs, spreadsheets, etc. Use Microsoft Word, Excel, and Microsoft Project.

Use Times Roman 12 point font unless otherwise specified.

All reports should include the following.

- 1) Cover page (See Appendix E for a sample cover page.)
 - a) Title of Report; plain English description of what is in the report
 - b) Project name and location, Grantee name
 - c) Date of report, if revisions, add Rev. 1, 2, etc.
 - d) Contract number
 - e) Task order number
 - f) Project number
 - g) Work order number
 - h) Oversight Procedures referenced
 - i) CLIN referenced
 - j) PMOC firm name, address
 - k) PMOC lead person's name, affiliation if different from PMOC firm, phone, email
 - l) Length of time PMOC firm and person have been assigned to this project
- 2) Executive Summary (one page max) – simply written summary of the PMOC's most important findings, professional opinions, conclusions, and recommendations
- 3) Description of PMOC personnel, qualifications performing the review
- 4) Table of Contents
- 5) Project Description (one page max)
- 6) Project Maps
- 7) Body of Report
 - a) Findings (include photos of site conditions to aid in understanding)
 - b) Analysis, opinions, recommendations (specify time frames for performance of recommended actions)
 - c) Concluding Statement
- 8) Appendix
 - a) Acronyms used
 - b) Tables, spreadsheets, photos

APPENDIX A

References

The following are the principal, but by no means the only, references to Federal legislation, codification, regulation and guidance with which the PMOC should have a good understanding as related to the Grantee's project work being reviewed under the Oversight Procedures (OPs):

Legislative

- SAFETEA-LU, Public Law 109-59

United States Code

- 49 U.S.C Section 5327, General /Intermodal Programs, Mass Trans; PMO
- 49 U.S.C Section 5309, Major Capital Investment Projects Final Rule

Regulations

- Project Management Oversight, 49 C.F.R. Part 633
- Major Capital Investment Projects, 49 C.F.R. Part 611
- Joint FTA/FHWA regulations, Metropolitan Planning, 23 C.F.R. Part 450
- Joint FTA/FHWA regulations, Environmental Impact and Related Procedures, 23 C.F.R. Part 771
- U.S. DOT regulation, Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition for Federal and Federally Assisted Programs, 49 C.F.R. Part 24

FTA Circulars -

- C4220.1D Third Party Contracting Requirements
- C5010.1C Grant Management Guidelines
- C5200 Full Funding Grant Agreements Guidance
- C6800.1 Safety and Security Management Plan

Guidance

- FTA Master Agreement, FTA MA
 - <http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/12-Master.doc>
- Project and Construction Management Guidelines, 2003 Update
 - http://www.fta.dot.gov/funding/oversight/grants_financing_104.html
- Guidance for Transit Financial Plans, June 2000
 - http://www.fta.dot.gov/publications/reports/other_reports/publications_1336.html
- New Starts
 - http://www.fta.dot.gov/planning/newstarts/planning_environment_218.html
 - http://www.fta.dot.gov/planning/newstarts/planning_environment_213.html
- Construction Project Management Handbook, December 2006
 - http://www.fta.dot.gov/publications/publications_5838.html
 - http://www.fta.dot.gov/funding/oversight/grants_financing_104.html
- Best Practices Procurement Manual, FTA, 2001
 - http://www.fta.dot.gov/publications/reports/other_reports/publications_4571.html

APPENDIX B

Sample Task Order

Federal Transit Administration

TASK ORDER No. ____

Date issued:

Summary title: **Projects X, Y, Z by Grantee Transit Agency ABC**
Located in City, Region, State/s

PMOC: Firm name
Lead person's name, title, phone, email
Firm address

Contract No.: DTFT60-0_____
Task Order: Managed by FTA Region or Headquarters
Project No. DC-_____
FTA Task Order Manager: name, phone, email

Scope: Description of scope of work
Reference to FTA Oversight Procedures
Reference to CLIN Numbers

Schedule: Task order duration / End date of task order

Cost: This is being issued under Contracting Officer authority.

Services performed or products delivered under this task order are authorized by work order and billable by work order.

The not-to-exceed amount is _____ for labor and expenses under this task order. Under no circumstances is the PMOC authorized to incur costs in excess of the amount above without prior authorization from the Contracting Officer.

APPENDIX C

Sample Work Order

Federal Transit Administration

WORK ORDER No. ____

Date issued: _____, 20__

Summary title: **Review of X on Project Y, Grantee Transit Agency ABC**
Located in City, Region, State/s

PMOC: Lead person's name, title, phone, email
Firm name, address

Contract No.: DTFT60-0_____

Task Order No.: _____

Project No. DC - _____

Task Order: Managed by FTA Region or Headquarters

FTA Task Order Manager: name, phone, email

FTA Work Order Manager: name, phone, email

Scope: Description of scope of work
Reference to FTA Oversight Procedures
Reference to CLIN Numbers

Schedule: Period of Performance, Schedule of Milestones, Due Dates

Cost: This is being issued under COTR authority. Services performed or products delivered under this work order are billable by work order and CLIN.

The not-to-exceed amount is _____ for labor and expenses under this work order. Under no circumstances is the PMOC authorized to incur costs in excess of the amount above without prior authorization from the COTR.

APPENDIX D

Sample Proposal Format

PROPOSAL TO FTA

Date: _____

Summary title: _____

PMOC: Lead person's name, title, phone, email
 Firm name, address

Contract No.: DTFT60-0 _____

Task Order No.: _____ if applicable

Task Order: Managed by FTA Region or Headquarters

FTA Task Order Manager: name, phone, email

Work Order No.: _____ if applicable

FTA Work Order Manager: name, phone, email

Scope: Description of scope of work; ref. to FTA Oversight Procedures, CLIN Nos.

Schedule: Period of Performance, Schedule of Milestones, Due Dates

Cost: Provide proposal breakdown including all of the information below:

CLIN	CLIN Name		Hours	Hourly Rate	Labor	OH Rate	Labor OH	Fee Rate	Subtotal	Total	SBE	DBE/WBE		
2B	On-Site Monitoring / Reporting	Name, Title per contract	15.0	\$85.00	\$1,275	130%	\$2,983	9%	\$3,196					
		Name, Title per contract	8.0	\$75.00	\$600	130%	\$1,380	9%	\$1,504					
		Name, Title per contract	0.0	\$45.00	\$0	130%	\$0	9%	\$0					
		Total Staff	23.0		\$1,875		\$4,313		\$4,701					
		Subconsult Name	13.0	\$160.00	\$2,080								\$2,080	\$2,080
		Subconsult Name	10.0	\$180.00	\$1,800								\$1,800	
		Subconsult Name	6.0	\$170.00	\$1,020								\$1,020	
		Total Subconsultants	29.0		\$4,900				\$4,900					
Total Labor									\$9,601	\$4,900	\$2,080			
4A	Travel Exp.	Staff	overnight						\$800					
		Subconsultants						\$0						
		Total						\$800						
4B	Other Direct Exp.	Staff	printing, phone charges						\$500					
		Subconsultants						\$0						
		Total						\$500						
G & A (if applicable)							5%		\$526					
Total									\$11,426					

APPENDIX E

Sample Report Cover Page

CAPITAL COST ESTIMATE REVIEW

Great City Light Rail Subway Project
Great City Transportation Authority
Region or City, State

May 1, 2008
May 22, 2008, Rev. 1

PMOC Contract Number DTFT __ - - - -
Task Order Number _____
Project Number DC-__ - _____
Work Order Number _____
OPs Referenced _____

PMOC firm name, address

PMOC lead person's name, affiliation if different from PMOC firm, phone, email
Length of time PMOC firm and person have been assigned to this project
