



August 31, 2016

241420

ENTERED  
Office of Proceedings  
August 31, 2016  
Part of  
Public Record

MEMBER AGENCIES

Los Angeles County Metropolitan  
Transportation Authority

North San Diego County  
Transit District

Orange County  
Transportation Authority

Riverside County  
Transportation Commission

San Diego  
Association of Governments

San Diego Metropolitan  
Transit System

San Luis Obispo  
Council of Governments

Santa Barbara County  
Association of Governments

Ventura County  
Transportation Commission

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS

Amtrak

California Department of  
Transportation

California High-Speed Rail Authority

Southern California  
Association of Governments

ADDITIONAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE MEMBERS

BNSF Railway

California Public Utilities Commission

Southern California  
Regional Rail Authority

Union Pacific

Surface Transportation Board  
Attn: Docket No EP 734  
395 E Street Southwest  
Washington, DC 20423-0001

To Whom It May Concern:

The Los Angeles – San Diego – San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Rail Corridor Agency (Agency) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the Surface Transportation Board's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, issued August 3, 2016, "Dispute Resolution Procedures Under the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act of 2015."

While the proposed rulemaking does address some of the key provisions and requirements of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act of 2015, the LOSSAN Agency's position is that the proposed rulemaking is deficient in fully meeting the original congressional intent. Specific areas of concern are detailed below.

- 1) The proposed rule would not establish binding dispute resolution procedures for disputes brought before the Surface Transportation Board (Board).
  - a) When a State or Amtrak requests the Board to conduct dispute resolution under United States Code, Title 49, Section 24712(c), Congress intended the decision of the Board to be binding on the parties. Subsection (3).
  - b) The proposed rule adds a new Section 1109.5, which would apply the existing mediation procedures under the Code of Federal Regulations Section 1109, and also allows a party to request informal Board assistance in securing outside professional mediation services in the absence of a complaint proceeding before the Board.
  - c) As experience with the implementation of Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act Section 209 and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service have demonstrated, it is critical that parties have access to an efficient mechanism to definitively resolve disputes. Non-binding mediation, or informal Board assistance in securing outside professional mediation, as proposed under this rule, is unlikely to be productive.

- 2) The Board should adopt binding arbitration as the dispute resolution procedure for disputes brought under Section 24712.
  - a) Dispute resolution should be conducted as binding arbitration either before the Board, or before a third-party arbitrator with the Board exercising limited review.
  - b) If the Board plans to use third parties for dispute resolution, the Board should issue a supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking addressing the following:
    - i) Selection process for the proposed arbitrator;
    - ii) Payment for arbitration services of third-party; and
    - iii) Rules of practice for arbitration.
- 3) Dispute resolution should be mandatory.
  - a) Upon request from one party, we believe that the Board has the authority to, and should, compel arbitration, or any other such dispute resolution mechanisms that the Board adopts.
- 4) If professional mediation is acceptable as the only form of dispute resolution available under Section 24712, the Board's role in the proposed procedures is insufficient. It is not clear what it means for the Board to "informally assist in securing outside professional mediation services." Specific questions that arise include:
  - a) Will the Board maintain a list of mediators?
  - b) Will the Board intervene when parties cannot agree to a mediator?
  - c) Will the Board establish terms for the payment of mediation services?
  - d) Will the Board require parties to participate in mediation?

Thank you for your consideration of our comments to this very important proposed rulemaking.

Sincerely,



Jennifer L. Bergener  
Managing Director