**Meeting Minutes**  
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL  
Tuesday, December 12, 2019, 2:00 – 3:30 p.m.

### Attendance

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacki Bacharach</td>
<td>David Feinberg</td>
<td>Karen Reside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasneet Bains</td>
<td>Winnie Fong (for Westside Cities COG)</td>
<td>Mary Reyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bwarie</td>
<td>Randy Johnson</td>
<td>Paul Albert Marquez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry Cartwright</td>
<td>Marianne Kim</td>
<td>Arthur Sohikian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Christoffels</td>
<td>Nancy Pfeffer</td>
<td>Cynde Soto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha D’Andrea</td>
<td>Andres Ramirez</td>
<td>Ann Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roderick Diaz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Dipple</td>
<td>Stephanie Ramirez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PAC Business and Minutes

Mr. Roderick Diaz started the meeting with roll call at 2:06pm; no callers noted on the phone. Ms. Jacki Bacharach requested that PAC representatives be noted in the minutes if they call in via the phone number. Mr. Diaz then asked for approval of the September 10, 2019 meeting minutes, Mr. Mark Christoffels moved with Mr. Arthur Sohikian seconding motion for approval.

Ms. Kalieh Honish added that we can reserve comments for later in case anyone would like to address the upcoming PAC agenda items.

### Active Transportation 2% Update

Mr. Jacob Lieb gave an update on the Active Transportation 2% Update. Mr. Lieb’s team looked to approve the first cycle of the MAT program and authorize a project selection process in the January Board cycle. Mr. Lieb also elaborated on the possibility of PAC members being used as evaluators for the selection process, similar to the State ATP. Answering some of the PAC members questions, Mr. Lieb stated that his team is still looking to finalize some of the details related to whether an evaluator can abstain from certain projects, if there is a conflict; if there is a cap on which an agency can apply; and how the process is addressing geographic diversity.

Mr. John Bwarie then asked if there was any action the PAC needed to take to endorse this process, noting that this is a unique body. Ms. Ramirez agreed that this is a unique opportunity, to which Ms. Honish stated this was best served by reaching consensus within the PAC whether it be offline, via emails, etc. Considering lack of consensus at this meeting, Mr. Lieb was open to circling back with the PAC or an interested portion of the PAC with any pending details. Ms. Nancy Pfeffer suggested a conference call, for which there seemed to be general appetite amongst PAC members; Metro staff to schedule. Ms. Karen Reside offered the opinion that diversity with respect to geography, as well as size, need to be considered, having been an evaluator for the Institute of Museum and Library Services.
**SCAG RTP/SCS Draft**
Ms. Honish announced that the SCAG RTP/SCS Draft is out for public comment and that staff would email the link to the PAC for review outside of the meeting. Mr. Steve Lantz asked whether Metro would provide comments to SCAG. Ms. Honish stated that Metro would likely have a few comments but do not have any issues at this time.

**NextGen Bus Study Update**
Mr. Robert Calix presented on the NextGen Bus Study Update. Answering Mr. Terry Dipple’s question, Mr. Calix stated that ‘minimize discontinued segments’ means combining various short segments to provide a more seamless trip. Mr. Dipple then questioned the statistic that 84% of the county has taken public transit at least once a year. Discussion was had in understanding this statistic—whether it is Metro bus and rail only, or any form of self-declared transit—and methodology. Ms. Tham Nguyen, of the Office of Extraordinary Innovation (OEI), added that the data gathered was via an online survey supplemented by focus groups. This research counted all trips, not just commute trips.

Other comments from the PAC included how Metro is working with municipal agencies and paratransit services. Mr. Calix stated that on both fronts, Metro is working with these agencies to address these important issues in order to match their services with NextGen. Addressing Mr. Lantz’s question, Mr. Calix clarified that the NextGen rollout would consist of three phases.

**Traffic Reduction Study**
Ms. Tham Nguyen presented on the Traffic Reduction Study. Notably, Ms. Nguyen invited PAC members to participate in the Traffic Reduction Study working group. In response to Mr. Diaz’s question, OEI is willing to accept any and all participants, with no limits on available seats. Mr. Kerry Cartwright asked if the scope of work (SOW) was available, to which Ms. Nguyen stated the initial SOW is available with the final to be published. In answering Ms. Ann Wilson’s question, Ms. Nguyen clarified that ‘equity’ in the context of the Traffic Reduction Study means socio-economic equity.

Mr. Dipple then gave the opinion that the “Traffic Reduction Study” is not honest when it should be referred to its old name, the “Congestion Pricing Feasibility Study”. Ms. Nguyen stated that the name change stemmed from wanting to focus on the outcome rather than the method, hence “traffic reduction”. Ms. Nguyen wrapped up her update by asking PAC to express their concerns regarding scope, participants, etc. Mr. Cartwright closed comments on this topic by stating that PAC is the right forum for further discussion regarding this study.

**LRTP Update**
Mr. Craig Hoshijima presented on the Short Range Financial Forecast (SRFF). Ms. Bacharach asked what other rail line refurbishments, besides the A Line (Blue), are within the SRFF, to which Mr. Hoshijima stated that that is an evolving issue and is to be rolled over from the transit asset management database to a capital plan in the works; the funding is present but exact programs are to be defined. Clarifying Ms. Martha D’Andrea, Mr. Hoshijima stated that there is not extra revenue to fund a call for projects. Mr. Sohikian asked if there are any highway projects in the SRFF expenditure plan and Mr. Hoshijima
explained that since they are not as expensive as transit projects they do not appear on the list sometimes, as in this case; there are many highway projects being funded despite them not appearing on this list. Mr. Lantz closed out comments by asking how much electrification of the bus fleet would set Metro back but Mr. Hoshijima stated that this is something Metro cannot accurately estimate currently.

10-Year Review of Measure R Funds

Mr. Hoshijima remained to present on the 10-Year Review of Measure R Funds. Ms. Bacharach asked for clarification on the I-405 South Bay project being included in Twenty-Eight by ‘28 and Mr. Hoshijima explained that Metro’s priorities have shifted since it is not one of the four pillar projects. Ms. Wilson asked about an I-5 project that was overfunded and the excess funds of which would come back to the subregion. While Mr. Hoshijima was not familiar with this project, Mr. Isidro Panuco, Metro Highways Programs, would look into the matter and get back to her. Mr. Dipple asked about the presentation of this item to the Board—which Metro staff plans to take along with any comments—as well as cost overruns—which Metro is currently thinking about how to address. Mr. Sohikian closed out comments by asking about updates to the Board and Mr. Hoshijima stated that they anticipate monthly updates with the first one coming in January 2020.

Ms. Honish gave a quick update on the LRTP, stating that a February 2020 release of the draft LRTP is anticipated, with a deeper dive at the next PAC meeting on March 10, 2020.

Work Plan

Mr. Diaz stated discussion of the work plan by explaining that some PAC members would like to hear about the goods movement strategic plan, subregional equity funds, and Measure M guidelines. Ms. Pfeffer added that she would like to hear about the federal SAFE rule and how it affects conformity, as well as Metro’s response to the governor’s executive order N-19-19.

Mr. Bwarie suggested that actions be tied to any item brought to PAC in order to allow for engagement within a diverse body. Several PAC members agreed with Mr. Bwarie. Ms. Honish responded that while the PAC is not a body that is typically tasked with actions it is within the rights of PAC to advise. Further conversation ensued regarding the future role of PAC and Mr. Diaz responded that the officers would meet in an effort to provide more structure.

PAC Announcements

Mr. Diaz and Ms. Pfeffer reminded the PAC that vacancies and upcoming meetings have been provided in the handouts to members.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.
Metro’s Equity Program

Presented by:
KeAndra Cylear Dodds
Executive Officer, Equity and Race
> Board Approved as of February 2018
> Core Objective:
  > Increase access to opportunity
> Four Pillars
  > Define and Measure
  > Listen and Learn
  > Focus and Deliver
  > Train and Grow
What is “Equity”?

Equity is both an outcome and a process to address racial, economic, and social disparities, to ensure fair and just access to opportunities, including jobs, housing, education, mobility options, and healthier communities. It is achieved when one’s outcomes in life are not predetermined, in a statistical or experiential sense, on their racial, economic, or social identities.

It requires community informed and needs-based provision, implementation, and impact of services, programs, and policies that reduce and ultimately prevent disparities.
Why Does Equity Matter?

Equality does not equal Equity
“Equality gives everyone the right to ride the bus. Equity ensures that there are curb cuts so people in wheel chairs can get to the bus stop and lifts so they can get on the bus, and ensures that there are bus lines where people need them so they can get to wherever they need to go. Equity means promoting just and fair inclusion throughout society and creating conditions in which everyone can participate, prosper, and reach their full potential.”

How do we assess Equity?

- State goals
- Analyze Data
- Engage the Community
- Plan for Equitable Outcomes
- Implement, Evaluate, and Strengthen
- Report Back
Q & A

> Are we on the right track with our definition?
> Are we on the right track with our approach?
> Do you have additional feedback, questions, or things you wish to share as I begin this work?
Traffic Reduction Study
Introduction

Policy Advisory Council
March 10, 2020
Mission:
Provide a world-class transportation system that enhances quality of life for all who live, work, and play within LA County

Vision:
• Increase prosperity for all by removing mobility barriers
• Swift and easy mobility, anytime
• Accommodate more trips by providing high quality mobility options
VISIONARY OUTCOMES BY 2028

Double the % usage of transportation modes other than driving alone, including transit, walk, bike, shared-ride and carpool modes

10-minute walk or roll to high-quality mobility options

15-minute maximum wait, any time of day

30% faster bus speeds

Options to bypass congestion

Metro
Traffic Reduction Study Goals

- Explore ways to dramatically **improve mobility, equity, and environmental outcomes** to achieve Metro’s strategic goals.
- Provide **reliable and convenient travel options** for people to bypass traffic.
- **Investigate feasibility** and framework for testing and implementing pricing strategies to reduce traffic.

Sixteen solo drivers in traffic congestion

Many more people moving smoothly when we make better use of street space.
**Congestion Pricing Models**

- **Cordon Pricing**: Creating a boundary around a central district and then charging vehicles to cross that boundary.
- **VMT Pricing**: Charging drivers based on Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).
- **Corridor Pricing**: Pricing all lanes on all roads within a specific corridor with high traffic congestion but a viable public transit alternative.
**Study Highlights**

- **Conduct feasibility study** to identify a pilot program
- **Develop grass-roots support** for this initiative through extensive community and public engagement
- **Develop** Equity Strategy
- **Build regional coalition** to solidify critical partnerships necessary for delivering the project
Study Highlights

• **Identify additional travel options**, including transit services, carpooling, ridesharing, bicycling & walking options, other improvements, and policy changes to accompany implementation of pilot program

• **Build off** existing efforts and research in the LA region and best practices/lessons learned regionally, nationally, and globally
Study Highlights

• Engage diverse audiences in this process:
  ▪ General public
  ▪ Potential communities that would be directly affected, including residents, workers, employers
  ▪ Other key stakeholders
• Leverage existing Metro advisory groups
• Establish advisory panel for project
PROJECT MILESTONES

Development (Ongoing Feedback)

- Advisory Panel
- Research
- Equity Strategy
- Communications & Engagement Strategy Part 1
- Location Assessment
- Transit & Multimodal Improvements
- Technology Requirements
- Legislative & Institutional Requirements
- Financial Plan
- Implementation Plan

Up to 24 months

Implementation (Board Authorization)

- Pilot Go/No Go Decision
- Award Contract for Pilot System Design
- Communications & Engagement Strategy Part 2

After 24 months
Engage in regional conversation and dialogue

- Raise awareness and interest
- Meet stakeholders where they are in a variety of settings and formats
- Facilitate rich and meaningful conversations
- Utilize feedback to inform the Traffic Reduction Study technical analysis

Spring 2020
Discussion
THANK YOU!

www.metro.net/vision2028

Tham Nguyen, Project Manager
Senior Director
Office of Extraordinary Innovation
NguyenTha@metro.net or (213) 922-2606

Ryan Wiggins, Deputy Project Manager
Senior Manager
Office of Extraordinary Innovation
WigginsR@metro.net or (213) 922-5343
PAC Announcements
March 10, 2020

a. MAT Program Evaluators

As mentioned in a February 6, 2020 email, Metro staff invites members of the PAC to participate in reviewing and scoring proposals for funding in the recently approved MAT program. This opportunity is available to any interested PAC member, provided that you (including your employer/or the entity that you represent on the PAC) have no interest in any of the projects competing for funding.

Program information is available on the Metro website here – https://www.metro.net/projects/metro-active-transport-mat-program/

Interested PAC members should contact Jacob Lieb by March 13, 2020 at liebj@metro.net.

b. NextGen

The proposed NextGen bus improvements would:

- Double the number of frequent Metro bus lines
- Provide more than 80% of current bus riders with 10 minute or better frequency
- Improve and expand midday, evening and weekend service, creating an all-day, 7-day-a-week service
- Ensure a ¼-mile walk to a bus stop for 99% of current riders
- Create a more comfortable and safer waiting environment

The changes shown in this Draft Plan are proposals only. We have released them for the sole purpose of gathering your feedback on these changes. Our team will be listening to you and gathering input on the Draft Plan through April 2020. Based on what we hear, we will then develop final proposals that you will also be able to review and provide input at public hearings later this year, targeted for June.

To explore the plan in full using interactive maps and detailed line-by-line descriptions, please click here. This link also has a “Comments” section where you can provide your feedback. If you would like to provide your input to Metro staff directly, we invite you to attend one of our public workshops.
c. Measure R Decennial Outreach

Metro is considering potential amendments to the Measure R sales tax ordinance, as January 2020 is the first ten-year opportunity to make certain transfers described in the ordinance. PAC members seeking additional information or to provide comments and other input are encouraged to contact MeasureR@metro.net. An information letter on this matter was emailed by Community Relations to PAC members, among others, on February 28, 2020.

d. TOC Implementation Plan

Metro staff is finalizing the TOC Implementation Plan. Staff anticipates reconvening the TOC Policy Working Group in late-March to go over the final draft Plan before going to the Metro Board of Directors in late spring 2020.

Metro staff will send the TOC Policy Working Group meeting invitation, along with the final draft TOC Implementation Plan, to the PAC.

Interested PAC members should contact Elizabeth Carvajal at carvajale@metro.net.
February 27, 2020

Dear Metro Stakeholders:

Metro is considering changes to the Measure R sales tax ordinance, which may impact currently planned projects, and is seeking input from key stakeholders to help inform this process. The potential changes involve a transfer of funds designated for highways to transit uses, or vice versa, and the creation of new projects or adding funds to existing projects.

Metro asks that you contact us if you have any input or would like additional information regarding the potential ordinance amendment. Metro is available to discuss this matter in person, including to stakeholder groups. Please contact us by March 31, 2020 at MeasureR@metro.net. Metro's points of contact are Laurie Lombardi, Senior Executive Officer, Financial Planning, Programming and Grants, and Craig Hoshijima, Deputy Executive Officer, Strategic Financial Planning.

The Measure R Sales Tax

The Measure R sales tax became effective in January 2009 and identifies the allowable uses for a 0.5% countywide sales tax in Los Angeles County that funds transportation improvement projects and transit operations. The sales tax ordinance created both transit and highway capital “subfunds” that receive a percentage of the Measure R sales tax revenue and fund the capital projects listed in an “Expenditure Plan.”

The Metro Board may amend the Measure R ordinance not more than once every ten years, beginning in 2020, to transfer sales tax revenue between the transit and highway capital subfunds.

Why Make Transfers?

Metro and the communities that it serves may want to transfer Measure R capital funds for the following reasons:

- Add transit or highway funding for a new project. Metro, a subregion, or other local agency in the county may want to cancel one or more Measure R project or use “surplus” funding from a project, and apply the funds to a new project. An example is the potential suspension of the $906 million South Bay highway program, transfer of remaining funds to transit, and creation of new transit projects in the Expenditure Plan.
• Add transit or highway funding to an existing project. This would apply freed-up and or surplus funding to a project that is already in the Expenditure Plan. An example is the addition of South Bay highway program funding for the Green Line to Torrance light rail project.

• Transfer funds to pay interest on debt. Metro may be compelled to transfer highway capital project contingency funds to transit capital project contingency to pay interest on transit debt. Such a transfer would be needed to ensure transit funds pay for transit costs, including the interest to finance transit projects. Metro expects that any such transfer can be postponed until the next ten-year transfer window.

Why Amend the Ordinance?

The ordinance would be amended to allow for an inter-fund transfer, change the funding amount of a project, or if a new project is added. However, if a project can be funded from the surplus of a project already in the Expenditure Plan, there is no need for a transfer, as the ordinance allows the Board to fund new projects of the same transit or highway category in a subregion without an amendment. So, in the South Bay highway program example above, the ordinance would not need to be amended if the Board determined the South Bay highway program is completed and the surplus is used for one or more other highway capital projects in the same subregion.

Why Amend the Ordinance Now?

There are two factors driving the timing of the potential transfer amendment – 2020 is the first opportunity for a transfer and subregions may want to start new projects as soon as possible. Metro expects that a proposed amendment could be considered by the Metro Board as early as June 2020 and formally adopted by two-thirds Board approval in mid-2021 (there is a one-year advance notice requirement if funding for a project is reduced).

What Are the Options?

At this time, there are four subregions that have either expressed an intent to cancel a project, or anticipate having Measure R surplus funds after the completion of a project. These are summarized below.
## Potential Surplus Measure R for Transfer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project(s)</th>
<th>Measure R Subfund</th>
<th>Estimated Surplus (millions)</th>
<th>Availability of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subregion: North County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 North Capacity Enhancements from SR-14 to Kern County Line</td>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>Pending completion</td>
<td>Project completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Truck Lanes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subregion: South Bay</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-405, I-110, I-105, and SR-91 Ramp and Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>Pending deduction of cost of prior highway commitments</td>
<td>Determined by amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subregion: San Fernando Valley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley North-South Rapidways (Canoga Corridor)</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$182.0</td>
<td>After FY 2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 Capacity Enhancement from SR-134 to SR-170</td>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>$30.0</td>
<td>After FY 2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subregion: Gateway</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 from I-605 to Orange County Line</td>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>To West Santa Ana Branch</td>
<td>After FY 2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 Carmenita Road Interchange Improvement</td>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>$92.9</td>
<td>After FY 2029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not included in this table are two projects that had surplus funds remaining after completion. The I-5/SR-14 project was deemed completed by Metro and the surplus was used on new projects in the North County subregion. The projected surplus on Expo II will be used on the Purple Line Extension Section 2 project.

### Unknowns

Two key unknowns are the amount of surplus funding, given several of the projects that may have a surplus are not yet completed, and the deferred availability of the surplus funds.

- The estimated surplus may be needed to complete projects that are in progress, if the remaining cost to complete the projects is higher than anticipated or if other sources of funding are not available. Understanding that the amount of any surplus available for transfer is unknown until the Board determines the project to be complete, the ordinance amendment may include placeholders – for example, a new project could be funded upon the completion of the prior project, identification of actual surplus, and subsequent transfer of funds.

- Much of the projected surplus is not immediately available and has been deferred to the third decade of Measure R, after FY 2029. Although the estimated surplus has been
known since 2008, as several projects in the Measure R Expenditure Plan were funded from other sources prior to the passage of the sales tax, the worldwide recession reduced the total amount of Measure R funds available and required that the surplus funding be pushed-out.

- It should be noted that the estimated amount of Measure R surplus was initially much higher, until January 2016 when Metro swapped Measure R funds with Prop C sales tax revenues. Currently, surplus Prop C funds remain available to the respective subregion but are not available for transfer to the Measure R transit subfund.

For those subregions that want to use surplus highway funds on a highway project or projects, or vice versa for transit, no transfer amendment to the ordinance is needed. But if a transfer is requested, the subregions should identify the existing Measure R source and the newly created use of funds.

**Subregions Without Surplus Funding**
Other subregions, local agencies, or other stakeholders may have ideas or proposals regarding amendments to the ordinance that can be considered. Metro and/or the subregional councils will undertake public outreach to determine if such interest exists.

**Amendment Language**
Attached for discussion purposes is draft amendment language that would provide for transfers between the Measure R highway and transit subfunds, use of transferred surplus revenues within a subregion, reduce funding for the South Bay highway program, and add South Bay transit projects. Also attached is a mark-up of the ordinance Expenditure Plan under these amendment assumptions.

We appreciate your consideration of this information and look forward to discussing this matter in detail with you.
Section 18.0 TRANSFERRING NET REVENUES BETWEEN SUBFUNDS

   a. Net Revenues not to exceed $[A] shall be transferred from the Highway Capital Subfund to the Transit Capital Subfund no later than January 2030 for use on eligible Transit Capital Projects within the South Bay subregion. The amount of Net Revenues for the "Interstate 405, I-110, I-105, and SR-91 Ramp and Interchange Improvements (South Bay)" project on line 33 in Attachment A is reduced from $906,000,000 to $[B]. The "[South Bay Transit Investments]" project is added to the Transit Capital Projects as shown in Amended Attachment A.

   b. Any surplus Net Revenues under Section 7(d)(4) may be transferred from the Transit Capital Subfund to the Highway Capital Subfund no later than January 2030 for one or more Highway Projects within the same subregion as the completed Transit Project.

   c. Any surplus Net Revenues under Section 7(e)(4) may be transferred from the Highway Capital Subfund to the Transit Capital Subfund no later than January 2030 for one or more Transit Projects within the same subregion as the completed Highway Project.
## Proposed One-Half Cent Sales Tax for Transportation: Expenditure Plan

### ATTACHMENT A

**30 Years, Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 - 2039**

As Adopted by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors July 24, 2008 and Amended _____, 2021

($ in millions)

### New Sales Tax (Assembly Bill 2321) vs. Other Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subfund</th>
<th>Potential Project in Alphabetical Order by Category (project definition depends on final environmental process)</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Additional</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Federal Funding</th>
<th>State Funding</th>
<th>Local Funding (Rail is 3% except as noted)</th>
<th>Funds Available Beginning</th>
<th>Expected Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Transit Projects: New Rail and/or Bus Rapid Transit Capital Projects. Could include rail improvements or exclusive bus rapid transit improvements in designated corridors.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Escalated $</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eastside Light Rail Access (Gold Line)</td>
<td>$ 30</td>
<td>$ 30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 30</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>FY 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exposition Boulevard Light Rail Transit</td>
<td>$ 1,632</td>
<td>$ 925</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 925</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 353</td>
<td>$ 354</td>
<td>FY 2010-12</td>
<td>FY 2013-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Metro and Municipal Regional Clean Fuel Bus Capital Facilities and Rolling Stock (Metro's share to be used for clean fuel buses)</td>
<td>$ 150</td>
<td>$ 150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 150</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>FY 2039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Regional Connector (links local rail lines)</td>
<td>$ 1,320</td>
<td>$ 160</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 160</td>
<td>$ 708</td>
<td>$ 186</td>
<td>$ 266 b</td>
<td>FY 2014-16</td>
<td>FY 2023-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Transit Capital Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Crenshaw Transit Corridor - project acceleration</td>
<td>$ 1,470</td>
<td>$ 235.5</td>
<td>$ 971.5</td>
<td>$ 1,207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 263 g</td>
<td>FY 2010-12 FY 2016-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Gold Line Eastside Extension</td>
<td>$ 1,310</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,271</td>
<td>$ 1,271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 39</td>
<td>FY 2022-24 FY 2033-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gold Line Foothill Light Rail Transit Extension</td>
<td>$ 758</td>
<td>$ 735</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 23</td>
<td>FY 2010-12 FY 2015-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Green Line Extension to Los Angeles International Airport</td>
<td>$ 200</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 200</td>
<td>$ 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD d</td>
<td>FY 2010-12 FY 2015-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Green Line Extension: Redondo Beach Station to South Bay Corridor</td>
<td>$ 280</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 272</td>
<td>$ 272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 8</td>
<td>FY 2028-30 FY 2033-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>San Fernando Valley I-405 Corridor Connection (match to total project cost)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 31</td>
<td>FY 2030-32 FY 2038-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>San Fernando Valley North-South Rapidways (Canoga Corridor) - project acceleration</td>
<td>$ 188</td>
<td>$ 32</td>
<td>$ 150</td>
<td>$ 182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 6</td>
<td>FY 2010-12 FY 2014-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>San Fernando Valley East North-South Rapidways - project acceleration</td>
<td>$ 70</td>
<td>$ 68.5</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 68.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2</td>
<td>FY 2013-15 FY 2016-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>West Santa Ana Branch Corridor (match to total project cost)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 240</td>
<td>$ 240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 7</td>
<td>FY 2015-17* FY 2025-27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Westside Subway Extension - to be opened in segments</td>
<td>$ 4,200</td>
<td>$ 900</td>
<td>$ 3,174</td>
<td>$ 4,074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 126</td>
<td>FY 2013-15 FY 2034-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17a</td>
<td>South Bay Transit Investments</td>
<td>$ 500</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 500</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>As funds become available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Capital Project Contingency (Transit)-Escalation Allowance for lines 8-17 to be based on year of construction</td>
<td>$ 7,331</td>
<td>$ 173</td>
<td>$ 3,103</td>
<td>$ 3,276</td>
<td>$ 2,200</td>
<td>$ 1,015</td>
<td>$ 840 g</td>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>FY 2039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>Total New Rail and/or Bus Rapid Transit Capital Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 18,939</td>
<td>$ 3,408.5</td>
<td>$ 10,381.5</td>
<td>$ 13,790</td>
<td>$ 2,908</td>
<td>$ 1,554 $ 1,965</td>
<td>FY 2010 FY 2039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**As funds become available**

---

Prepared by Programming & Policy Analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subfund</th>
<th>Potential Project in Alphabetical Order by Category (project definition depends on final environmental process)</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>New Sales Tax (Assembly Bill 2321)</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Local Funding (Rail is 3% except as noted)</th>
<th>Funds Available Beginning</th>
<th>Expected Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Additional</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Federal Funding</td>
<td>State Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Highway Projects: Capital Projects - Carpool Lanes, Highways, Goods Movement, Grade Separations, and Soundwalls</td>
<td>Escalated $</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Alameda Corridor East Grade Separations Phase II</td>
<td>$1,123</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>BNSF Grade Separations in Gateway Cities</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Countywide Soundwall Construction (Metro regional list and Monterey Park/State Park - 60)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>High Desert Corridor (environmental)</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Interstate 5 / St. Route 14 Capacity Enhancement</td>
<td>$161</td>
<td>$90.8</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$90.8</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Interstate 5 Capacity Enhancement from I-605 to Orange County Line</td>
<td>$1,240</td>
<td>$264.8</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$264.8</td>
<td>$78</td>
<td>$834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I-5 Capacity Enhancement from SR-134 to SR-170</td>
<td>$610</td>
<td>$271.5</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$271.5</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I-5 Carmenita Road Interchange Improvement</td>
<td>$389</td>
<td>$138</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$138</td>
<td>$97</td>
<td>$154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Highway Operational Improvements in Arroyo Verdugo subregion</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Highway Operational Improvements in Las Virgenes/Malibu subregion</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Interstate 405, I-110, I-105, and SR-91 Ramp and Interchange Improvements (South Bay)</td>
<td>$906</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$906</td>
<td>$906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Interstate 5 North Capacity Enhancements from SR-14 to Kern County Line (Truck Lanes)</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$410</td>
<td>$410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Interstate 605 Corridor “Hot Spot” Interchanges</td>
<td>$2,410</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$590</td>
<td>$590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Interstate 710 North Gap Closure (tunnel)</td>
<td>$3,730</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$780</td>
<td>$780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Interstate 710 South and/or Early Action Projects</td>
<td>$5,460</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$590</td>
<td>$590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>State Route 138 Capacity Enhancements</td>
<td>$270</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Capital Project Contingency (Highway)-Escalation Allowance for lines 31-38 to be based on year of construction</td>
<td>$2,575</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$2,575.9</td>
<td>$2,576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Total Capital Projects Highway: Carpool Lanes, Highways, Goods Movements, Grade Separations, and Soundwalls</td>
<td>$22,337</td>
<td>$1,215.1</td>
<td>$6,644.9</td>
<td>$7,880</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Funding (Rail is 3% except as noted)</th>
<th>Funds Available Beginning</th>
<th>Expected Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$6,164.9</td>
<td>FY 2010 FY 2039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,380</td>
<td>FY 2010 FY 2039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DRAFT
Policy Advisory Council
12-Month Look-Ahead

March 10, 2020

- Traffic Reduction Study (formerly Congestion Pricing Study)
- BRT Vision & Principles Study
- Equity Officer
  - Introduction
  - Draft Equity Definition

June 9, 2020

- LRTP Draft Review for Public Comment
- Goods Movement Strategic Plan Draft (TBD)
- TOC

September 8, 2020

- NextGen
- Equity Officer Follow-up
  - Equity Implementation Plan
- LRTP (Review any changes at adoption & discuss next steps)
- BRT Vision & Principles Study (Draft network & top 3 corridors)

December 8, 2020

- NextGen
- Metro Travel Demand Model Survey Update
- Traffic Reduction Study (formerly Congestion Pricing Study, TBD)
- Rail Integration Study
- Financial Plan Update
  - Pillar Projects
  - Short Range Transportation Plan Parameters