Agenda

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

William Mulholland Conference Room

FY 2017 Budget Workshop (STARTS AT 9:00 AM)  Information
30 min (Conan Cheung)

1. Call to Order/Roll Call  Action (Fanny Pan, Brian Lam)

2. New Chief Planning Officer
   Therese McMillan Introduction

3. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees  Information
   Bus Operations (Jane Leonard)
   Local Transit Systems (Sebastian Hernandez)
   Streets and Freeways (Fulgene Asuncion)
   TDM/Sustainability (Neha Chawla)
   Attachment 1: Subcommittee Agendas
   Attachment 2: Subcommittee Actions

4. Chairperson’s Report  Information
   • April Board Recap (Handout) (Fanny Pan)
   • Potential Ballot Measure

5. Consent Calendar  Action
   • Approval of Minutes
     Attachment 3: Draft April 6, 2016 Minutes

6. FY 13-15 TDA Triennial Performance Review Report  Information
   5 min (Armineh Saint)

7. TIMED AGENDA 9:50 AM  Action
   Call for Projects Deobligation Appeals (Fanny Pan)
   Attachment 4: TAC Call for Projects Appeals Protocol

Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Metro
TAC Minutes and Agendas can be accessed at: [http://www.metro.net/about/tac/](http://www.metro.net/about/tac/)

Please call Brian Lam at (213) 922-3077 or e-mail lamb@metro.net with questions regarding the agenda or meeting. The next meeting will be on June 1, 2016 at 9:30 a.m. in the William Mulholland Conference Room.
Attachment 1

Subcommittee Agendas
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
Mulholland Conference Room – 15th Floor
9:30 am

1. Call to Order
   (1 minute)
   Action
   Jane Leonard

2. Approval of March 15, 2016 Minutes
   (1 minute)
   Action
   BOS

3. Chair’s Report
   (5 minutes)
   Information
   Jane Leonard

4. Metro Report
   (5 minutes)
   Information
   Annelle Albarran

5. FTA Updates
   (10 minutes)
   Information
   Charlene Lee Lorenzo/Stacy Alameida

6. FY2013-15 TDA Performance Review
   (15 minutes)
   Information
   Lin Ma & Associates/Moore & Associates

7. Potential Ballot Measure Update
   (10 minutes)
   Information
   Tim Mingle

8. Access Update
   (10 minutes)
   Information
   Matthew Avancena

9. FAP Updates
   (5 minutes)
   Information
   Carlos Vendiola

10. Legislative Report
    (10 minutes)
    Information
    Raffi Hamparian/Marisa Yeager
    Michael Turner
11. Transit Industry Debriefing/Updates  
   Information  
   *(5 minutes)*

12. New Business  
   Information  
   *All*

13. FTA 5307 Discretionary Funds Allocation  
   Action  
   *(2 hours)*  
   Judy Vaccaro/Jane Leonard

14. Adjournment

Information Items:

- 90-day Rolling Agenda
- Summary of Invoices FY 2016
- Summary of EZ Pass Invoices FY 2016
- Subsidy Matrix FY 2016
- TDA-STA Capital Claims FY 2016
- TDA-STA Claims FY 2016
- Regional Pass Sales FY 2016

BOS Agenda Packages can be accessed online at:

https://www.metro.net/about/bos/

Please call ANNELLE ALBARRAN at 213-922-4025 or JOHN GREEN at 213-922-2837 if you have questions regarding the agenda or meeting. The next BOS meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 17, 2016, at 9:30 am in the Mulholland Conference Room, 15th Floor of the Metro Headquarters Building.
NOTE TIME: 1:30 PM

Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE

4th Floor TAP LAB – or Call in (213) 922-4930
In house call ext. 24930

1. Call to Order
   Action
   Sebastian Hernandez, Chair

2. Approval of Minutes – (Handout or email attachment)
   Action
   Sebastian Hernandez, Chair

3. Potential Ballot Measure Update
   Information, Possible Action
   Tim Mengle, Metro

4. Free Fare Access
   Information, Possible Action
   Eric Haack, Access

5. 3rd Draft FY2016-17 Funding Marks, plus other
   Local Fundmarks for FY17
   Information, Possible Action
   Susan Richan, Metro

6. New Business, Date of Next LTSS Meeting
   Sebastian Hernandez, Chair
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

*Mulholland* Conference Room, 15th Floor

1. Call to Order
   1 min  
   Action *(Bahman Janka)*

2. Approval of Minutes
   Attachment 1: March 17, 2016 Minutes
   Attachment 2: Sign-in Sheet/Attendance Sheet
   Attachment 3: 90-Day Rolling Agenda
   Action *(Subcommittee)*

3. Chair Report
   - Meeting Date/Time
   10 min  
   Information *(Bahman Janka)*

4. Metro Report
   5 min  
   Information *(Fulgene Asuncion)*

5. Caltrans Update
   5 min  
   Information *(Steve Novotny)*

6. CTC Update
   10 min  
   Information *(Patricia Chen)*

7. Potential Ballot Measure Update
   30 min  
   Information *(Wil Ridder)*

8. State and Federal Legislative Update
   15 min  
   Information *(Raffi Hamparian/Michael Turner)*
   Information (Steven Mateer)
   10 min

10. Open Streets Cycle 2
    Information (Avital Shavit)
    10 min

11. New Business
    5 min

12. Adjournment
    1 min

The next meeting for the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee will be held on May 19th at 9:30 a.m. on the 15th floor, Mulholland Conference Room. Please contact Fulgene Asuncion at (213) 922 – 3025 should you have any questions or comments regarding this or future agendas.

Agendas can be accessed online at: http://www.metro.net/about/sfs/
Attachment 2

Subcommittee Actions
Disposition of Subcommittee Actions

April 2016

Bus Operations Subcommittee:

- Approved the March 15, 2016 meeting minutes
- A motion to approve the minutes was made by Joyce Rooney (Beach Cities Transit) and seconded by Dana Pynn (Long Beach Transit). The minutes were approved with the following amendments:
  - The FTA Section 5307 Guidelines were approved via email on March 8, 2016
  - Page 10 should state that “Ticket Vending Machines and other fare collection equipment are not eligible projects under the 1% ATI category, but are eligible for the 15% category per FTA guidelines”
  - Page 11 should state that “Culver CityBus may be releasing $1.6 million back into the 15% Discretionary Funds allocation. Metro and FTA is to provide clarification and guidance on this process”
- A motion to approve the FY17 Section 5307 15% Capital Funds to the following agencies: SCRTTC, Metro, Norwalk, Culver CityBus, SM Big Blue Bus, G-Trans, Long Beach Transit, and Foothill was made by Martin Gombert (Commerce) and seconded by Joseph Loh (G-Trans). The motion was unanimously approved.
- A motion to approve the recommended allocation of the FY17 Section 5307 1% ATI funds to the following agencies: Metro, Norwalk, Santa Monica BBB and Culver City Bus was made by Joseph Loh (G-Trans) and seconded by Gloria Gallardo (Montebello). The motion also specified that the unawarded balance of $398,527 would be allocated to Santa Monica Big Blue Bus for an associated transit improvement project to be determined, with funds to become available through the FY18 ATI 1% cycle if no project is identified. The motion was voted on via email and approved on April 25, 2016. The final results were 12 in favor, 1 abstention, and 4 no vote.

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:

- No actions were taken

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:

- Approved the March 17, 2016 meeting minutes

TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee:

- Did not meet in April
Attachment 3

April 6, 2016 TAC Minutes

April 6, 2016 Sign-In Sheets
Meeting Minutes

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. Call to Order/Roll Call
Brian Lam (Alternate Chair) called the meeting to order at 9:38 A.M., took roll and declared a quorum was present.

2. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees
Bus Operations Subcommittee (BOS)
- Last met on March 15, 2016
- Received updates on:
  - FTA
  - Revised SRTP Submittal Process
  - Access Free Fare Program
  - FY 17 Budget Development Plan
  - FTA 5307 Working Group
  - FAP Funding Marks
- Next meeting is scheduled for April 19, 2016

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee (LTSS)
- Last met on March 17, 2016
- Received updates on:
  - Access Free Fare Working Group Recommendations
  - Second Draft FY 2016-17 Funding Marks
  - New MOU for FY 2017-21
  - 5310 Working Group Update
- Next scheduled meeting on April 21, 2016

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee
- Last met on March 17, 2016
- Received updates on:
  - Active Transportation Strategic Plan
  - Highway Program
- Cap and Trade and Intercity Rail Capital Program
- Metro Open Streets Cycle 2 Grant Program
- Countywide Bike Share Equity Initiatives
- Next meeting is scheduled for April 21, 2016

**Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Sustainability Subcommittee**
- TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee did not meet in March
- Next meeting is scheduled for April 13, 2016

### 3. Chairperson’s Report (Fanny Pan, Metro)

A handout of the March 2, 2016 Metro Board meeting recap was distributed in lieu of an oral report.

Ms. Pan announced that next month’s TAC meeting on May 4th will be the annual TAC Deobligation Appeal. This meeting is anticipated to last the entire day. Please plan accordingly.

Ms. Pan reported that the email vote on the Call for Projects Revised Lapsing Policy resulted with approval of the policy. There were comments submitted from several agencies regarding reprogramming opportunities for projects that are stuck. Ms. Pan asked for project sponsors to contact her if they have projects that need to be reprogrammed and staff will review on a case-by-case basis.

Mohammad Mostahkami (League of California Cities – Gateway Cities COG) suggested that staff inform all the various agencies directly about this reprogramming opportunity.

Dan Mitchell (City of Los Angeles) asked for clarification about the case-by-case review process, stating that he previously understood that there would be a one-time re-baselining for all projects. Ms. Pan clarified that staff is still having internal discussions on the topic and is trying to get an idea of how many projects will be requesting reprogramming in order to inform that discussion and management decision.

Ms. Pan announced that Metro’s new Chief Planning Officer (CPO), Therese McMillian, will be starting on April 11th. She was previously the Acting Administrator of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

Metro will host a community celebration for reaching the halfway mark on the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Project on Saturday May 7th, from 10 am – 4 pm at Leimert Park Village.

Metro initiated the preparation of the Program Environmental Impact Report (Program EIR) for the Los Angeles Union Station Master Plan. The Scoping Meeting was held last Thursday on March 24th. Written comments are due by April 19th.

The Open Streets Grant Program Cycle 2 application was released last week. Applications are due May 12th. A workshop for interested applicants will be held at Metro Headquarters on April 24th in the 4th Floor University Conference Room from 8:30 am – 12 pm.
4. Consent Calendar
A motion to approve the March 2, 2016 TAC minutes was made by Mohammad Mostahkami (League of California Cities – Gateway Cities COG) and seconded by Richard Dilluvio (Bicycle Coordinator). Dan Mitchell (City of Los Angeles) and David Feinberg (League of California Cities - Westside Cities) abstained. The minutes were approved.

5. Potential Ballot Measure Update (Wil Ridder, Metro)
Mr. Ridder stated that the Metro Board approved the release of the Potential Ballot Measure (PBM) Draft Expenditure Plan for public review at the March 2016 Board Meeting. Metro is currently conducting its outreach program. Mr. Ridder stated that there are approximately 10 community meetings scheduled throughout the County. Metro will also be conducting a telephone town hall which will be a live presentation where Metro will be taking calls from the public. In addition to these meetings, Metro will also be meeting with the Subregional Executive Directors on April 7th at 1 pm. at Metro Headquarters, and will be discussing the outreach progress.

Mr. Ridder reviewed the details of the Board Meeting approval in a presentation to TAC. The Draft Expenditure Plan involved a collaborative subregional process, which originated with the Mobility Matrices that identified priority projects in nine subregions throughout the County. The Board approved performance metrics, modeling, and cost estimate methodology for the major highway and transit capital projects.

Mr. Mostahkami asked who scored and ranked the projects in the modeling process? Mr. Ridder stated it was Metro staff and the consultant team working on the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) update. Further details are available in the Board Report (posted on the Metro website), which includes the scoring and how the projects were ranked. For projects that were not able to be modeled, staff continued the Mobility Matrices concept that involved a more qualitative assessment. All the individual project results can be viewed in Attachment F of the Board Report. Concerning the annual revenue assumptions, the new half-cent sales tax is expected to generate $860 million in the first year. From FY40-FY57, one cent will replace the Measure R tax rate. $120 billion in Year of Expenditure (YOE) dollars would be generated over the 40-year program.

Michelle Caldwell (BOS) commented that revenue typically doesn’t begin to fully generate in the first year. Mr. Ridder elaborated that usually there is a lag due to the necessary procedures with the State Board of Equalization.

Mr. Mitchell asked if Metro staff is recommending a 50-year program? Mr. Ridder confirmed that staff is recommending up to a 50-year program in order to address various needs that could not be accommodated through a 40-year program.

Mr. Ridder detailed the current draft funding recommendations for the various transportation categories. Metro is recommending 35% for Transit Construction, 17% for Highway Construction, 2% for Transit Systemwide Connectivity Projects, and 2% for Highway Systemwide Connectivity Projects. The Systemwide Connectivity projects are focused on capital projects identified as priorities within the subregions. This category addresses gaps in
the highway system and modal connectivity, and provides funding for projects around regional facilities such as the Airports, Seaports, and Los Angeles Union Station. Local Return will be increased from 15% to 16%. Regional Active Transportation Projects are recommended to receive 2%, 1% of which will be going towards completing gaps on the LA River Bike path, and 1% for implementing the Active Transportation Strategic Plan. Mr. Ridder stated that in addition to the 2%, there were also other projects identified by the subregions that can fall into either the Highway or Transit Systemwide Connectivity Projects. Metro staff is suggesting that a total of 4.5% of the total program will be used to support Active Transportation projects. There will also be opportunities in the Local Return fund for supporting Active Transportation projects. ADA Paratransit Service for the Disabled, Discounts for Seniors and Students is a new program to receive 2%. 1% is recommended for Regional Rail, 2% for Metro State of Good Repair, 5% for Metro Rail Operations, and 20% for Transit Operations.

Mr. Mitchell asked if Transit Systemwide Connectivity projects involve connecting from transit to transit, or connecting to other modes of transportation? Mr. Ridder replied that this category is mainly looking at connectivity from transit to the airports, seaports, and Union Station—these would include the Airport Metro Connector and highway connectivity to the seaports. Mr. Ridder also stated that these funds could be used for the Countywide Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) expansion system.

Valerie Watson (Pedestrian Coordinator) asked for clarification on an earlier statement about Active Transportation projects being eligible for the Systemwide Connectivity category. Mr. Ridder clarified that Active Transportation elements are eligible as part of highway and transit capital projects. The Systemwide Connectivity categories are more focused on larger scale projects.

Ms. Watson stated that Active Transportation funding seems insufficient for the 40-year need, given that it is only 2%, of which 1% will be dedicated to the LA River, as well as the assumptions for Local Return. She asked if there are additional ways to define how Active Transportation projects can be an eligible use, or how Metro’s Complete Streets policy will require Active Transportation to be a component of systemwide connectivity. Mr. Ridder replied that in addition to the 2% recommended for Regional Active Transportation projects, there is another 2.5% in the capital side that includes projects such as Complete Streets, First/Last mile, and Great Streets. These various projects are the ones that some subregions have prioritized for their capital investments. Metro is finding a balance between recognizing these subregional priorities, while also creating opportunity for investment in those subregions where Active Transportation projects are not prioritized.

Mr. Mitchell asked for confirmation that Active Transportation policies have been included in the transit and highway construction costs. Mr. Ridder replied that he is unable to delineate costs of Active Transportation elements on a project-by-project basis.

Ms. Watson asked how Metro plans on incorporating station area connectivity? Mr. Ridder replied that Metro is trying to provide financial resources to help facilitate discussions with local agencies that operate the roadway systems around transit stations.
Ted Semaan (League of California Cities – South Bay Cities COG) asked if the State of Good Repair category is intended only for the local agencies? Mr. Ridder replied that category is intended for the Metro system.

Mr. Ridder continued to describe the proposed 40-year build out for transit and highway projects, which is broken into three phases: first 15 years, second 15 years, and final 10 years. Mr. Mostahkami asked how the projects were prioritized into the three phases. Mr. Ridder replied that scheduling was based on the performance modeling results and the existing Measure R project schedules.

Mr. Ridder explained that staff is looking into expanding the 40-year sales tax into either a 45 or 50-year scenario and seeing what additional revenues could support. A 45-year scenario would allow for construction funding for the High Desert Corridor project, as well as an acceleration of the Crenshaw Line Northern Extension. A 50-year scenario would allow for funding for a second alignment for the Gold Line Eastside Extension Phase 2. Currently, Metro can only fund one of the proposed alignments under the 40-year plan. Other types of projects would include various investments in active transportation, systemwide connectivity, regional facilities, and highway needs. Metro is looking into seed money to help finance projects that Metro cannot directly fund, such as an express train from LAX to Union Station and South Bay Congestion Relief.

Mr. Ridder explained that Local Return will be 16% of a half cent that will be layered on top of revenues that are being received through Measure R from FY18 until FY39. From FY40 until FY50, the Local Return will be 16% of a full one cent.

Ms. Caldwell asked if the Potential Ballot Measure is passed, will the current funding sources for ADA paratransit be reduced or will the recommended 2% be added to the existing sources? Mr. Ridder replied that it is expected to be added.

Larry Stevens (League of California Cities – San Gabriel Valley COG) commented that every rail station project, as well as other projects, has costs attributed to facilitating ADA compliance, so in reality it is more than 2%. He commented that there should be some language in the descriptions that acknowledge First/Last Mile strategies and ADA costs within the Transit Construction and High Construction categories. Mr. Ridder acknowledged that that was an important issue to consider.

Mr. Ridder explained that the 1% funding recommendation for Regional Rail is a decrease from the current 3% under Measure R. Under Measure R, Regional Rail funds are only dedicated to capital. In addition, the new 1% under the PBM will allow for more flexibility and includes operations, maintenance, expansion, and State of Good Repair. At the FY 40 horizon, there could be an opportunity to increase the Regional Rail percentage up to an additional 1%, based on verifiable service improvements. Metrolink capital projects are also eligible as a part of the systemwide connectivity program, whose funds would be allocated on a competitive basis.

Ms. Caldwell asked for clarification on Metro’s plan that proposes that for every $1 of Metro’s operating funds towards Metrolink to be matched by $3 from other member agencies and fare
revenues. She asked where the other agencies will be getting the money to match. Mr. Ridder replied that the issue will be decided on a line-by-line basis. Metro is aware of other counties pursuing their own sales tax measures in 2016. The intention from Metro is to recognize that it is not Metro’s sole responsibility to fund Metrolink.

Mr. Ridder stated that in regards to the scheduling and implementation, circumstances may change and the private sector could present an opportunity to advance certain projects. Metro wants to be open to these types of opportunities and not strictly adhere to how projects are scheduled in the draft plan.

Mr. Ridder noted that Metro is open to meeting with any TAC members’ respective groups to go over details of the PBM.

Sebastian Hernandez (LTSS) asked where the meetings with the Subregional Executive Directors would fall in the Plan? Mr. Ridder replied that those meetings are under the public input process.

Mr. Stevens asked what the time frame would be between the community meetings and the Board meetings? Mr. Ridder replied that Metro is trying to finish all community meetings in April so that staff has enough time to prepare the June Board report. However, Metro is anticipating incorporating community comments through June. Mr. Stevens asked if there will likely be changes in the Metro staff recommendations as a result of the public input process or will staff leave it to the Board? Mr. Ridder stated that it is too early to confirm. Mr. Stevens asked for confirmation that since this is a draft, aspects of the Expenditure Plan are still subject to change. Mr. Ridder confirmed that there could be changes to the Expenditure Plan.

Mr. Mostahkami asked about the percentage changes from Measure R. Mr. Ridder replied that the Measure R Highway Program was reduced from 20% to 17% and Regional Rail was reduced from 3% to 1% in the new PBM. Transit Construction, Transit Operations, and Rail Operations will remain the same. Metro State of Good Repair, ADA Paratransit, and Regional Active Transportation Projects are new categories. Local Return will increase from 15% to 16%.

Ellen Blackman (ADA) asked if the ADA Paratransit Service for the Disabled, Discounts for Seniors and Students category will include any types of expenditures that will expand user friendliness for people with disabilities. Mr. Ridder replied that he is currently not aware that Metro has fully defined those uses and has not yet broken down the 2% funding.

Mr. Ridder acknowledged a challenge in defining the categories before June. Similar to Measure R, some aspects will be subject to new types of guidelines, policies, and procedures.

Mike Behen (League of California Cities – North Los Angeles County) asked what will happen to the current 15% Local Return funding from Measure R, after FY 39. Mr. Ridder replied that starting FY 39, Local Return funding will be 16% of a full one cent, instead of 16% of a half cent on top of 15% of a half cent that would take place from FY 18-FY 39.
Mr. Behen asked for the status of the subregional projects that were submitted based on the allocations. Mr. Ridder replied that the information is located in Attachment A of the March Board Report, and that Metro has had to look at other LRTP revenues in order to fully fund some of those projects. He stated that there has been augmentation in some of the revenues in North County. He cited how the $100 million for the High Desert Corridor ROW did not cover the full cost, so Metro increased the amount by $170 million. In other situations, the revenues could not cover all the projects on the Subregional project lists. For instance, funding is limited to only fund one of two alignments for the Metro Gold Line Eastside Phase 2.

Mr. Behen asked how projects on the subregional priority list that were above the recommended funding cap were handled? Mr. Ridder replied that it was a case-by-case basis. In some cases Metro decided that they could not be funded, some were separated into phases, and others were put into different funding sources and addressed various equity issues in the subregions. Mr. Behen stated that the rulebook is not consistent across the board, and if Metro is looking for funding for projects above the funding caps, then that information should be made available to all subregions. Mr. Ridder replied that each project was handled on a case-by-case basis and he doesn’t want to imply that there weren’t fiscal constraints employed on those projects beyond the subregional targets.

David Feinberg (League of California Cities – Westside Cities) asked if the Metro meeting with the Subregional Executive Directors will be open to the public? Mr. Ridder replied that the meetings are based on the interests of the respective COGs.

Mr. Stevens asked if the 1.5% administrative cost is consistent with prior measures? Mr. Ridder replied yes.

Mr. Stevens asked his fellow TAC members if TAC should be making formal comments as a group during the public comment period? Mr. Mostahkami stated he does not want TAC official comments to conflict with comments that may be submitted by individual agencies or jurisdictions. He stated he would like to be informed about current public comments. Ms. Pan stated TAC members will be provided with an update from the Subcommittee representatives of their discussions on the subject at the next TAC meeting.

Mr. Semaan asked if TAC members would be interested in providing comments to the June Board meeting. Ms. Pan replied that it will be up to the TAC members. Ms. Caldwell elaborated that all TAC members seem to represent a specific interest in transportation, and all those interests are not always in alignment. Because of that, she proposed that each individual make their comment in relation to their special interest, and then TAC can review all the individual comments. Mr. Stevens replied that while TAC is made of up different special interests, there is also a broader general interest, and he suggested TAC should comment on the general interest.

Marianne Kim (Auto Club of Southern California) asked when Metro will come back with the Ordinance language, and commented that she would like to see a Consumer Price Index (CPI) or some sort of adjustment on the Local Return. She also asked if the issues will be coming
back to TAC before going to the Board? Mr. Ridder replied that staff would speak internally on the matter. Ms. Kim asked when Metro is going to the Board. Mr. Ridder stated replied June.

Ms. Pan stated that Metro will be making presentations to the Subcommittees in April. Subcommittee comments will be presented at a future TAC meeting. Mr. Stevens commented that they may need to set up a special meeting, since the next TAC meeting will be dedicated to Call for Projects TAC Deobligation Appeal. Ms. Pan replied that there will be further discussion on the matter at the meeting.

Mr. Mitchell suggested to TAC that everyone should formulate what their broader comments will be, as well as comments from each member’s respective agency. He requested that there be reports from the Subcommittees and an agenda item that could include possible action. Ms. Pan acknowledged Mr. Mitchell’s request.

Mr. Mitchell asked if there have been any changes in the method that Local Return will be distributed. Mr. Ridder replied it will be the same as Measure R, in which distribution is based on population.

6. ATP Update (Patricia Chen, Metro)
A handout was distributed detailing projects receiving grant assistance for the Active Transportation Program (ATP). Ms. Chen stated that Metro will be focusing on maximizing funding for ATP projects in Los Angeles County. There are three types of projects that would be eligible for Metro’s grant assistance: 1) voluntary approved Call for Project with no fund assignment; 2) projects that have a Metro Board commitment; and 3) projects well suited to ATP and Metro goals for active transportation. Ms. Chen stated that Metro is still working with different cities to find funding for bike share.

7. CTC Update (Steven Mateer, Metro)
Mr. Mateer reported that the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) and the Federal Highway Association (FHWA) are giving states, cities, and regions an opportunity to repurpose unobligated earmarks. Metro is working with Caltrans to determine the policy to help move those projects forward. Metro will be meeting with Caltrans next week to discuss how to move the program forward.

Mr. Mateer stated that the deadline for repurposing projects will be September 2016. Metro is currently soliciting feedback for repurposing the earmarks.

Kevin Minne (City of Los Angeles) asked how Metro will be making the decision for the earmarks, since they are handled federally? Mr. Mateer replied that the FHWA has given Caltrans direction to develop use for these earmarks, so they solicited help from the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (Metro) to help guide the policy and repurposing process. He elaborated that there are options for Metro to free up the funds to make it easier to spend than having an obligated earmark, which is also why Metro is involved.

John Walker (County of Los Angeles) asked for details on CTC’s role in the earmark decision. Mr. Mateer replied that the guidelines state the funds should be obligated on a project within 50 miles of the earmark location. He stated that Metro would like to keep the money in Los
Angeles County. So far the guidelines do not indicate how the funds should be used. The FHWA determined that the earmarks need to be consistent with the USDOT Surface Transportation Block Grant Program, which allows for flexibility of different types of projects.

8. Union Station Master Plan Update (Elizabeth Carvajal, Metro)
Ms. Carvajal presented a broad overview of the Union Station Master Plan and updated TAC on the project’s progress. Metro purchased Union Station in 2011 and initiated a master planning process from October 2012 to 2014. The implementation phase began in November 2014, which includes a program EIR currently underway. Metro has secured $13.3 million in ATP Cycle 2 and Prop A grant funding. The scoping meeting took place at Metro on March 31st. The scoping period extends from March 17th to April 19th and is welcomed to TAC.

Metro will not be acquiring additional property unless it served a direct transit purpose and is proposing to acquire and demolish the Mosaic apartments at Union Station, to convert Cesar Chavez Avenue into a key transit access point.

The Union Station Master Plan has three main goals: 1) Transit Optimization; 2) Destination; and 3) Connectivity. The Transit Optimization goal will be fulfilled by a new multi-modal concourse area, relocation of the Patsaouras Bus Plaza, and seamless integration of High-Speed rail. Ms. Carvajal detailed the Southern California Regional Interconnection Project (SCRIP). With the relocation of Patsaouras Plaza, there would be consolidated bus service with local and regional buses in one location. Private vehicle drop-off will no longer be allowed in the bus plaza and will instead take place elsewhere at the station. The Destination goal is addressed with a Development Program of 3.25 million square feet that identified different potential uses such as hotel, mixed use, and commercial. The final program will be dictated by the market at the time of initiation. Metro is proposing density to the east to preserve view sheds of historic Union Station. No development will take place over the rail yard. Concerning the Connectivity goal, staff identified a series of ground level connections throughout the station such as plazas and terraces. Staff also identified key bike connection points that will later help with short and long term bike parking and bike connections to transit facilities. Currently, the biggest connectivity issue to Union Station is the main entrance, which is fronted with surface parking and low walkability. Metro is proposing a new civic plaza in the front entrance to transform the space, which will include a more direct path from Union Station to El Pueblo with a consolidated crosswalk. Metro will be pursing this plan in ATP Cycle 3. Metro received ATP Cycle 2 funding to design and implement the Alameda Street Crossing, which involves a reconfiguration of Alameda Street to widen pedestrian and bicyclist facilities in front of Union Station and El Pueblo.

Mr. Mitchell asked if the section between Arcadia Street and Alameda Street will be closed, since currently it is used by pedestrians as a shortcut to reach the Expressway from Union Station. Ms. Carvajal replied that the stakeholder meetings will be a good place to solicit these types of input and incorporate them into the design process.

Ms. Carvajal stated that staff will be working with the City of Los Angeles for an amendment to the Alameda District Specific Plan. The Plan was adopted in 1996 when Union Station was owned by a private developer. Metro has six million square feet of development rights at Union Station that it is interested in retaining. The Metro Board approved the concourse as
part of the project level analysis in the environmental document. The Board also directed the SCRIP and Union Station Master Plan to accommodate high speed rail at Union Station.

9. Countywide Bike Share Equity Initiatives (Avital Shavit, Metro)
Ms. Shavit presented information on Metro’s Bike Share program. She stated that the Metro Board approved a fare structure of: $20 for a monthly pass, which includes unlimited 30-minute rides; $40 for an annual flex pass, which includes a discounted rate of $1.75 for every 30-minutes; or $3.50 for a one-time use of up to 30-minutes, with every additional 30-minutes costing $3.50.

Metro staff proposed an equity program to the Board in March, which will provide a zero-dollar flex pass for anyone enrolled in Metro’s Rider Relief program, which provides subsidies for people who are low-income to purchase transit passes at a discount. Individuals enrolled in the Rider Relief program will receive a zero-dollar pass coupon code to register on the Metro Bike Share website. Once registered, the user will be charged $1.75 for each 30-minute ride.

The Bike Share program will be discounted 50% for the first two months in order to encourage people to try the program. Metro is anticipating launching the Bike Share Pilot program in Summer 2016, which will include up to 80 stations in downtown Los Angeles, with up to 1,000 bicycles.

Mr. Mostahkami asked how Bike Share will measure a 30-minute ride. Ms. Shavit stated that each bike kiosk will include a docking point that is connected to a main computer. The system recognizes the account of the registered user based on the TAP card, and will know what type of fare to charge. The system will then begin counting down the time once the bike is released from the docking station and stops when the bike is returned to another station.

Mr. Mostahkami asked for clarification on the concept of the 30-minute ride in the $20 monthly pass plan. Ms. Shavit stated that the user can take an unlimited number of trips under the monthly pass, as long as each individual trip is under 30 minutes.

Corinne Ralph (City of Los Angeles) asked if the TAP card stored value could be used to access Bike Share? Ms. Shavit replied that stored value cannot be used when the pilot program is launched. The Bike Share system will be using a separate account. Staff is working on a long term plan to add bike share as an item in the TAP card, as well as incorporating an option to use cash payment. Currently, users can only register with a credit card. When the user registers on the Bike Share website, they can enter their TAP number, which then becomes their key to unlocking the biking from the docks.

Mr. Feinberg asked for confirmation that TAP cards are associated with a credit card online, and each payment will be made from a credit card. Ms. Shavit confirmed, and stated that staff is also exploring options to use other forms of credentials to access Bike Share in the future, such as a mobile device or proof of employment. Ms. Shavit stated that for users who register for Bike Share online and don’t currently have a TAP card, Metro will mail them a special bike share TAP card that will act as their key. The new Bike Share TAP card will also be able to store
value for transit access, but Ms. Shavit reiterated that Bike Share and TAP stored value are on two separate accounts.

Mr. Stevens asked if the bicycles will be operated by a vendor under contract with Metro? Ms. Shavit replied yes. Mr. Stevens asked if the Bike Share systems in the adjacent cities such as Santa Monica and Long Beach, will be compatible with the Downtown Los Angeles Pilot Program? Ms. Shavit replied that Metro has chosen to utilize a smart dock system as this system tends to work best for large-scale Bike Share networks. The Cities of Santa Monica and Long Beach are utilizing Smart Bike technology where all the technology is on the bike. The current equipment is not compatible with the equipment used in Santa Monica or Long Beach. Metro’s Bike Share system is using TAP interoperability so that cities with their own Bike Share systems can opt-in in the future to incorporate TAP access. It will be up to the Bike Share vendors to decide to opt-in.

Mr. Stevens noted that theoretically in cities with different Bike Share vendors there could be competing Bike Share kiosks adjacent to one another. Ms. Shavit stated she does not envision that happening as Bike Share is meant for short trips rather than traveling from Downtown Los Angeles to Long Beach for instance. For cities that do not have a bike share system, but are looking for financial support from Metro to implement a bike share system, they will have to use the Metro operator.

Mr. Mostahkami asked for clarification about the number of bike stations. Ms. Shavit stated there will be 80 stations located at or near a Metro transit station and around different activity centers in Downtown Los Angeles. The number of bikes per station will vary, but she stated there will be approximately 12 bikes per kiosk.

Mr. Mostahkami asked how bike maintenance will work? Ms. Shavit replied that there are performance standards in the vendor contract that the bikes must be in a State of Good Repair. The vendor will routinely check bikes for necessary maintenance. She noted that an informal method users in other cities have done is reverse the bike seat to let other users know a bicycle is out of order and signal to vendors to check that bike. There will also be a telephone number for customers to call when they are having issues with their bike.

Mr. Mitchell asked if there will be a smartphone app that tells users where stations are located? Ms. Shavit confirmed that there will be an app that will let users know where stations are located and how many bikes are available at each station at any given time.

Mr. Stevens asked how fare box recovery rates are in other Bike Share systems? Ms. Shavit replied that fare box recovery in Bike Share programs across the U.S. vary widely. Some suburban areas have 40% fare box recovery, which includes user fees and advertising, while places like central Washington DC have 100% fare box recovery just with user fees. She stated that there are different approaches to take, such as incorporating advertising to make up for low fare box recovery from user fees.

10. Metro Open Streets Grant Program (Avital Shavit, Metro)
Ms. Shavit reported that Metro recently released the Open Streets Grant Program Cycle 2 online application. Applications are due May 12th. Staff is conducting outreach to the various
Subregions, TAC, and TAC Subcommittees. The grant funds will be available starting October 2016 and would be eligible for any event until December 2018. The requirements are similar to the Cycle 1 guidelines and are listed on the online application.

Cycle 2 will either have a funding limit of $149,000 per city, or the sum of the population share if multiple cities are applying together, whichever is greater. A list of funding eligibility and how much each city is eligible to receive is also available.

Mr. Mostahkami asked how much is the local match? Ms. Shavit replied that the grant requires a 20% local match, but can include in-kind services.

Ms. Shavit announced that a workshop will be held on April 14th at Metro Headquarters from 8:30 am – 12 pm in the 4th Floor University Conference Room. The Cities of Los Angeles and Long Beach will be talking about lessons learned from implementing their own events.

Ms. Shavit provided a hand-out listing eight upcoming Open Streets events that have been funded under Cycle 1.

11. Legislative Update
No Legislative update was provided.

Adjournment
Ms. Pan adjourned the meeting and reported that the next scheduled TAC meeting is May 4, 2016 in the William Mulholland Conference Room on the 15th floor at 9:30 am. She reminded the TAC members that the TAC Deobligation Appeals will be held at this meeting, which is expected to last until the afternoon. If you have questions regarding the next meeting, please contact Brian Lam at (213)922-3077 or email lamb@metro.net.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Automobile Club of California</strong></td>
<td>1. Marianne Kim/Stephen Finnegan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle Coordinator</strong></td>
<td>1. Rich Dilluvio/Michelle Mowery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus Operations Subcommittee (BOS)</strong></td>
<td>1. Michelle Caldwell/Susan Lipman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Jane Leonard/Gloria Gallardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>California Highway Patrol</strong></td>
<td>1. Sgt. Dave Nelms/Ofc. Christian Crasch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caltrans</strong></td>
<td>1. Gary Slater/Steve Novotny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Robert So/Kelly Lamare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizen Representative on ADA</strong></td>
<td>1. Ellen Blackman/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Long Beach</strong></td>
<td>1. Eric Widstrand/Nathan Baird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>1. Corinna Ralph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant/Corinne Ralph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Daniel Mitchell/Carlos Rios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Ferdy Chan/Kevin Minne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>1. Tina Fung/Ayala Ben-Yehuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. John Walker/Inez Yeung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Pat Proano/Allan Abramson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES</td>
<td>1. David Kriske/Roubik Golanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Mohammad Mostahkami/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Robert Brager/Elizabeth Shavelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Mike Behen/Allen Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Larry Stevens /Craig Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Robert Newman/Wayne Ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Robert Beste/Ted Semaan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. David Feinberg /Sharon Perlstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE (LTSS)</td>
<td>Sebastian Hernandez/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laetitia Garcia/Linda Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>Fanny Pan/Brian Lam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Metro)</td>
<td>Countywide Planning &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane Corral-Lopez /Carolyn Kreslake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDESTRIAN COORDINATOR</td>
<td>Valerie Watson/Dale Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>Susan Price/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY</td>
<td>Anne Louise Rice/Karen Sakoda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SCRRA - Ex-Officio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>Eyvonne Drummonds/Kathryn Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SCAQMD -- Ex-Officio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF</td>
<td>Warren Whiteaker/Annie Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNMENTS (SCAG -- Ex-Officio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>Lupe Valdez/LaDonna DiCamillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/</td>
<td>Vacant/Phil Aker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>Mark Hunter/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Bruins</td>
<td>LAFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSICA MERNEY</td>
<td>INVESTING IN PLACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH GUEVARA</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Marshala</td>
<td>LAC DRP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Kim/Stephen Finnegan (A)</td>
<td>AUTO CLUB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Dilluvio/Michelle Mowery (A)</td>
<td>BICYCLE COORDINATOR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Caldwell/Susan Lipman (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Warning!</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Leonard/Gloria Gallardo (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgt. Dave Nelms/Oic. Christian Cracraft (A)</td>
<td>CHP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Slater/Steve Novotny (A)</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert So/Kelly Lamare (A)</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Blackman/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>CITIZEN REP ON ADA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Widstrand/Nathan Baird (A)</td>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant/Corinne Ralph (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Mitchell/Carlos Rios (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fardy Chani/Kevin Minne (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Fung/Ayalla Ben-Yehuda (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Walker/Inez Yeung (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Proano/Allan Abramson (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kraker/Roubik Golianian (A)</td>
<td>ARROYO VERDUGO CITIES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Mostahkami/Lisa Rapp (A)</td>
<td>GATWAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Brager/Ramiro Adeva (A)</td>
<td>LAS VIRGENES MALIBU COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Belen/Allen Thompson (A)</td>
<td>NORTH L.A. COUNTY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Stevens/ Craig Bradshaw (A)</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL VALLEY COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Newman/Wayne Ko (A)</td>
<td>SAN FERNANDO VALLEY COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Besler/Ted Semaan (A)</td>
<td>SOUTH BAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Feinberg/Sharon Perlstein (A)</td>
<td>WESTSIDE CITIES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian Hernandez/Justine Garcia (A)</td>
<td>LTSS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Warning!</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justine Garcia/Linda Evans (A)</td>
<td>LTSS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanny Pan/Brian Lam (A)</td>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Cornall-Lopez/Carolyn Kreslak (A)</td>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Watson/Dale Benson (A)</td>
<td>PED COORDINATOR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Price/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH COORDINATOR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Louise Roe/Karen Sakoda (A)</td>
<td>SC/RRA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewyonne Drummond/Kathryn Higgins (A)</td>
<td>SCAGMD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Whiteaker/Annie Nam (A)</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupe Valdez/LaDonna DCamilo (A)</td>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Yamarone/Phil Aker (A)</td>
<td>TDM/SUST SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hunter/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>TDM/SUST SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 4

TAC Call for Projects
Appeals Protocol
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TAC Roles and Responsibilities: TAC is an Advisory Committee and serves as the appeal body for Metro Grant Programs including the Call for Projects, Transit Oriented Development (TOD), FTA Section 5310, to name a few. TAC’s primary role and responsibility is to provide an objective, technical, and countywide perspective in the appeals process. TAC’s role is also to objectively listen to project sponsors’ appeal for funding. Based on the merits of the appeal, it is TAC’s role to recommend whether the project is justified to receive funding from the Board approved TAC Appeal Reserve fund. Projects are not to be reevaluated or rescored. Metro staff can concur, reject or recommend alternatives to the TAC recommendations. To ensure TAC’s countywide role, these protocols shall govern:

- The Alternate TAC member shall only participate in the meeting when the primary TAC member is not present.
- Ex-officio members are not allowed to vote.
- For projects for which their respective agency has submitted an application(s) or appeal(s), TAC members and/or Alternates are prohibited from providing oral testimony.
- TAC members and/or Alternates should not participate in TAC discussion concerning project(s) their agency sponsored so as not to be perceived as taking an advocacy role.
- Motion seconds should be made from an agency/jurisdiction/League of Cities/TAC Subcommittee representative other than the agency/jurisdiction/League of Cities/TAC Subcommittee representative that originated the motion.
- Any discussion involving the public will be allowed when acknowledged and determined appropriate by the TAC Chairperson.
- TAC discussion and motion development is intended for TAC members’ participation only.
Attachment 5

Recommended Project
Deobligation List
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPEAL TIME</th>
<th>PROJ ID#</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECT COSTS $ (000')</th>
<th>TOTAL METRO PROG $ (000')</th>
<th>METRO PROG YR(S)</th>
<th>LAPSING PROG YR(S)</th>
<th>LAPSING FUND TYPE</th>
<th>METRO AMOUNT SUBJECT TO LAPSE $ (000')</th>
<th>TOTAL EX'TS YEARS</th>
<th>REASON(S) FOR APPEAL</th>
<th>DATE OF LAST TAC APPEAL</th>
<th>PREVIOUS TAC RECOMMENDATION FROM LAST APPEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 9:50</td>
<td>F3729</td>
<td>Culver City</td>
<td>REAL-TIME BUS ARRIVAL INFORMATION SYSTEM</td>
<td>2,521</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>LTF</td>
<td>$ 1,972</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 9:55</td>
<td>F3317</td>
<td>Culver City</td>
<td>BUS SIGNAL PRIORITY IN CULVER CITY</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>$ 2,134</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 10:00</td>
<td>F1121</td>
<td>City of Diamond Bar</td>
<td>STATE RTE-60/LEMON AV PART, INTERCHANGE (ON-OFF-RAMPS)</td>
<td>17,909</td>
<td>2,204</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>$ 2,108</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>One-year extension to June 30, 2016 to be under construction and report to TAC at the May 4, 2016 TAC Appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 10:05</td>
<td>F5701</td>
<td>City of Burbank</td>
<td>BURBANK TRAVELER INFORMATION AND WAYFINDING SYSTEM</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Need to execute Letter of Agreement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 10:10</td>
<td>8018</td>
<td>City of South Pasadena</td>
<td>SOUTH PASASENA FAIR OAKS CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>12,991</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>$ 672</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>One-year extension to June 30, 2016 with the condition that the Project Sponsor must submit a written report to Metro by December 2015 demonstrating their good faith effort to secure design and construction funding. As part of the written report, the Project Sponsor must acknowledge the requirement per Amendment #4 dated January 31, 2013, to return the design funds to Metro if the project is not constructed. The Project Sponsor will present the report to TAC at the January 6, 2016 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 10:15</td>
<td>F1649</td>
<td>City of Long Beach</td>
<td>WILLOW STREET PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>3,114</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$ 1,806</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>One-year extension to June 30, 2016 to award construction contract and report to TAC at the May 4, 2016 TAC Appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 10:20</td>
<td>F1528</td>
<td>City of Long Beach</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL RIVER BIKE PATH GAP CLOSURE AT WILLOW STREET</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$ 691</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>One-year extension to June 30, 2016 to complete construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 10:25</td>
<td>F3174</td>
<td>City of Lancaster</td>
<td>10TH STREET WEST CAPACITY IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>5,417</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>$ 1,596</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 10:30</td>
<td>F1205</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>OLYMPIC BL AND MATEO STREET GOODS MOVEMENT IMP-PHASE II</td>
<td>4,422</td>
<td>2,874</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>$ 1,150</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>One-year extension to June 30, 2016 to complete construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2016 Call for Projects Deobligation TAC Appeal

#### May 4, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPEAL TIME</th>
<th>PROJ ID#</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECT COSTS $(000'')</th>
<th>TOTAL METRO PROG $(000')</th>
<th>METRO PROG YR(S)</th>
<th>LAPSING PROG YR(S)</th>
<th>LAPSING FUND TYPE</th>
<th>METRO AMOUNT SUBJECT TO LAPSE $(000')</th>
<th>TOTAL EXT'S YEARS</th>
<th>REASON(S) FOR APPEAL</th>
<th>DATE OF LAST TAC APPEAL</th>
<th>PREVIOUS TAC RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:35</td>
<td>F3142</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>EXPOSITION PARK TRAFFIC CIRCULATION IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>$ 4,477</td>
<td>$ 2,910</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$ 1,164</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40</td>
<td>F3171</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>DE SOTO AVE WIDENING: RONALD REAGAN Fwy TO DEVONSHIRE ST</td>
<td>$ 11,535</td>
<td>$ 7,498</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>$ 3,206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>F3640</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>LANI-EVERGREEN PARK STREET ENHANCEMENT PROJECT</td>
<td>$ 1,076</td>
<td>$ 844</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$ 468</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50</td>
<td>F1708</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>HOLLYWOOD INTEGRATED MODAL INFORMATION SYSTEM</td>
<td>$ 2,708</td>
<td>$ 1,682</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$ 1,408</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:55</td>
<td>F3535</td>
<td>City of Santa Clarita</td>
<td>CITYWIDE WAYFINDING PROGRAM FOR PEDESTRIANS AND BICYCLISTS</td>
<td>$ 271</td>
<td>$ 217</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$ 133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>F3806</td>
<td>City of Redondo Beach</td>
<td>RIVERA VILLAGE ENHANCEMENT PROJECT</td>
<td>$ 727</td>
<td>$ 545</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>LTF</td>
<td>$ 542</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10</td>
<td>F1617</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>HOLLYWOOD PEDESTRIAN/TRANSIT CROSSROADS PHASE II</td>
<td>$ 860</td>
<td>$ 619</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>$ 531</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15</td>
<td>F1615</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>EASTSIDE LIGHT RAIL PEDESTRIAN LINKAGE</td>
<td>$ 2,990</td>
<td>$ 2,392</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$ 2,072</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>F1630</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>WASHINGTON BLVD. TRANSIT EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>$ 2,384</td>
<td>$ 1,671</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>$ 1,385</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:25</td>
<td>F5624</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>WASHINGTON BOULEVARD PEDESTRIAN/TRANSIT ACCESS</td>
<td>$ 2,294</td>
<td>$ 1,491</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Need to execute Letter of Agreement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>F3721</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>ANGELS WALK SILVERLAKE</td>
<td>$ 843</td>
<td>$ 675</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>LTF</td>
<td>$ 312</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:35</td>
<td>F3722</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>ANGELS WALK BOYLE HEIGHTS</td>
<td>$ 819</td>
<td>$ 655</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>LTF</td>
<td>$ 655</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:40</td>
<td>F3139</td>
<td>City of Manhattan Beach</td>
<td>SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD BRIDGE WIDENING PROJECT</td>
<td>$ 10,729</td>
<td>$ 6,813</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>$ 5,373</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45</td>
<td>F3518</td>
<td>City of Long Beach</td>
<td>DAISY CORRIDOR AND 6TH STREET BIKE BOULEVARD</td>
<td>$ 2,655</td>
<td>$ 1,115</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$ 108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal Time</td>
<td>Proj Id#</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Total Project Costs $ (000')</td>
<td>Total Metro Prog $ (000')</td>
<td>Lapsing Yr(s)</td>
<td>Lapsing Fund Type</td>
<td>Metro Amount Subject to Lapse $ (000')</td>
<td>Total Ext's Years</td>
<td>Reason(s) for Appeal</td>
<td>Date of Last TAC Appeal</td>
<td>Previous TAC Recommendation from Last Appeal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>F3714</td>
<td>City of Glendale</td>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Commute Manager System</td>
<td>$754</td>
<td>$418</td>
<td>2012 2012</td>
<td>LTF</td>
<td>$371 2</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:35</td>
<td>F3711</td>
<td>City of Long Beach</td>
<td>Parking Guidance &amp; Wayfinding Systems (PGS)</td>
<td>$1,196</td>
<td>$957</td>
<td>2012 2012</td>
<td>LTF</td>
<td>$957 2</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:40</td>
<td>F3712</td>
<td>City of Baldwin Park</td>
<td>Metrolink Parking Resource Management Demonstration Project</td>
<td>$265</td>
<td>$186</td>
<td>2012 2012</td>
<td>LTF</td>
<td>$186 2</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45</td>
<td>F5404</td>
<td>City of Signal Hill</td>
<td>City-Wide Bus Shelter Upgrades W/Electronic Kiosks</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$127</td>
<td>2016 -</td>
<td>LTF</td>
<td>- 0</td>
<td>Need to execute Funding Agreement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:50</td>
<td>81118</td>
<td>Foothill Transit</td>
<td>Expansion of Countywide BSP</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>2007 2007</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>$576 7</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>One-year extension to June 30, 2016 to complete street equipment installation, award CAD/AVL equipment vendor contract, and report to TAC at the May 4, 2016 TAC Appeal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:55</td>
<td>6281</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>North County/Antelope Valley Traffic Improvement</td>
<td>$2,605</td>
<td>$1,928</td>
<td>2002 2002</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>$523 12</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>One-year extension to June 30, 2016 to be under construction and report to TAC at the May 4, 2016 TAC Appeal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>8120</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>South Bay Forum Traffic Signal Corridors Project</td>
<td>$8,235</td>
<td>$6,588</td>
<td>2006 2008</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>$2,283 8</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>One-year extension to June 30, 2016 to complete construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:05</td>
<td>8127</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Gtwy Cities Forum Traffic Signal Corridors Project - Phase IV</td>
<td>$10,412</td>
<td>$8,187</td>
<td>2006 2008</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>$2,308 8</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>One-year extension to June 30, 2016 to complete 75% design and to develop a funding plan for construction to be presented at the May 4, 2016 TAC Appeals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>F1311</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>South Bay Forum Traffic Signal Corridors Project</td>
<td>$8,731</td>
<td>$6,939</td>
<td>2009 2019</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>$4,130 5</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>One-year extension to June 30, 2015 to complete design and advertise for construction. Sponsor to provide a written progress report to Metro in December 2014.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2016 Call for Projects Deobligation TAC Appeal

## May 4, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPEAL TIME</th>
<th>PROJ ID#</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECT COSTS $ (000')</th>
<th>TOTAL METRO PROG $ (000')</th>
<th>METRO PROG YR(S)</th>
<th>LAPSING PROG YR(S)</th>
<th>LAPSING FUND TYPE</th>
<th>METRO AMOUNT SUBJECT TO LAPSE $ (000')</th>
<th>TOTAL EXT'S YEARS</th>
<th>REASON(S) FOR APPEAL</th>
<th>DATE OF LAST TAC APPEAL</th>
<th>PREVIOUS TAC RECOMMENDATION FROM LAST APPEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>THIRD STREET &amp; LA VERNE AVENUE PARKING STRUCTURE</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>$814</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$689</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1:25 F3136</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>THE OLD ROAD FROM MAGIC MOUNTAIN PARKWAY TO TURNBERRY LANE</td>
<td>$53,001</td>
<td>$15,001</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>$6,735</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1:30 F7500</td>
<td>City of Lawndale</td>
<td>HAWTHORNE BOULEVARD CLASS II BICYCLE LANES</td>
<td>$233</td>
<td>$186</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LTF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Need to execute Funding Agreement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1:35 F3112</td>
<td>City of Lawndale</td>
<td>INGLEWOOD AVENUE CORRIDOR WIDENING</td>
<td>$3,615</td>
<td>$2,172</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>$223</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1:40 F1198</td>
<td>City of Lawndale</td>
<td>INGLEWOOD AVE CORRIDOR WIDENING PROJECT</td>
<td>$4,493</td>
<td>$1,019</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>$948</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>One-year extension to June 30, 2016 to be under construction and report to TAC at the May 4, 2016 TAC Appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1:45 F7817</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>VERMONT AVE STORMWATER CAPTURE &amp; GREENSTREET TRANSIT PROJECT</td>
<td>$2,936</td>
<td>$1,145</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Need to execute Agreement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1:50 F7703</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>EXPERIENCELA 3.0 - MOBILITY IN THE CLOUD</td>
<td>$973</td>
<td>$779</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LTF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Need to execute Funding Agreement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$199,739</strong></td>
<td><strong>$95,435</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50,987</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Attachment 6

TAC Appeals
Fact Sheets
Call for Project #: F3729  Time Extension Request: 1 year(s)
Project Sponsor: Culver CityBus  Date of last TAC appeal: Not Applicable
Project Title: Real-Time Bus Arrival Information System  Call Awarded Year: 2009

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

The Project will develop and install real-time bus arrival information system using intelligent transportation system (ITS) technology to disseminate “next bus” information to travelers. The project will include real-time information signs at 60 bus stops and transit center/hub within the City of Culver City. The non-physical component is located on a web server.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

No.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

The project RFP has been released on January 29, 2016; the bid closed on April 7th, and the proposals are currently being evaluated. The next steps in the RFP process include interviews, site visits, and Best and Final Offer (BAFO) process before the final selection is determined. The scheduled City Council contract award date is July 11.

There was no prior TAC recommendation.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

Not applicable. No ROW acquisition required.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

Yes, the project is financially viable and fully funded.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

The success of the Real-Time Bus Arrival Information System is dependent upon a reliable CAD/AVL system. In the past few years, Culver CityBus has been experiencing issues with its existing CAD/AVL system and has been working with the CAD/AVL vendor to try to resolve the issues. However, the CAD/AVL system continues to have issues after multiple attempts to address the issues. After careful evaluation, the City determined that a replacement of the CAD/AVL system is required in order to implement a successful Real-Time Bus Arrival Information System. As such, the City has incorporated the Real-Time Bus Arrival Information System project into one ITS Project that includes the replacement of the CAD/AVL system, Real-Time Bus Arrival Information System, and Bus Signal Priority project. Since the ITS Project is a much bigger project to implement, additional time was required in order to prepare the specifications and the RFP. The City has worked with its ITS consultant to ensure that the project RFP was issued in a timely manner and that the project will be implemented in the most efficient manner.
Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

Additional time for project implementation is required due to the delay caused by the issues with the CAD/AVL system, the multiple attempts to resolve these issues, the evaluation period that ultimately led to the determination that the CAD/AVL system needs to be replaced in order to implement a successful Real-Time Bus Arrival Information System, and the complexity of the ITS Project that the Real-Time Bus Arrival Information System is under. The project is now in the midst of the RFP process.

Delays have been overcome and the project is scheduled to be completed by December 2017.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Construction Bid &amp; Award</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
May 4, 2016 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: F3317  Time Extension Request: 1 year(s)
Project Sponsor: Culver CityBus  Date of last TAC appeal: Not Applicable
Project Title: Bus Signal Priority in Culver City
Call Awarded Year: 2009

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

The Project will design, develop, and install the wireless bus signal priority (BSP) system on Culver CityBus fleet and at intersections along transit corridors within the City of Culver City to increase bus operation efficiency and travel time saving. The project intersections are located within the City of Culver City.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

No.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

The project RFP has been released on January 29, 2016; the bid closed on April 7th, and the proposals are currently being evaluated. The next steps in the RFP process include interviews, site visits, and Best and Final Offer (BAFO) process before the final selection is determined. The scheduled City Council contract award date is July 11.

Concurrently, CCB is preparing for a community outreach for the relocation of approximately 35 bus stops from the nearside to the farside location to maximize the efficiency of BSP. The community outreach open house is scheduled to be on June 18, 2016.

There was no prior TAC recommendation.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

Not applicable. No ROW acquisition required.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

Yes, the project is financially viable and fully funded.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

The success of the BSP project is dependent upon a reliable CAD/AVL system. In the past few years, Culver CityBus has been experiencing issues with its existing CAD/AVL system and has been working with the CAD/AVL vendor to try to resolve the issues. However, the CAD/AVL system continues to have issues after multiple attempts to address the issues. After careful evaluation, the City determined that a replacement of the CAD/AVL system is required in order to implement a successful BSP project. As such, the City has incorporated the BSP into one ITS Project that includes the replacement of the CAD/AVL system, real-time bus arrival information system, and bus signal priority project. Since the ITS Project is a much bigger project to implement, additional time was required in order to prepare the specifications and the RFP. The City has worked with its ITS consultant to ensure that the project RFP was issued in a timely manner and that the project will be implemented in the most efficient manner.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

Additional time for project implementation is required due to the delay caused by the issues with the CAD/AVL system, the multiple attempts to resolve these issues, the evaluation period that ultimately led to the determination that the CAD/AVL system needs to be replaced in order to implement a successful BSP system, and the complexity of the ITS Project that the BSP Project is under. The project is now in the midst of the RFP process and community outreach planning process. No further delay is anticipated.

Delays have been overcome and the project is scheduled to be completed by December 2017.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Construction Bid &amp; Award</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
May 4, 2016 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: F1121  
Time Extension Request: 2 year(s)  
Project Sponsor: City of Diamond Bar  
Date of last TAC appeal: May 6, 2015  
Project Title: SR-60 / Lemon Ave. Partial Interchange Construction  
Call Awarded Year: 2007

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):  
The Cities of Diamond Bar and Industry, in cooperation with Caltrans, propose to construct a new partial interchange on State Route 60 (SR-60) at Lemon Avenue, Post Mile R21.5/R23.0. The intersection will consist of a partial (three-legged) interchange, with a westbound (WB) on-ramp, and eastbound (EB) off-ramp, and an EB on-ramp at Lemon Avenue and will permanently remove the existing EB on- and off-ramps at Brea Canyon Road.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:  
In November 2013, Amendment No. 3 was approved, which allowed a portion of the grant funds to be used toward the Right-of-Way phase.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):  
The Right of Way necessary for the project has been acquired. A total of 13 parcels were involved in the right of way phase for partial property acquisition and/or temporary construction easements. Right of Way Certification No. 1 was issued by Caltrans on October 19, 2015. Furthermore, all necessary arrangements have been made for the completion of all remaining utility work. Arrangements have been made with the owners of all conflicting utility encroachments, which will remain within the right of way of the project so that adequate control of the right of way will be achieved. The Design team has been working to finalize the plans in order to get final approval from Caltrans. The PS&E was submitted to Caltrans Design Oversight (OE) on May 1, 2015. Although the plans were not at 100%, OE agreed to review the plans in an effort to expedite the schedule. OE review process was expected to be completed by December 15, 2015 but is expected to be completed this month.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):  
The ROW necessary for the project has been acquired. Two properties were acquired since the last TAC appeal, resulting in a final total of 13 parcels being acquired for the project. Right of Way Certification No. 1 was issued by Caltrans on October 19, 2015.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:  
A cooperative agreement was executed with Caltrans on December 16, 2014 to advertise, award and administer (AAA) the project. When the AAA was executed, the construction capital and construction administration was estimated at $17,315,366 ($13,600,00 for CON Capital and $3,715,366 for CON Support). The Successor Agency to the Industry Urban-Development Agency was expected to cover about a 42% share ($7,258,526) of project costs using agency bond proceeds. The City of Diamond Bar secured $10,056,840 in federal and transportation related funding for the remaining 58%. Therefore, the construction portion of the project was fully funded when the cooperative agreement was signed. However, in March 2016, the design firm advised that the current construction capital cost estimate is $6 million over budget. The top items contributing to the cost increase include retaining walls, roadway mobilization, existing reinforced concrete box relocation and additional storm drains. The estimated construction capital cost is now $19,555,000. The Cities of Industry and Diamond Bar are actively seeking funding options to continue moving the project forward and cover the funding shortfall.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:  
The Cities met with Caltrans on April 12, 2016 and Metro on April 21, 2016 to discuss the funding shortfall and identify potential funding sources. The Cities will be exploring the repurposing option for federal earmarks, to determine if additional funding may be available through repurposing or apply for SHOPP’s “mobility” program category for additional funding.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map  
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:
At this time it is being requested that a time extension is granted to allow the Cities an opportunity to explore additional options for funding. Acquisition and design are complete. This project is critically important to the region and given the unique opportunity that is being presented through re-purposing of federal earmark funds the Cities want to explore the viability of this option, while securing existing funding sources.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>November 2005</td>
<td>March 2016-revalidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>March 2009</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)*</td>
<td>April 2017</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction*</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dates based on project being fully funded by 12/30/2016

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
May 4, 2016 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project Id.  F5701  
Time Extension Request:  0 Years
Project Sponsor:   City of Burbank  
Date of Last TAC Appeal   N/A
Project Title:  Burbank Traveler Information and Wayfinding System  
Call Awarded Year:  2011

Scope of Work:
The proposed wayfinding project will provide traveler information systems for all major travel modes in Burbank. The traveler information program will reduce private vehicle usage and encourage transit, rail and bicycle use in the city. The proposed system uses infrastructure already in place to provide the most improvement with the least implementation cost. The proposed work will include systems to provide travel information to the main travel modes in Burbank with the purpose of maximizing the use of public transportation systems, including: Transit, Rail, Bicycle, and Private Vehicle.

Were there any changes in Scope of Work since the Metro Board approved the project?  
No

Project Status and whether last TAC recommendation was met:
Project LOA scheduled to be approved by Burbank City Council on May 24, 2016. Because of needed changes in LOA and Council schedule for budget hearings, staff was unable to get approved LOA in time.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal?  
No properties are in ROW acquisition process.

Is project financially viable and fully funded?  If no, explain.  
Project is viable and fully funded.

Reasons for delay, if any and how remedied:
Delay caused by changes in LOA document prior to approval by Metro. LOA scheduled to be approved by Burbank City Council on May 24, 2016 and it will be delivered to Metro that week. The delay in approving LOA will NOT result in a delay for the project. Project will start as scheduled in July 2016 and be completed by April 2017, as shown in application.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:
The delay in approving the LOA will not cause any delay in the project implementation. Project scheduled to begin in July 2016 as shown in the application, and that schedule remains intact.

Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>Negative Declaration</td>
<td>Negative Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid and Award</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>August 2016</td>
<td>February 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 1
Wayfinding and Traveler Information Project
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
May 4, 2016 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: 8018  
Project Sponsor: City of South Pasadena (City)  
Project Title: South Pasadena Fair Oaks Corridor Improvements  
Date of Last TAC Appeal: May 6, 2015  
Time Extension Request: 1 year

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):
Widening the northbound SR-110 off-ramp at Fair Oaks Avenue from 2 to 4 lanes, removal of the dual left turn lanes from northbound Fair Oaks to southbound SR-110, adding a right turn lane from northbound Fair Oaks to State Street, new southbound SR-110 on-ramp adjacent to the existing SR-110 Fair Oaks off-ramp, re-striping of the Fair Oaks Bridge, and installation of video detection at the intersection.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approval of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:
No changes to the Scope of Work.

Project status or whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):
The City was requested to provide a “good faith effort” to obtain the remaining funding shortfall associated with the project. Since the last TAC Appeal, the City has adopted a resolution to act as the Fiduciary Agent for the remaining $9.3 million in Rogan Funds for Caltrans to complete the design and construction of the SR-110 Interchange Project. City Staff has met with Caltrans to discuss Caltrans ability to take on the role of Lead Agency for the project. Caltrans has agreed to partner with the City and has identified an additional $2.5 million in state funds to cover the funding shortfall to deliver the off-ramp portion (Phase 1) of the project.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):
N/A

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:
With the introduction of an additional $2.5 million from Caltrans there are sufficient funds to complete the first phase of the project. The City is currently working with Caltrans and the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) to identify the remaining $2.5 million necessary to complete the on-ramp portion (Phase 2) of the project.

Reason(s) for delay, if any, and how remedy:
The original project design and environmental approval was completed in 2003, and Caltrans granted a conditional approval with the issuance of an E-76. Additional design work, right-of-way acquisition and utility relocations were required before construction could proceed. Plans are now required to be in English units and Caltrans standards for construction such as environmental, storm water, and structural components have also been upgraded. In addition, the design variances of the hook-ramp must be fully approved by Caltrans. The City sought cost estimates for the design update in 2012 and received prices ranging from $1-1.5 million. There is $672,240 available in PC25 funds available; however, the City faces an additional $400,000-900,000 shortfall. The City has approached Caltrans to see if they would be able to take on the role of lead agency for the project and provide the remaining funds necessary to utilize the federal grant. Caltrans has agreed to partner with the City and has secured $2.5 million in state funds to cover Phase 1 of the project. The City will work with the SGVCOG to secure the remaining $2.5 million for Phase 2.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map  
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to the TAC at the Appeal
Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:
The City has secured an additional $2.5 million to complete Phase 1 of the project through Caltrans and there are sufficient funds to complete the first phase of the project. The City will continue to work with the SGVCOC to secure the remaining $2.5 million to complete Phase 2.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>Jan 2017</td>
<td>Aug 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>Jan 2018</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>Oct 2018</td>
<td>Nov 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Jan 2019</td>
<td>Aug 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to the TAC at the Appeal
Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to the TAC at the Appeal
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
May 4, 2016 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to the TAC at the Appeal
Call for Project #: F1649  
Project Sponsor: City of Long Beach  
Project Title: Willow Street Pedestrian Improvements Project  
Call Awarded Year: 2010  
Time Extension Request: 1 year(s)  
Date of last TAC appeal: May 6, 2015

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):
This project provides pedestrian-oriented improvements to Willow Street including medians, pedestrian lighting, landscaping, signage, and crosswalk treatments

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:
No Changes

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):
The design is 65% complete.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):
N/A

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:
Yes, and yes.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:
The project design was put on hold in September of 2013 to allow time for Southern California Edison to complete the design and obtain easements for an undergrounding project within the limits of the Willow Street Pedestrian Improvements Project. The SCE project that needed to be constructed before this one starts is now currently under construction.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:
The extension is needed to allow time for the SCE undergrounding project to move forward since that work will need to be constructed before the Pedestrian Improvements project can complete the design and to start construction. The undergrounding project is scheduled for construction, and construction should be completed by January 2017. Pole removal will follow that date as the other telcom agencies remove their facilities from the poles.

The design of the Pedestrian Improvement project was re-started in January 2015 and is currently underway. The design and bid phase will be complete by April of 2017 to start the project immediately following the undergrounding project.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>July 2010</td>
<td>October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>Jan 2017</td>
<td>April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>April 2017</td>
<td>Dec 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map  
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Call for Project #: F1528        Time Extension Request:  1 year(s)
Project Sponsor: City of Long Beach        Date of last TAC appeal: May 6, 2015
Project Title: San Gabriel River Bike Path Gap Closure at Willow Street        Call Awarded Year: 2007

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):
Creation of a .5 mile off-street bicycle path to achieve bicycle route gap closure on Willow Street from the San Gabriel River Trail west to Studebaker Road.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:
No changes.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):
While obtaining an E-76 by June 30, 2016 is anticipated, the City of Long Beach is requesting a one-year extension as a precautionary measure. The project is in environmental review, pending a Categorical Exclusion. The PES was originally submitted on 2/11/16 and additional information was submitted on 3/3/16 and 4/6/16 at Caltrans’ request.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):
ROW acquisition is not required for this project.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:
The project is fully funded through project completion.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:
Final design and environmental work took longer than anticipated. An approved CE is expected in the first week of May. As stated earlier, PES was submitted in February. ROW approval from Caltrans is expected to be swift, since no acquisition or utility relocation is required. Caltrans has reviewed draft submissions of the ROW certification packet, which will be submitted immediately upon environmental clearance.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

Environmental clearance has taken longer than anticipated and resulted in a slim timeline for obtaining an E-76. Submission of the request for authorization to proceed with construction will be submitted in May. We expect to receive an E-76 by June 30, 2016 but are requesting an extension as a precaution.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>November 2016</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)**  
**May 4, 2016 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet**

**Call for Project #:** F3174  
**Project Sponsor:** City of Lancaster  
**Project Title:** 10th St W Capacity Improvements  
**Call Awarded Year:** 2009

**Time Extension Request:** 1 year  
**Date of last TAC appeal:** N/A

---

**Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):**

This project shall improve the capacity of 10th Street West, between Avenue M and Avenue L, in the City of Lancaster. The widening shall be extended to existing right of way extents and close the mixed flow lane gaps along 10th Street West, to bring the major arterial segment to a total of three continuous mixed flow lanes in each direction, to provide for continuous pedestrian access, and add bus stop turnouts to improve the safety and efficiency of the corridor. The project will include center medians to reduce cut through traffic and help beautify the alignment with stamped concrete and landscaping. The project will add an additional signalized intersection. The widening of 10th Street West also requires the construction of a Master Plan of Drainage facility to provide for positive drainage along this corridor.

**Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:**

No changes in scope.

**Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):**

**Project Status:** Final design and right-of-way acquisition.

**If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):**

6 Road Easements and 1 Reciprocal Access Agreement are needed. Three road deeds have been acquired, three are remaining. One Owner has agreed to reciprocal access and we are pursuing agreement with the second.

The remaining acquisitions are as follows:

- 3128-011-805 and 806: Road Easement, SCE Voluntary Condemnation – August 2016
- 3109-024-014: Road Easement – May 2016
- 3109-025-043: Road Easement

**Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:**

The project is financially viable and fully funded.

**Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:**

ROW acquisition is the reason for the delay. SCE is required to obtain Public Utilities Commission (PUC) approval prior to dedication. This is a lengthy process and after exhausting efforts on our end, we have abandoned our request for SCE to bring the dedication before the PUC and have started the process of voluntary condemnation at the recommendation of SCE. We hope to have an order of possession by August 2016. For the remaining acquisitions, we are actively negotiating with Property Owners to complete the process as soon as possible.

---

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map  
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

On March 18, 2015, the City filed for a 2 year extension on this project. On November 16, 2015, Metro executed Amendment No. 1 of the MOU extending the lapsing date of funds to June 30, 2016. As noted in our Quarterly Progress Reports, in addition to Consultant design issues, ROW acquisition has been an on-going process that we have actively pursued but have not been able to resolve within the time allotted.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/31/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>05/31/2012</td>
<td>09/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>05/31/2012</td>
<td>08/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>09/25/2016</td>
<td>12/13/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>01/16/2017</td>
<td>04/21/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
May 4, 2016 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: F1205  
Project Sponsor: City of Los Angeles  
Project Title: Olympic Blvd. and Mateo St. Goods Movement Imp-Phase II  
Call Awarded Year: 2007  
Time Extension Request: __1__ year(s)  
Date of last TAC appeal: __05/06/15__

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

Widen approximately 300 feet of Olympic Blvd. between Santa Fe Ave. and Mateo St. to accommodate a westbound right-turn pocket at Mateo St.

Increase curb radii at Olympic Blvd. and Mateo St. and at Mateo St. and Porter St.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

No change to scope.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

The right-of-way phase is complete. The construction phase has commenced. Due to the complexity of the construction, it has been split into two phases. Phase I - Demolishing the building on the NE corner of Olympic Blvd. and Mateo Street and grading the site, and Phase II – Street improvements. The bid and award is complete for Phase I and the contractor is mobilizing his crews in the last week of April, 2016. Phase II is expected to commence in January 2017.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

Not applicable.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

Project is financially viable and fully funded.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

Entire building to be demolished and not just a piece as originally estimated. Asbestos and Lead surveys had to be performed by an environmental consultant. Project split into two construction phases to save time and money.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

Construction has commenced for Phase I (building demo and site grading) and Phase II (street improvement components) will commence at the completion of Phase I which is currently estimated to be in January, 2017.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map  
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>July 2008</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>July 2009</td>
<td>July 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>July 2010</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
May 4, 2016 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: F3142  
Project Sponsor: City of Los Angeles, Dept. of Transp.  
Project Title: Exposition Park Traffic Circulation Improvements  
Call Awarded Year: 2009  
Time Extension Request: 1 year(s)  
Date of last TAC appeal: ____________

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

This project will widen the east leg of Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. at Vermont Ave. and restripe the west leg to provide exclusive right-turn lanes for westbound and eastbound motorists. The project will also widen the north leg of Figueroa St. at Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. to provide an exclusive right-turn lane for southbound motorists.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

No, there are no changes in the scope of work.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

This project is currently in the Design/Environmental phase. The Authorization to Proceed with Preliminary Engineering was received in April 2012. Shortly after, the City began design work. The Preliminary Environmental Study (PES) was submitted to Caltrans, who, in response, required several environmental studies. Due to retirements and staff changes, the City did not have qualified personnel available to complete these studies, so a consultant had to be hired. This caused a significant delay in the schedule. Currently, the consultant is preparing the studies, which will then go through the Caltrans review and approval process. Environmental is anticipated to be complete around November 2016.

The last TAC recommendation was an administrative time extension of 1 year.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

This project is not in ROW acquisition phase.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

Yes

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

The schedule of this project has experienced a significant delay due to the extensive environmental studies required by Caltrans. The City has attempted to remedy the delay by hiring an experienced consultant to prepare the environmental studies and work with Caltrans to get them completed and approved.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map  
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

The City of Los Angeles respectfully requests a one year time extension because it is currently in the middle of the environmental clearance process and the project is moving forward. The City is overcoming the delay by having qualified, experienced consultants prepare the environmental studies and work closely with Caltrans to ensure all of the environmental requirements are met.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
<td>November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>February 2019</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Vicinity Map
Exposition Park Traffic Circulation Improvements
Project Number: CML-5006 (734)

City of Los Angeles

- Project Locations
  - Vermont Ave. & Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
  - Figueroa St. & Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

Widen both sides of De Soto Ave. from 100 feet south of the SR-118 Fwy. eastbound on-ramp to Devonshire St. to provide three travel lanes in each direction.

Improvements include construction of asphalt concrete pavement, concrete curb and gutter, 10-foot sidewalks, street trees, street lighting, and traffic signal improvements.

No right-of-way acquisition is required.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

No change in scope.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

The project is still in the design phase (approximately 35% complete).

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

Not applicable.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

The project is substantially underfunded. A solution to the funding shortfall is being sought.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

The project has been put on hold until the funding issue is resolved.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

Once the funding shortfall has been resolved, the design will commence. Since there is no right-of-way, future delays should be minimal if at all.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
May 4, 2016 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: F3640  Time Extension Request: 1 year(s)
Project Sponsor: City of Los Angeles  Date of last TAC appeal: _____________
Project Title: LANI – Evergreen Park Street Enhancement
Call Awarded Year: 2009

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):
Three bus shelters with bus stop security lighting will be installed. Bus stop security lighting will also be installed at four other bus stops. Four bus benches will be installed. Continental crosswalks will be installed at 14 intersections (42 legs). Six new curb ramps will be installed at two new signalized intersections (three at each location). 40 new street trees will be planted throughout the project area.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:
No. There were no recent approved changes in the scope of work. We have been in communication with the program managers at Metro and are in the process of changing the scope of work.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):
We have been in communication with the program managers at Metro and are in the process of changing the scope of work.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):
No ROW acquisition is required for this project. All project elements will be installed in City ROW.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:
Yes. The project is financially viable and fully funded in the 2015 Federal Transportation Improvement Program.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:
There were previous improvements in the project area that were part of the original scope. Safe Routes to School funding recently installed signal equipment at the intersection of 1st Street and Savannah Street, and 4th Street and Fickett Street, which were part of our original scope. Additionally, sidewalk improvements and street trees were recently installed along 1st Street funded as part of the City’s Eastside Access Project. With recent improvements within our project area, staff walked the project area to re-assess the project elements from the original scope to determine elements to be included in our scope of work change. Staff has been working with Metro to execute the change of scope of work since September 2015.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:
Once the change of scope of work has been approved by Metro, the City and LANI will begin the process of implementing this project immediately. Staff is prepared to immediately implement the project in a timely manner as shown in the table below; executing a final contract with LANI to include the elements of the scope of work change, obtain the authority to expend design funds, obtain environmental and right-of-way clearance, final construction documents, authority to expend construction funds, and constructing the project.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Execute contract with LANI</td>
<td>5/1/16</td>
<td>7/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-76 for Design</td>
<td>8/1/16</td>
<td>8/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>2/1/16</td>
<td>3/31/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>9/1/16</td>
<td>4/30/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Clearance</td>
<td>4/1/17</td>
<td>5/30/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>6/1/17</td>
<td>12/31/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1/1/18</td>
<td>12/31/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
LANI Evergreen Park Street Enhancement Project

CFP F3640
LAF3640

Project Boundary
Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):
The project includes the installation of electronic direction and parking availability signs to address vehicle traffic congestion in the Hollywood area. Pedestrian wayfinding signs will be installed at key destinations in Hollywood to encourage park and ride and pedestrian travel.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:
Yes, LADOT proposes to reduce the number of parking availability directory signs from eight to four. The intent is to redirect the resources saved from those signs to upgrade parking technology. All other aspects of the original scope of work will remain unchanged. The amendment to the scope of work has been submitted to Metro and approval is under consideration.

Project status and whether the last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):
LADOT has a consultant on board for the design and installation of the electronic signs and to upgrade the parking technology (if approved). The consultant is in the process of selecting a design firm specializing in wayfinding signage. LADOT already started the public outreach process with the council office and Hollywood Chamber of Commerce.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):
Not applicable

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:
Yes

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:
The delays were a result of the dissolution of CRA/LA, the time to transfer the project from CRA/LA to LADOT, and reobligation of the federal funds for preliminary engineering. LADOT does not foresee any further delays.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:
LADOT requests extension of the project funding on the basis that the project has begun, our consultant has started work, and the milestones set by TAC have been met. To expedite the implementation of the project, we worked with Caltrans to have the project classified as an ITS project and all funds will be obligated as part of the preliminary engineering phase. We have requested that our consultant complete the work by the end of next fiscal year.
Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
May 4, 2016 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: F3535  Time Extension Request: 1 year
Project Sponsor: City of Santa Clarita  Date of last TAC appeal: N/A
Project Title: Citywide Wayfinding Program for Pedestrians and Bicyclists
Call Awarded Year: 2009

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

Project will install wayfinding signs throughout the City’s existing network of pedestrian and bicycle facilities to
direct users to the City’s major transit and employment centers and other major destinations. The scope includes
design of signs, community participation to help identify content/locations, and fabrication/installation of signs.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes,
please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

There have been no changes to the scope of work.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

This is the first time before the TAC. To date, the project has completed several tasks including:
• Request for Authorization for Design in February 2014
• Design Bid in March 2014
• Design Award in June 2014
• Community Meetings in March 2015
• Received CEQA/NEPA Clearance in May 2015
• Completed Design in April 2016

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been
acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

This project does not require the acquisition of ROW or any new easement agreements. The City will submit
paperwork to Caltrans in May 2016 for ROW Certification.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely
manner should extension be granted:

The project is financially viable and fully funded.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

The project encountered a couple of delays that included the following:

1. Discovered programming error in FTIP in September 2013. All of the grant funds (CMAQ) were
programmed in the construction phase with all local match in design phase. The project as adopted by
the Metro Board included grant funds for both design and construction. City could not receive Request for
Authorization for Design from Caltrans until FTIP was amended to include CMAQ funds in design phase.
City staff worked with Metro to amend the FTIP which occurred in late January 2014.

2. Design phase took longer than expected. The City collaborated with a large number of stakeholders as
well as conducting public participation. Trying to address all input received for design of signs and
information content of the signs took more time than originally allocated. In addition, being cognizant that
federal funds were assigned to this project, extra time and research was taken upfront to ensure that
nearly 200 sign locations were on existing City ROW or on existing easement agreements. The Design
phase was completed in April 2016

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

The City has made considerable forward progress towards this project that includes the following milestones: obtaining Environmental (NEPA/CEQA) Clearance, completing Design Bid & Award, and finishing Design. Delays encountered in the previous question have been addressed.

No further delays are anticipated. The City is in progress of working on next milestone which is submitting paperwork to Caltrans for ROW Certification in May 2016. Delay is not expected in this milestone as there are no properties or easements needed to be acquired. Once ROW Certification is received, City will proceed immediately into requesting an E-76 for Construction with Caltrans. Once obtained, project will move to Bid and Award for Construction and finally in Construction.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>August 2014</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Certification</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Authorization (E-76) for Construction</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>October 2016</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>February 2017</td>
<td>May 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
May 4, 2016 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: F3806 Time Extension Request: __1___ year(s)
Project Sponsor: City of Redondo Beach Date of last TAC appeal: __May 2015____
Project Title: Riviera Village Enhancement Project Call Awarded Year: 2009

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

The Riviera Village Enhancement Project is located in Redondo Beach’s Riviera Village which is a triangular-shaped area of 64 acres, bounded to the southeast by Palos Verdes Boulevard, to the southwest by South Catalina Avenue and to the north by Avenue I. The right of way is owned by the City of Redondo Beach. The Riviera Village Enhancement Project consists of the design, construction, and installation of electrical conduit for tree up lighting, street lighting, street furniture, sidewalk pavers and parkway landscaping.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

No

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

Survey has been completed and design will be completed in August. Last year TAC granted a one year extension that was not met due to numerous staff vacancies. Engineering staff is now back at 100%.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

N/A

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

The project is fully funded and financially viable. The City is committed to completing the project this fiscal year.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

The project is behind schedule due to several staff vacancies in the Engineering Division. The vacancies have all been filled including a new Department Director. Project design will be completed in August.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

The City is committed to completing the project this fiscal year.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>01/01/14</td>
<td>06/12/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>10/01/13</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>12/01/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>02/01/17</td>
<td>06/30/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
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Call for Project #: F1617
Project Sponsor: City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Street Services
Project Title: Hollywood Pedestrian/Transit Crossroads Ph.2
Call Awarded Year: 2007

Time Extension Request: ___ year(s)
Date of last TAC appeal: 5/6/2015

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):
Funded through the 2007 Metro Call for Projects, this project will design and install pedestrian streetscape enhancements on: (1) Highland Ave between Sunset Bl to Franklin Ave., (2) Vine St. between Sunset Bl. and Fountain Ave. Proposed project elements include sidewalk improvements, new street trees, street furniture, decorative paving, new transit shelters, curb ramps, driveways, continental crosswalks and pedestrian lighting.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

There have not been changes to the scope of work since the original Metro Board approval.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):
This project was originally awarded to the CRA/LA through the 2007 Call for Projects. The City formally adopted this project and executed an assignment agreement with the CRA/LA Successor Agency as of December 2013. Preliminary engineering funds were obligated and preliminary design is complete. Environmental documents (NEPA) have been submitted to Caltrans and pending approval.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):
The project does not require any ROW acquisition. All work will be performed in the City ROW.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:
Yes the project is financially viable and fully funded.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:
Due to the legislative dissolution of all redevelopment agencies by the California Supreme Court in December 2011, the CRA/LA could no longer implement any agreements or continue its commitment to this project. The CRA/LA, A Designated Local Authority (CRA/LA-DLA) worked with the Governing Board and Oversight Board to request the State Department of Finance (DOF) to release the match funds on April 2014. Design began in July 2014 and is on-going. NEPA documentation is under review with Caltrans

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:
The City will expedite final design activities and preparation of construction documents using current staffing once NEPA clearance is received. This will avoid lengthy bid and award process for procuring a consultant for these services. Construction will also be performed by City crews to avoid the bid and award process for procuring a construction contractor.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>2/1/2016</td>
<td>5/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>11/30/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Location Map
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Call for Project #: F1615
Project Sponsor: City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Street Services
Project Title: Eastside Light Rail Pedestrian Linkage
Call Awarded Year: 2007

Time Extension Request: 1 year(s)
Date of last TAC appeal: 5/6/2015

Project Status:

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

The Eastside Light Rail Pedestrian Linkage project is part of an overall effort to improve pedestrian linkages to the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension project on 1st St between Alameda St to Lorena St in Boyle Heights. The funds for this project represents 1 of 8 phases of work for this overall project. In partnership with Metro, funded by Metro’s Measure R Eastside Light Rail Access Project, the City is currently implementing the other 7 phases. Project elements include new street trees, new sidewalk, crosswalk enhancements, pedestrian lighting, bicycle racks, trash receptacles, street furniture, and access ramps. Please see attached map displaying all 8 phases of this overall project.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

Yes, the overall limits of work have been revised to more accurately reflect this project’s scope as part of the larger Eastside Light Rail Access project. The original Board approval showed limits of work on 1st St between Alameda St to Lorena St, however as negotiated with Metro, the revised limits are on 1st St between Soto St to Rivera St and Fresno St to Concord St. The revision of project limits was approved by the Board and a revised LOA was executed on November 14, 2014.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

An LOA reflecting the revised project limits was executed and the revised project limits were amended in the FTIP. A revised Preliminary Environmental Study (PES) has been submitted to Caltrans for review. Preliminary design is complete while the other phases of this project are currently in construction.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

This project does not require any ROW acquisition.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

Yes this project is financially viable.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

The Caltrans Professionally Qualified Staff (PQS) determined that Cultural Resource studies are required prior to final NEPA clearance. Required technical studies include, an Area of Potential Effect (APE) map, a Historical Property Survey Report (HPSR), and an Archaeological Survey Report (ASR). It was anticipated at the last TAC that these studies will require 6-12 months to complete. Since then, BSS negotiated with Caltrans to assure them that cultural resources would not be affected. BSS submitted revised environmental documents, and Caltrans is currently reviewing them.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

Additional time is needed to complete the NEPA process. The City is currently in construction on other phases of this project and will transition to construction on this phase upon receipt of all necessary clearances.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>10/1/13</td>
<td>9/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>5/1/2012</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2/1/2017</td>
<td>4/1/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
PROJECT OVERVIEW

METRO GOLD LINE EASTSIDE ACCESS PROJECT | funded through Metro Measure R funds
EASTSIDE LIGHT RAIL PEDESTRIAN LINKAGE | funded through 2007 Metro Call for Projects

Eastside Light Rail Pedestrian Linkage
1st Street Call Project
1st Street from Soto to Rivera Streets and Fresno to Concord Streets
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
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Call for Project #: F1630  Time Extension Request: 2 year
Project Sponsor: City of Los Angeles Bureau of Street Services  Date of last TAC appeal: __________
Project Title: Washington Bl Transit Enhancements Phase 1  
Call Awarded Year: 2007

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

As originally scoped, this project will design and install pedestrian and streetscape enhancements on Washington Bl. between Figueroa St. and San Pedro St., enhancing access to Blue Line Stations. Proposed elements to include pedestrian lighting, directional signage, street trees, sidewalk improvements, and street furniture.

This project is the first phase of improvements to the Washington Bl. corridor to enhance connectivity to the Metro Blue Line.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

There have not been any changes to the scope of work since the original Metro Board approval, however a change of scope will be needed to create a viable project.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

This project was originally awarded to the CRA/LA through the 2007 Call for Projects. The City of Los Angeles executed an assignment agreement on October 4, 2013 with the CRA Successor Agency and has received two Department of Finance approved ROPS (13-14A & 13-14B) payments on November 6, 2013 and May 1, 2014 to cover the CRA committed overmatch. The receipt of both ROPS payments allowed the City to re-obligate preliminary engineering funds that were deobligated by Caltrans due to inactivity. The formal obligation was approved and received on June 27, 2014. The city has been actively working on a site assessment to achieve a revised scope that can be implemented.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

No ROW acquisition is required.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

No, this project is not financially viable or fully funded as originally scoped by the CRA. The project scope will need to be modified to allow for successful implementation within current standards and available budget.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

The dissolution of the CRA/LA created significant delays for this project. Challenges including substandard scope and jurisdictional issues need to be addressed prior to moving forward. Additional community outreach is also required given the length of time between when the project was awarded and the present. The City has started conducting preliminary site investigations and community outreach to achieve a revised scope that is viable. More details below.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

Although the project was awarded to CRA/LA through the 2007 Call for Projects, project activities did not commence until the City received DOF approved CRA match funding in May 2014. In addition, an adjacent CRA/LA project funded under Prop 1C will directly affect the Washington Bl. corridor prompting significant coordination to prevent redundancy in efforts.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
The City will expedite design activities, environmental documentation (NEPA), and the preparation of construction documents using current staffing. A revised scope will be presented for Metro staff review and approval as soon as possible.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>9/1/2016</td>
<td>12/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>10/14/2015</td>
<td>4/30/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>7/1/2017</td>
<td>6/30/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
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Call for Project #: F5624
Project Sponsor: City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Street Services
Project Title: Washington Bl Pedestrian Transit Access Phase 2
Call Awarded Year: 2011

Time Extension Request: 1 year(s)
Date of last TAC appeal: N/A

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

This project was funded through the 2011 Metro Call for Projects. As originally scoped, this project will design and install pedestrian and streetscape enhancements on: (1) Washington Blvd from Hooper St. on the west to Alameda St. on the east, (2) Long Beach Ave. from Washington Bl. to 20th St. New access will also be provided to the Metro Blue Line Station from the north and south ends. Proposed elements include sidewalk improvements, curb extensions, new curb ramps, street furniture, continental crosswalks, pedestrian signals at crosswalks, stop bars, pedestrian lighting, bike racks, new street trees, landscaping at station entrance, and pedestrian safety gates.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

There have not been any changes to the scope of work since the original Metro Board approval. However, a change in scope will be needed prior to an LOA execution.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

The project was originally awarded to the CRA/LA through the 2011 Call for Projects. The City Council accepted the project on May 7, 2014, authorizing City funds to be used as matching funds and authorizing the execution of a grant agreement. An LOA is to be executed by December 2016 following a Board approved scope modification.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

The project does not require any ROW acquisition. However, current proposed work scope is within Metro ROW and Metro jurisdiction. Once revised, all work will be done in the City ROW.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

No, the project is not financially viable or fully funded as originally scoped. The current work scope will be revised to meet a suitable budget.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

Due to the legislative dissolution of all redevelopment agencies by the California Supreme Court in December 2011, the CRA/LA could no longer enter into any agreements or continue committed projects. After City Council authorized funding and a grant agreement in May 2014, initial coordination efforts and analysis of originally proposed project elements revealed various issues to be reconciled. A new project scope is to be determined in conjunction with coordinating with other agencies to prevent redundancy in efforts. Please see details below.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

Significant work proposed by the CRA/LA (modification to existing rail station and track aesthetics) is within Metro jurisdiction and should be handled by Metro directly. Other elements throughout the project violate City standards or current ADA standards and must be resolved. Along with an adjacent CRA/LA project funded under Prop 1C that would directly impact the Washington Bl. corridor, Metro also intends to implement station and track modifications proposed in the original work scope; therefore, significant coordination regarding concurrent projects will be necessary. Preliminary community outreach is also needed to ensure the project can be successfully implemented within City standards.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>6/1/2018</td>
<td>9/1/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>1/1/2017</td>
<td>1/1/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4/1/19</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
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Call for Project #: F3721
Project Sponsor: City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Street Services
Project Title: Angels Walk Silver Lake
Call Award Year: 2009

Time Extension Request: 2 year(s)
Date of last TAC appeal: N/A

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

This project will design a self-guided walking tour throughout the Silver Lake area of the City of Los Angeles. Included in this project is the design and installation of 15 informational stanchions, a series of on-street historic markers along the walk, and tour guide pamphlets for visitors, guiding them to significant and historical locations in the area.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

No, there have not been any changes to the scope of work since the original Metro Board Approval.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

The preliminary design of this project is currently on hold. The City is in the process of executing the necessary contracts with Angels Walk LA (AWLA) to complete the project.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

No, this project is within the City’s right-of-way and requires no right-of-way acquisition.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

Yes, this project is financially viable and fully funded. Once the AWLA contract is executed, the project can move forward to the construction phase.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

The design consultant for this project, Angels Walk LA, experienced a change in management causing delays in delivering the project's final designs. In addition, the contract with AWLA expired preventing the project from moving forward.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

The City will expedite the preparation of the construction documents, and construction will also be performed by City crews to avoid the bid and award process for procuring a construction contractor.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>9/1/16</td>
<td>12/1/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>1/11/13</td>
<td>5/1/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>7/1/17</td>
<td>5/1/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
This map is a user-generated static output from an Internet mapping site, and is for reference only. Data layers that appear on this map may or may not be accurate, current, or otherwise reliable.
Call for Project #: F3722
Project Sponsor: City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Street Services
Project Title: Angels Walk Boyle Heights
Call Award Year: 2009

Time Extension Request: 2 year(s)
Date of last TAC appeal: N/A

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

This project will design a self-guided walking tour throughout the Boyle Heights area of the City of Los Angeles. Included in this project is the design and installation of 15 informational stanchions, a series of on-street historic markers along the walk, and tour guide pamphlets for visitors, guiding them to significant and historical locations in the area.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

No, there have not been any changes to the scope of work since the original Metro Board Approval.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

The preliminary design of this project has started but is currently on hold. The City is in the process of executing the necessary contracts with Angels Walk LA (AWLA) to complete the project.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

This project is within the City's right-of-way and requires no right-of-way acquisition.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

Yes, this project is financially viable and fully funded. Once the AWLA contract is executed, the project can move forward to the construction phase.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

The design consultant for this project, Angels Walk LA, experienced a change in management causing delays in delivering the project's final designs. In addition, the contract with AWLA expired preventing the project from moving forward.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

The City will expedite the preparation of the construction documents, and construction will also be performed by City crews to avoid the bid and award process for procuring a construction contractor.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>9/1/16</td>
<td>12/1/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>2/10/12</td>
<td>5/1/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>7/1/17</td>
<td>5/1/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
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Call for Project #: F3139
year(s)
Project Sponsor: City of Manhattan Beach
Project Title: Sepulveda Boulevard Bridge Widening
Call Awarded Year: 2009

Time Extension Request: 2
Date of last TAC appeal: N/A

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

Widen existing bridge structure to accommodate an additional northbound through lane on Sepulveda Boulevard (State Highway 1) from 33rd Street to 640' north of 33rd Street consistent with the existing street cross-section north and south of the project.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

Yes, there were changes to the overall project scope-of-work since the Metro Board first approved the project. However, the costs of the scope changes were absorbed by other funding sources (Safetea-LU and Measure R Highway Program). The CFP funding was not affected. Only the schedule was affected. As background, these changes primarily included:

1. Caltrans required New Advanced Planning Study (APS)
2. Caltrans required design changes to sidewalk and roadway geometrics based on changes to Caltrans policy, procedures, and direction (required Caltrans Fact Sheets).
3. Additional Traffic Analysis was required.
4. Additional drainage design due to poor condition of existing storm drain to remain.
5. Additional design for a non-standard retaining wall.
6. Caltrans required to seismic retrofit the existing bridge.
8. Additional detailing of bridge aesthetics.

The funding term was extended by 1 year by the Metro Board on June 25, 2015. The new lapsing date was set to June 30, 2016. Project extension was granted via the attached Letter of Agreement (Amendment 1) and did not require TAC approval to our knowledge.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

Project is in final design and right-of-way acquisition phases. Plans are 100% completed and in final review and negotiations with adjacent property owners continues.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

The right-of-way requires acquisition of 6 Caltrans Highway Easements, 5 Temporary Construction Easements, and 1 Caltrans Maintenance Easement.

To date, the City:
- Has received Irrevocable Offers to Dedicate (IOD) for 1 Caltrans Highway Easements
- Adjacent Manhattan Village Mall development entitlement required property owner to dedicate 3 Caltrans Highway Easements and 4 Temporary Construction Easements
- Actively negotiating to acquire the remaining 2 Caltrans Highway Easements, 1 Temporary Construction Easement, and 1 Caltrans Maintenance Easement.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
The project is fully funded.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

Delay was caused primarily by additional work required by Caltrans and also by delays in obtaining right-of-way acquisition documents from adjacent property owners.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

The project is in the final stages of PS&E and ROW Acquisition. The extension will allow additional time to complete the right-of-way acquisition, obtain right-of-way certification from Caltrans, obtain E76 from Caltrans for construction, and construct. The City’s project team has stepped-up negotiation efforts to accelerate execution of the remaining acquisition documents.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>November 2016</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Scope of Work:

Construct two (2) bicycle boulevards along two corridors known as the Daisy and 6th Street in Long Beach. The proposed bike boulevard along Daisy Corridor is a north – south route between Broadway and 70th Street. The proposed 6th Street bike boulevard is an east - west route between Junipero Avenue to Bellflower Boulevard.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

There have been no changes to the scope of work since Metro Board approved the project.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

The project plans, specifications and estimate (PS&E) are 100% complete and shovel ready for construction.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

Not applicable.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

The project is fully funded. The project will use a combination of federal CMAQ funds, State of California SR2S funds and local funding sources for construction.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

The project is awaiting NEPA - Categorical Exclusion (CE) from Caltrans Office of Environmental and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for the Daisy Avenue corridor bike boulevard. The 6th Street bike boulevard has received CE on 3/22/2016. Right of Way Certification has been filed for both with Caltrans Office of Right of Way on 03/30/2016. The Request for Authorization (RFA) package will be filed with Caltrans Office of Local Assistance no later than 5/13/2016.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

The extension is needed to allow time to complete the NEPA clearance, request and receive authorization to proceed with Caltrans and the subsequent bid, award construction and project close out.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>10/2009</td>
<td>05/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>09/2010</td>
<td>03/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>08/2012</td>
<td>03/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>08/2016</td>
<td>11/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>02/2017</td>
<td>09/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
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Call for Project #: F3714  
Time Extension Request: 1 year(s)

Project Sponsor: City of Glendale  
Date of last TAC appeal: N/A

Project Title: Arroyo Verdugo Commute Manager System  
Call Awarded Year: 2009

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):  
The City of Glendale, in partnership with the Cities of Burbank and Pasadena, obtained funding to develop a Commute Management tool to centralize trip planning, public transit services and employer transportation programs within an easy to use format. The project is branded as “GoVerdugo” and the system allows individuals to create a personal transportation and trip planning profile and receive real-time data based on their traveler preferences and profile.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:  
There were no changes to the scope of work.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):  
The project is 46% complete. We have not received a prior TAC recommendation.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):  
Not applicable.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:  
Since our last quarterly report submitted to Metro, which was Q2 FY 2015-16, we had expended a total of $346,206.14, representing 46% of the project budget. The Metro balance remaining is $225,935.08 and the local match remaining is $182,635.78 for a total of $408,570.86.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:  
The project experienced some delays due to changes in project managers both for the City of Glendale and Metro. Due to shifting resources we determined the necessity to contract with an Administrative Project Manager. Once the project managers were set, the project got back on track with notable progress reported in each quarter. We exercised the first one-year extension with Metro. It became apparent early into the first amendment that building the technical components, integrating with Metro ITS to utilize the trip planner and conducting beta testing would take at least one year’s time. There have been some unanticipated delays in the trip planning component and the beta testing. We made adjustments and continued to build our outreach campaign. We launched a manually based pilot new rider subsidy program to continue our momentum with the public while we finalized the technical aspects of the web enabled system.

Note:  1) Please attach a Project Map  
  2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:
The City is seeking a one-year extension to allow for a full year of system operations needed to conduct a thorough evaluation of the project for reporting purposes and gauge the overall effectiveness in reducing SOV trips. Our full public launch of the system is projected to take place in May 2016. In essence, by June 2016, the system will be completely up and running. The remaining project components including recruitment of businesses to create contributor pages, recruitment of individuals to register in the system, and, recruitment of new transit riders through our subsidy program, require additional time.

In summary:

- The Project is currently 46% completed.
- The Project will finish within budget.
- The Cities have already launched manual Pilot programs, enabling us to engage our target audience and already provide monthly pass subsidies to a number of new transit riders.
- The online system development is projected to be complete in May 2016, and will offer an automated process to distribute the subsidies, allowing for subsidy distribution on a much larger scale.
- In-depth outreach over the past year has allowed us to develop a list of targeted participants, and we’ve spent considerable time educating our target private sector audience about the GoVerdugo system and transit subsidies.
- The project will be completed by June 30, 2017.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Public Launch</td>
<td></td>
<td>May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map  
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Call for Project #: F3711
Project Sponsor: City of Long Beach
Project Title: Parking Guidance & Wayfinding Systems
Call Awarded Year: 2009

Time Extension Request: __1__ year(s)
Date of last TAC appeal: ____________

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

The scope for this project consists of upgrading downtown parking structures (The Aquarium, The Pike, Civic Center, City Place, and The Convention Center) with vehicle occupancy technology/communications. Included in this project is the deployment of up to six fixed roadside changeable message signs (CMS) to route drivers to convenient parking structures/ lots closest to their place of interest.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

There has been no changes to the scope of work since the Metro Board approved the project.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

The project is currently in the design stage. There has been no TAC recommendations on this project.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

Not applicable.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

The project is fully funded. The design will be completed by July 2016, contract awarded by December 2016, and construction will start in January 2017 and finish May 2017.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

Original Project Manager left the City. Project was reassigned to a new Project Manager. The Project Manager has lead the process of retaining the design consultant(s) and coordinating with all Stakeholders. Project Manager goal is to complete the project by June 2017.
Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

The project schedule has been readjusted by current Project Manager. The Project Manager is optimistic that project will be completed by the end of June 2017. The current project is in design phase and will be completed by July 2016. The bidding, Council approval, contract, and NTP for construction will occur by the end of December 2016. The construction will start January 2017 and tentatively be completed by May 2017.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>1/2014</td>
<td>2/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>4/2015</td>
<td>5/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>7/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>8/2016</td>
<td>12/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1/2017</td>
<td>5/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Call for Project #:  F3712  
Project Sponsor:  City of Baldwin Park  
Project Title:  Metrolink Parking Resource Management Demonstration Project  
Call Awarded Year:  2009

Time Extension Request:  1 year(s)  
Date of last TAC appeal:  none

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):
This project will reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for commuters by providing directional wayfinding signage at the Transit Center/Parking Structure (floors 3 and 4), Metrolink Cruz Baca Transcentre and at the Metolink Park and Ride. Parking detection and transmission equipment will be installed at the Transit Center Structure and at the Metrolink Cruz Baca Transcentre to direct motorists to available parking.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:
The Baldwin Park Transit Center/ Parking Structure will install the parking detection and transmission equipment on the 3 and 4 floors of the structure instead of on the 4th and 5th floors of the structure, plus the timeline request is updated and streamlined.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):
The environmental assessment has been completed for posting, comments and recordation. The project is in the design phase.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):
Right-of-way (ROW) has been established and there will be no need to acquire additional R.O.W. to complete our project.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:
This project is financially viable and funds are in place for each phase of the project.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:
Our project was delayed, in part, due to a change in staff and the inability to incorporate funds into the Transit Center/ Parking Structure, which was under construction at the time of funds award.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map  
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:
City staff will be performing design, construction management, funds management and will hire a contractor to complete project elements to keep control of the project schedule.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>May 1, 2016</td>
<td>July 31, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>May 1, 2016</td>
<td>June 1, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>July 4, 2016</td>
<td>August 18, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>September 9, 2016</td>
<td>March 16, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
City of Baldwin Park
Vicinity Map and proposed way-finding sign locations

- Proposed directional signage
- Public Parking at Park and Ride Lot
- Public Parking at Metrolink Station Parking Lot
- Public Parking in Transit Center Structure
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Call for Project #: F5404  
Project Sponsor: City of Signal Hill  
Project Title: Bus Shelter Upgrades and Kiosks  
Call Awarded Year: 2011  
Time Extension Request: 1 year(s)  
Date of last TAC appeal: None

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

The City of Signal Hill will improve fourteen regionally significant existing bus stops along three major thoroughfares representing approximately five miles of regionally significant transit routes within the City of Signal Hill on Pacific Coast Highway, Cherry Avenue and Willow Avenue.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

The sponsor has been in discussions with MTA staff regarding possible scope changes to reflect current field conditions and real time scheduling technologies.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

Project is in planning. No previous TAC appeals or recommendations.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

Selected stops are all in existing ROW.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

Yes, sufficient funds have been fully allocated for this project.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

The on-going discussions with MTA staff regarding possible scope changes based current on recommended shelter locations and incorporating current real time scheduling technology.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

With the extension for one year, sponsor will be able to complete discussions with MTA staff on the scope and technologies to be specified in the contract scope.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>July 1, 2016</td>
<td>August 30, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>September 1, 2016</td>
<td>November 15, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>December 1, 2016</td>
<td>January 31, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>Na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>February 1, 2017</td>
<td>March 15, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>April 1, 2017</td>
<td>June 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map  
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
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Call for Project #: 8111B
Project Sponsor: Foothill Transit
Project Title: Expansion of Countywide BSP
Call Awarded Year: 2001

Time Extension Request: 1 year(s)
Date of last TAC appeal: May 6, 2015

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

The scope of the Expansion of Countywide Bus Signal Priority is to expand the LA County bus signal priority to cover the corridor currently traveled by Foothill Transit’s Line 187. Line 187 is Foothill Transit’s busiest line providing 1.9 million trips in fiscal year 2016. The line travels from the city of Pasadena to the city of Montclair while going through the cities of Arcadia, Duarte, Azusa, Glendora, La Verne, San Dimas, and Claremont. Line 187 is a major regional connector connecting the western portion of San Bernardino County and the San Gabriel Valley to Pasadena.

The scope involves installing wireless network equipment at key intersections that will communicate with the on-board equipment installed on the bus. If the bus is running late within a certain threshold, a message will be sent to the traffic signal requesting priority which will either have a red signal light turn green faster or hold an existing green traffic signal. The difference between this project and other signal priority projects is the signals will communicate with existing on-board CAD/AVL equipment instead of installing on-board hardware solely for the purpose of signal priority. Foothill Transit was the first agency to attempt signal priority using the existing on-board CAD/AVL equipment to communicate to intersections via Wi-Fi connection.

With the extension of the Gold Line from Sierra Madre to Azusa, ridership on Line 187 will be impacted. Currently there are plans to split the line in half and adjusting the frequencies to meet demand. The possible introduction of reduced headways makes schedule adherence even more important, thus reducing the customers’ wait time at stops, making the introduction of bus signal priority even more important.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

No changes have been made to the scope of work.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

The recommendations of the TAC were to:

1. Award contract to CAD/AVL vendor
2. Complete the installation of the street side equipment

Only recommendation 1 was completed. Foothill Transit completed the procurement for a new CAD/AVL vendor, Avail Technologies, and successful testing and completion of the bus signal priority project was included in the scope of work. Foothill Transit has just completed the preliminary design review phase of the implementation of the new CAD/AVL system.

Recommendation 2 was not complete. The street equipment vendor’s project manager went on medical leave which delayed the project. The street equipment vendor has also been acquired, but Foothill Transit has received the support from new management to continue and complete the project. The street vendor project manager has returned from leave and is fully committed to the project.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
The street equipment vendor has submitted updated pricing for the installation of the street equipment. Foothill Transit and the street equipment vendor are negotiating final terms for a contract to reflect the updated installation pricing due to the delay in the project.

The project is ready to go for street equipment installation. Legal agreements have been made with the cities within the Line 187 corridor. All traffic intersection equipment has been purchased and configured. The vendor has the resources ready once the contract is executed.

**If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):**

Not applicable

**Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:**

Yes, the project is fully funded. Foothill Transit has the funds available to pay for the price increase caused by the delay.

**Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:**

Foothill Transit has the full commitment of both the street equipment and vehicle equipment vendors to complete the project. The previous delay in the project was caused by the previous CAD/AVL vendor’s inability to successfully pass acceptance testing. This and other issues caused Foothill Transit to procure a new CAD/AVL system, which was completed earlier this year. Full implementation of the Avail Technologies CAD/AVL system is expected in early 2018 meaning the entire Foothill Transit fleet will be fully equipped with the new Avail Technologies CAD/AVL equipment. The bus signal priority programming and testing by Avail Technologies, which is one of the main components of this project, is expected to be completed by April 2017.

The street equipment vendor project manager was on leave for a majority of last year, but has returned and is fully committed to the completion of the project with the support of management. As a result of the delay, the contract between Foothill Transit and street equipment vendor has lapsed, but Foothill Transit and the vendor are currently in negotiations to execute a contract. Once the contract is executed, the installation of the street equipment is scheduled for completion by January 2017.

**Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:**

As mentioned earlier, the primary cause for delay was the inability of the old CAD/AVL vendor to successfully pass acceptance testing. The new CAD/AVL vendor has looked at the specifications for the signal priority project and is confident in making sure the vehicle equipment successfully communicates with the street equipment at the intersections. The specifications of this project were included as one of requirements in the scope of work of the procurement.

The street equipment vendor has the resources ready once the contract with Foothill Transit is executed.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
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Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New CAD/AVL vendor contract award</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execute contract with street equipment vendor</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete installation of street equipment</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test communications between street and vehicle equipment</td>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td>April 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Line 187: Montclair - Claremont Glendora - Pasadena](image)

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map  
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
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Call for Project #: P0006281LA  
Time Extension Request: 1 year(s)

Project Sponsor: L.A. County Dept. of Public Works  
Date of last TAC appeal: May 6, 2015

Project Title: North County/Antelope Valley Traffic Forum Improvements  
Call Awarded Year: 1999

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):  
County of Los Angeles Public Works to analyze the existing changeable message sign (CMS) system composed of 12 CMS and the installation 5 new CMS in the North County/Antelope Valley area. In addition, the City of Palmdale to install 5.1 miles of fiber optic interconnect and video detection along a portion of Avenue S and a portion of Avenue R.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:
Yes. This grant was originally assigned to the City of Palmdale. At their request, via MOU amendment number 1, Public Works took over administration of the grant in March 2008. The original scope of work involved installing 8 CMS and 2 transducers to monitor road weather conditions. Due to lessons learned from this project and escalating construction costs associated with CMS, the scope of work was revised via MOU amendment number 1 to install 5 CMS and no transducers.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):
- Total Grant Amount = $1,928,000. As of FY 15-16 Q3, $1,470,875 spent (76.3%)
- Executed contract amendment for a revised design.
- Per the last TAC appeal, this project was supposed to be under construction by the end of the fiscal year. Currently, we have completed 90% design plans and anticipate advertising in September 2016.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):
No need to acquire ROW for this project.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:
This project is over budget. However, we intend to contribute additional local match to provide funds to construct the project per the MOU scope of work.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:
Prior delays were associated with developing an approach to design new signs for those locations considered to have the highest priority and negotiating the revised scope with the project consultant. Delays also occurred during the detailed design phase of the project due to many comments/revision from various divisions at the County.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:
County reviewing final design plans recently submitted by Consultant. Completion of design is scheduled in June 2016. It is anticipated the project will be advertised by September 2016 and completed by March 2017.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>Q1 FY 15-16</td>
<td>Q4 FY 15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>Q3 FY 11-12</td>
<td>Q4 FY 11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Q1 FY 15-16</td>
<td>Q4 FY 15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>Q4 FY 15-16</td>
<td>Q1 FY 16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Q2 FY 16-17</td>
<td>Q3 FY 16-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map  
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
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Call for Project #: P0008120  
Time Extension Request: 1 year(s)
Project Sponsor: L.A. County Dept. of Public Works  
Date of last TAC appeal: May 6, 2015
Project Title: South Bay Traffic Signal Corridors Project  
Call Awarded Year: 2001

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):  
TSSP projects along Marine Av, Vermont Av., and 223rd St./Wardlow Rd.

The implementation of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) improvements through the expansion of the South Bay fiber optic communications and CCTV cameras project, the wireless communications project, and the KITS interface to the IEN project.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved: No.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):
- Total Grant Amount = $6,588,000. As of FY 15-16 Q3, $4,429,214 spent (67.2%)
- 6 projects completed including all TSSP projects
- Per the May 2015 TAC appeal, this grant was scheduled to be completely expended.
- The South Bay fiber optic communication and CCTV camera project is scheduled to be completed in May 2016.
- Intersection upgrades on Lomita Boulevard at Vermont Avenue and 223rd Street at Normandie Avenue are currently under construction.
- The KITS-IEN interface is scheduled to be installed by December 2016.
- For the Econolite Centracs System project, working on the sole source agreement to procure the Centracs system.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable): N/A

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted: Yes.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:
Delays were associated with the Lomita Boulevard at Vermont Avenue project due to the lowest bid being 30% above Engineer's original estimate, which required Board Approval. Delays also occurred with the Econolite Centracs System due to our Director wanting assurances that the involved agencies and the affected Council of Governments support this sole source procurement and the County efforts associated with the Traffic Signal Management Program.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:
The KITS-IEN interface component of the project is ongoing and scheduled to be completed by December 2016. Working closely with County Counsel and County CIO to execute the agreement for the Econolite Centracs System with installation anticipated to be completed by June 2017.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>Q1 FY 15-16</td>
<td>Q4 FY 15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>Q3 FY 11-12</td>
<td>Q4 FY 11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Q1 FY 15-16</td>
<td>Q4 FY 15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>Q4 FY 15-16</td>
<td>Q1 FY 16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Q2 FY 16-17</td>
<td>Q4 FY 16-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map  
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
May 4, 2016 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: P0008127
Time Extension Request: 1 year(s)
Project Sponsor: L.A. County Dept. of Public Works
Date of last TAC appeal: May 6, 2015
Project Title: Gateway Cities Forum Traffic Signal Corridors Project- (PH IV)
Call Awarded Year: 2001

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):
The TSSP projects along Colima Rd/La Mirada Blvd, Garfield Av, Painter Av/Carmenita Rd, Studebaker Rd, 38th St/37th St/Bandini Blvd. The implementation of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) improvements through the expansion of the Gateway Cities fiber optic communications and CCTV cameras project and the wireless communications project.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved: No.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):
- Total Grant Amount = $8,187,000. As of FY 15-16 Q3, $6,260,380 spent (77%).
- 10 projects completed including all TSSP projects.
- This grant is on schedule per the May 2015 TAC appeals.
- 5 remaining projects:
  - Continued working to obtain Railroad approval for an intersection improvement project at Garfield Ave at Randolph Rd.
  - Continued deployment of the KITS system enhancements.
  - Completed 75% design plans for the Gateway Cities Fiber Optic Communications and CCTV Camera project.
  - Continued the RFP process for the IEN system modernization.
  - Continued working on the sole source agreement to procure the Econolite Centracs System.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable): N/A

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted: Yes

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:
A change in the Railroad’s contractor forced us to start over again with obtaining the Railroad permit. We will continue to work with the Railroad to expedite the permitting process. Delays also occurred with the Econolite Centracs System due to our Director wanting assurances that the involved agencies and the affected Council of Governments support this sole source procurement and the County efforts associated with the Traffic Signal Management Program.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:
Completion of KITS system enhancements, RFP for IEN system modernization, design of the Fiber Optic Communications and CCTV Camera project, obtaining Railroad approval and completing construction of the Garfield Ave at Randolph Rd Improvement project are anticipated to take an additional year. Working closely with County Counsel and County CIO to process the agreement for the Econolite Centracs System with installation anticipated to be completed by June 2017.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Q3 FY 07-08</td>
<td>Q2 FY 16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>Q1 FY 11-12</td>
<td>Q1 FY 16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Q3 FY 11-12</td>
<td>Q4 FY 16-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
May 4, 2016 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: P000F1311  
Project Sponsor: LA Dept. of Public Works  
Project Title: South Bay Forum Traffic Signal Corridors Project  
Call Awarded Year: 2007  
Time Extension Request: 1 year(s)  
Date of last TAC appeal: N/A

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

TSSP projects along Crenshaw Boulevard and Aviation Boulevard. As part of the Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) improvements scope, we are implementing communications for the County’s Centracs central system in Cities of Carson and Hawthorne.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

No.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

- Total Programmed Grant Amount = $5,019,000. As of FY 15-16 Q3, $959,954 expended (100% of FY 2009-2010 Programmed funds, 3.4% of FY 2010-2011 funds).
- This is the first TAC appeal for this grant.
  - TSSP projects: Awarded and will start Construction by July 2016.
  - ITS project: Implementation of communications within Carson and Hawthorne is awaiting County’s Centracs contract execution.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

N/A

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

Yes

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

For the Aviation Boulevard and Crenshaw Boulevard TSSP, start of construction was delayed due to agency coordination and transition to the 2015 Public Works specifications. Delays also occurred with the Econolite Centracs System due to our Director wanting assurances that the involved agencies and the affected Council of Governments support this sole source procurement and the County efforts associated with the Traffic Signal Management Program.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

Complete construction of TSSP projects. Work closely with County Counsel and County CIO to execute the agreement for the Econolite Centracs System with the installation to be completed by June 2017.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>Q2 FY14-15</td>
<td>Q3 FY 14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>Q3 FY 10-11</td>
<td>Q4 FY 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Q1 FY 11-12</td>
<td>Q3 FY 14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>Q4 FY 14-15</td>
<td>Q3 FY 15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Q3 FY 15-16</td>
<td>Q4 FY 16-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
May 4, 2016 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: P000F1344  
Project Sponsor: L.A. County Dept. of Public Works  
Project Title: Slauson Avenue Corridor Improvements  
Call Awarded Year: 2007

Time Extension Request: 2 year(s)  
Date of last TAC appeal: May 6, 2015

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):
The design and construction of multijurisdictional Traffic Signal Synchronization Projects (TSSP) on Slauson Avenue and Stocker Street. The implementation of Intelligent Transportation System improvement projects in the Ladera Heights area.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

No.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

- Total Grant Amount = $2,406,000. As of FY 15-16 Q3, $872,173 spent (36%)
- ITS projects completed.
- TSSP design:
  - Slauson Avenue from Shenandoah to Rimpau Boulevard and Stocker Street from La Cienega Boulevard to La Brea Avenue/Overhill Drive. Design underway. Anticipate advertising in August 2016. To be completed by December 2017.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

N/A

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

This project is over budget. However, we intend to contribute additional local match to provide funds to construct the project per the MOU scope of work.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

The design improvements were more extensive than anticipated due to unforeseen utility issues and additional improvements requested by the local residents. This caused delays due to the estimated construction costs being over budget. As a result, the design plans were re-evaluated and revised to reduce costs without impacting the MOU scope of work.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

We are working with the consultant to modify the design plans to reduce the cost while maintaining the integrity of the project. The project is scheduled to advertise in August 2016.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>Q2 FY 13-14</td>
<td>Q3 FY 13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Q3 FY 13-14</td>
<td>Q2 FY 15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>Q1 FY 16-17</td>
<td>Q1 FY 16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Q2 FY 16-17</td>
<td>Q2 FY 17-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
May 4, 2016 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: F1414
Project Sponsor: County of Los Angeles DPW
Project Title: 3RD STREET AND LA VERNE AVENUE PARK-AND-RIDE
Call Awarded Year: 2007

Time Extension Request: 2 year(s)
Date of last TAC appeal: N/A

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):
The County of Los Angeles proposed to construct a park-and-ride lot adjacent to Metro Gold Line East LA Civic Center station providing 87 parking spaces including 4 ADA compliant stalls. The proposed project includes soil removal, grading, utility relocation, concrete walkway, parking lot lighting with foundation, signage, fencing, landscaping, bicycle kiosk, bus stop shelter and a bus turnout.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:
The County applied under the 2007 Call for Projects to construct a 370 space parking structure for both mixed-use development and Gold Line patrons. The total cost for the parking structure project was $19,035,000. The County was awarded $7,070,000. In 2012 the scope was reduced to constructing a parking lot consisting of 87 parking spaces including 4 parking spaces for disabled patrons, a bus bay, lighting, and landscaping. The reduced project cost is $2,200,000 with $814,000 Call for Project award.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):
N/A

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):
N/A

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:
The original estimated project cost of $2,200,000 was to be funded with $814,000 (37 percent of cost) 2007 Call for Projects award and $1,386,000 (63 percent of the cost) County local funds. Preliminary studies and geotechnical reports have been completed. The updated project cost is $2,550,000 with $814,000 (32 percent) to be funded with Call for Project award and $1,736,000 (68 percent) to be funded by local funds. The project is financially viable. The County has sufficient Proposition A Local Return fund to fully finance the project.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:
The Metro Board of Directors motioned for additional technical work to address comments received by partner agencies regarding SR-60 North Side Design Variation alternative for the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 project and to identify a new route for the Washington Blvd alternative. Potential alignments under consideration include: Arizona Avenue, Atlantic Avenue and Garfield Avenue (underground). The Arizona alternative may impact the 2 existing Gold Line stations currently within walking distance to the proposed parking-and-ride lot. Under the Arizona alignment, a new Gold Line station would be located at Arizona Avenue and Whittier Boulevard over three quarters of a mile to the proposed park-and-ride. The justifications for the proposed park-and-ride project should be re-evaluated based on the outcome of the Metro alternative study.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:
An extension is requested until the findings of the Technical Study become available. The findings are scheduled to be presented to the Metro Board sometime in early 2017.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>January 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Call for Project #: F3136
Project Sponsor: County of Los Angeles DPW
Project Title: The Old Road-Magic Mountain Parkway to Turnberry Lane
Call Awarded Year: 2009

Time Extension Request: 5 year(s)
Date of last TAC appeal: N/A

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

The Old Road-Magic Mountain Parkway to Turnberry Lane improvements primarily consist of widening The Old Road, replacement of two bridges, improvement of two intersections, construction of a multiuse trail, sidewalks, raised medians and bike lanes, removal of the existing Armor-Flex blanket in the Santa Clara River and installation of stream bank protection for the new bridge.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

Yes. Prior to execution of the Letter of Agreement, DPW requested a scope revision in June 2013 to exclude widening between Turnberry Lane and Henry Mayo Drive, bank protection installation north of the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts and the Valencia Water Reclamation Plant, extension of an existing drainage culvert, and realignment of The Old Road and Henry Mayo Drive intersection. Metro approved the request and subsequently excluded the aforementioned items from the Letter of Agreement scope of work.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

Project is in the PAED phase. Preliminary structure plans for the bridge over the Santa Clara River Bridge were prepared and vertical and horizontal roadway alignments have been established.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

Project is not in ROW acquisition phase.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

The project is funded with a combination of Highway Bridge Program, Surface Transportation Program-Local and local County transportation funds.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

Environmental issues regarding working in the river and protected species have delayed the project. The Supreme Court of California recently overturned an environmental impact report related to a Newhall Ranch development, with one of the issues being the mitigation measures regarding the endangered Unarmored Threespine Stickleback fish, concluding that mitigation measures calling for capture and relocation of the stickleback, a fully protected species under Fish and Game Code section 5515, subdivision (b)(9), constitutes a taking prohibited under that same statute. The Court decision affects design and construction methods for this project as similar mitigation was proposed for it.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

DPW is in negotiation with the regulatory agencies on a solution for the bridge replacement.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>September 2013</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>October 2011</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Stage</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>April 2017</td>
<td>September 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>February 2021</td>
<td>June 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>September 2021</td>
<td>September 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
May 4, 2016 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: F7500
Project Sponsor: City of Lawndale
Project Title: Hawthorne Blvd Class II Bicycle Lanes
Call Awarded Year: 2013

Time Extension Request: One year
Date of last TAC appeal: N/A

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

The Hawthorne Boulevard Class II Bicycle Lanes (Project) consists of the design and construction of 1.0 mile, each direction, of Class II bike lane(s) along Hawthorne Boulevard. The bicycle lanes will share the existing roadway between the number three lane and the parking lane. This Project includes 20 bike racks along the sidewalks and parking areas serving destinations and bus stops. This project supports the bikeway expansion identified through the South Bay Bicycle Master Plan, which includes implementation of bike lanes on Hawthorne Blvd.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

None.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

N/A.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

N/A.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

Yes, it is financially viable.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

City received the MOU from Metro on or about April 20, 2016. The MOU is going through our Legal Department for City Council to execute the agreement on or around May 16, 2016.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

Once the MOU is fully executed by Metro and City, delays are not anticipated.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>N/A (Categorically Exempt)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>10/2016</td>
<td>12/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>01/2017</td>
<td>06/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>09/2017</td>
<td>02/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>03/2018</td>
<td>08/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
May 4, 2016 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: F3112  Time Extension Request: One year
Project Sponsor: CITY OF LAWNDALE  Date of last TAC appeal: May 2015
Project Title: INGLEWOOD AVENUE CORRIDOR WIDENING
Call Awarded Year:

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

This project is for traffic improvements along the Inglewood Avenue Corridor aimed at improving traffic flow and capacity in the city of Lawndale including:

- Inglewood Avenue between Rosecrans and Marine Avenues for the roadway widening along the west side of Inglewood Avenue to accommodate a dedicated third lane.

The roadway capacity addition, as well as modification to the signal systems, will improve traffic operations and flow on this busy corridor.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

Design alternatives have been submitted to Metro for consideration and approval. Proposed scoping changes are aimed to be a more economical and effective option that satisfies the original intent of the scope initially conceived.

The scoping changes are due to inability to acquire the required aerial easements for the relocation of SCE’s overhead transmission lines – precluding the development of a new #3 Southbound Lane from Rosecrans to Marine Avenue.

Proposed scope changes include:

1. Major design features being proposed on Inglewood between Rosecrans and Marine Avenues include:
   i. Introduce a southbound 3rd travel after 147th Street and approximately 200' passed the High School’s first driveway entrance aligned with and connecting with the existing southbound #3 travel lane on the southerly side of Marine.
   ii. Introduce a new right-turn only lane about 250' north of Marine Ave. About 100' will be in front of El Tarasco and the remainder in front of the High School. The design will maintain a 10' wide sidewalk from Marine Ave to the school’s sidewalk entrance.
   iii. Reduce the proposed 6-foot wide center median between 149th and Marine to 4-feet
   iv. Continue to construct center medians where possible between 147th and Rosecrans
   v. Synchronize traffic signals along the Inglewood corridor from Rosecrans to Manhattan Beach Boulevard
   vi. Provide median left-turn lane into Lawndale High School, coordinate left-turn traffic movements with traffic synchronization along the Inglewood Avenue corridor

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

- The project has experienced extensive delay in our attempts to acquire the necessary right-of-way. However the City has now received confirmation from one of the three property corners at

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
     2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Inglewood and Marine to acquiesce the needed right-of-way for the construction a right-turn pocket and relocation of overhead electrical facilities. The City is currently working with the Centinela Valley Union High School District and is proceeding to acquire a Notice of Intent to grant an easement from the School Board at its May 10, 2016 meeting. Adoption of resolution to approve the easements is scheduled for June 2016.

- Golden State Water has completed its relocation of their water main that was in conflict with the relocation of SCE’s utility poles.
- The City has been meeting with SCE regarding project updates. SCE will begin design of the relocation of facilities upon receipt of the City’s base maps showing final design along the Inglewood Avenue corridor and grant of easement by the School District. The revised change in scope will significantly reduce the scope of work by SCE. However, SCE cannot begin design of relocation of facilities until the City-retained engineering consultant (Consultant) has completed the changes to the Inglewood Avenue Project. Changes cannot begin until the revised scope is approved by Metro.

- The City has acquired the services of a transportation planner/traffic engineer to evaluate current intersection LOS and to develop a traffic model to review the proposed scope alternatives for justification, feasibility, and effectiveness.
- City Staff will need to amend the contract agreement with the current engineering Consultant to revise the project plans to reflect the change in scope. Staff will need to submit a "Public Interest Form" to Caltrans formalizing the added work and change in Consultant.
- The City’s current engineering Consultant (Ghalbi and Associates) was hired via an RFP process to design the SBCCOG's Measure R funded portion of the project - the South Bay Measure R Highway Program Funding Agreement MR312.15 - Inglewood Avenue Widening Project from 156th Street to SB I-405 Freeway On-Ramp. Huitt-Zollars, the original engineering consultant to the Inglewood Avenue Project, was terminated for non-responsiveness. Ghalbi has been assisting Staff in drafting concept plans to support the Staff’s recommended changes in scope to Metro. Therefore, City Staff will need to amend the contract agreement with the current engineering consultant to revise the project plans to reflect the approved change in scope. Staff will need to submit a "Public Interest Form" to Caltrans formalizing the added work and change in Consultant, since portions of the Inglewood project are federally funded.
- As an fyi, City Staff is requesting that the SBCCOG/Metro to suspend the Southbound I-405 On-Ramp Project until a resolution from Metro is received approving changes/modification to the scope of work for the other phases of the Inglewood Avenue Widening project. A letter from the City Manager was prepared and submitted to Metro/SBCCOG on April 18 for review and recommendation by the SBCCOG Steering Committee on May 18, 2016 for final approval by the SBCCOG Board of Directors on June 23, 2016.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

The City has completed the assessment and appraisal report for the one property located at the Northwest corner of Inglewood and Marine per CFP #f1198. The City is currently working with the Centinela Valley Union High School District to acquire approval to acquire the needed easements for the construction of the right-turn pocket and relocation of overhead utilities. Further, progress of final R/W acquisition will resume upon Metro’s approval of the scope changes.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
   2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

Yes, the project is still financially viable.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

Delays to the project have consisted of both external and internal delays. External delays include extensive delays encountered during the process of working to acquire the necessary right-of-way; coordinating efforts with the numerous property owners. However, a significant amount of delay can be attributed to internal delays consisting of the City's loss of the Public Works Director/City Engineer and the City's limited staff resources. The City has hired a new and permanent Director/City Engineer in October 2015. Since then, the City's engineering department’s priority has been to maintain focus on the project, to address the project’s challenges and to find economical and engineering viable solutions to the various setbacks encountered while striving to meet the project intent.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

The City has identified the project’s challenges and has therefore submitted a request for revisions to the project scope for Metro’s consideration and approval. At this time, Staff believes it has determined and identified all project milestones as described above. The City has already initiated a traffic analysis/modeling study for the purposes of providing a recommendation of the City's re-scoped improvement options for effectiveness. Following approval of the scope changes, the City is poised to manage the project towards completion.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>01/2012</td>
<td>05/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>07/2011</td>
<td>04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>07/2012</td>
<td>10/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>01/2017</td>
<td>07/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>08/2017</td>
<td>12/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
May 4, 2016 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: F1198                             Time Extension Request: One year
Project Sponsor: CITY OF LAWNDALE                  Date of last TAC appeal: May 2015
Project Title: INGLEWOOD AVENUE CORRIDOR WIDENING
Call Awarded Year:

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

This project is for traffic improvements along the Inglewood Avenue Corridor aimed at improving traffic
flow and capacity in the city of Lawndale including:

- Inglewood Avenue between Manhattan Beach Blvd and 154th Street for the roadway widening
  along the east side of Inglewood Avenue to accommodate a dedicated third lane to the I-405
  freeway access ramp;
- Inglewood Avenue at Marine Avenue for roadway widening at the intersection corners to
  accommodate three dedicated right turn lane pockets; and
- Inglewood Avenue between Rosecrans and Marine Avenues for the roadway widening along the
  west side of Inglewood Avenue to accommodate a dedicated third lane.

The roadway capacity addition, as well as modification to the signal systems, will improve traffic
operations and flow on this busy corridor.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes,
please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

Design alternatives have been submitted to Metro for consideration and approval. Proposed scoping
changes are aimed to be a more economical and effective option that satisfies the original intent of the
scope initially conceived.

The scoping changes are due to inability to acquire the required Right-of-Way from; 1) two of the three
corner properties at Inglewood and Marine – precluding two of the three right turn pockets; 2)
property adjacent to the Northeast corner of Manhattan Beach Boulevard and Inglewood Avenue –
precluding the development of a new #3 Northbound lane; 3) and aerial easements for the relocation
of SCE's overhead transmission lines – precluding the development of a new #3 Southbound Lane from
Rosecrans to Marine Avenue.

Proposed scope changes include:

1. Major design features being proposed on Inglewood between Marine and Rosecrans include:
   i. Introduce a southbound 3rd travel passed 147th Street and approximately 200' passed the
      High School's first driveway entrance
   ii. Introduce a new right-turn only lane about 250' north of Marine Ave. About 100' will
       be in front of El Tarasco and the remainder in front of the High School. The design
       will maintain a 10' wide sidewalk from Marine Ave to the school’s sidewalk entrance
   iii. Introduce a pedestrian-phase only at Marine-Inglewood traffic signal
   iv. Reduce the proposed 6-foot wide center median between 149th and Marine to 4-feet
   v. Continue to construct center medians where possible between 147th and Rosecrans
   vi. Allow double right-turns from Eastbound Marine Ave to Southbound Inglewood Ave
   vii. Enlarge the curb returns at all four corners at Marine-Inglewood (accommodate the
        queuing of pedestrians)

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
ii. Introduce a northbound 3rd travel lane beginning at about 200' south of the railroad tracks, reconstruct driveway entrances to provide easier/smöother vehicle ingress & egress into the new #3 drive lane

iii. Improve pedestrian accessibility along Inglewood

iv. Synchronize traffic signals at Manhattan Beach-Inglewood

v. Relocate transit stops along MBB to opposite sides of the intersection – reduce traffic congestion

vi. Modify traffic signal operations at the southbound 405-freeway off-ramp and Inglewood to maintain continuous traffic flow for the new northbound #3-lane & Improve lane directional signage approaching the 405-Freeway (both sides of the freeway)

vii. Modify the southbound 405-Freeway on-ramp to coordinate with proposed changes along Inglewood

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

- The project has experienced extensive delay in our attempts to acquire the necessary right-of-way. However, the City has now received confirmation from one of the three property corners at Inglewood and Marine to acquiesce the needed right-of-way for the construction a right-turn pocket and relocation of overhead electrical facilities. The City is currently working with the Centinela Valley Union High School District and is proceeding to acquire a Notice of Intent to grant an easement from the School Board at its May 10, 2016 meeting. Adoption of resolution to approve the easements is scheduled for June 2016.

- Golden State Water has completed its relocation of their water main that was in conflict with the relocation of SCE’s utility poles.

- The City has been meeting with SCE regarding project updates. SCE will begin design of the relocation of facilities upon receipt of the City’s base maps showing final design along the Inglewood Avenue corridor and grant of easement by the School District. The revised change in scope will significantly reduce the scope of work by SCE. However, SCE cannot begin design of relocation of facilities until the City-retained engineering consultant (Consultant) has completed the changes to the Inglewood Avenue Project. Changes cannot begin until the revised scope is approved by Metro.

- The City has acquired the services of a transportation planner/traffic engineer to evaluate current intersection LOS and to develop a traffic model to review the proposed scope alternatives for justification, feasibility, and effectiveness.
• City Staff will need to amend the contract agreement with the current engineering Consultant to revise the project plans to reflect the change in scope. Staff will need to submit a "Public Interest Form" to Caltrans formalizing the added work and change in Consultant.

• The City’s current engineering Consultant (Ghalbi and Associates) was hired via an RFP process to design the SBCCOG’s Measure R funded portion of the project - the South Bay Measure R Highway Program Funding Agreement MR312.15 - Inglewood Avenue Widening Project from 156th Street to SB I-405 Freeway On-Ramp. Huitt-Zollars, the original engineering consultant to the Inglewood Avenue Project, was terminated for non-responsiveness. Ghalbi has been assisting Staff in drafting concept plans to support the Staff’s recommended changes in scope to Metro. Therefore, City Staff will need to amend the contract agreement with the current engineering consultant to revise the project plans to reflect the approved change in scope. Staff will need to submit a "Public Interest Form" to Caltrans formalizing the added work and change in Consultant, since portions of the Inglewood project are federally funded.

• City Staff is requesting that the SBCCOG/Metro to suspend the Southbound I-405 On-Ramp Project until a resolution from Metro is received approving changes/modification to the scope of work for the other phases of the Inglewood Avenue Widening project. A letter from the City Manager was prepared and submitted to Metro/SBCCOG on April 18 for review and recommendation by the SBCCOG Steering Committee on May 18, 2016 for final approval by the SBCCOG Board of Directors on June 23, 2016.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

The City has completed the assessment and appraisal report for the one property located at the Northwest corner of Inglewood and Marine. The City is currently working with the Centinela Valley Union High School District to acquire approval to acquire the needed easements for the construction of the right-turn pocket and relocation of overhead utilities. Further, progress of final R/W acquisition will resume upon Metro’s approval of the scope changes.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

Yes, the project is still financially viable.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

Delays to the project have consisted of both external and internal delays. External delays include extensive delays encountered during the process of working to acquire the necessary right-of-way; coordinating efforts with the numerous property owners. However, a significant amount of delay can be attributed to internal delays consisting of the City’s loss of the Public Works Director/City Engineer and the City’s limited staff resources. The City has hired a new and permanent Director/City Engineer in October 2015. Since then, the City’s engineering department’s priority has been to maintain focus on the project, to address the project’s challenges and to find economical and engineering viable solutions to the various setbacks encountered while striving to meet the project intent.
Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

The City has identified the project’s challenges and has therefore submitted a request for revisions to the project scope for Metro’s consideration and approval. At this time, Staff believes it has determined and identified all project milestones as described above. The City has already initiated a traffic analysis/modeling study for the purposes of providing a recommendation of the City’s re-scoped improvement options for effectiveness. Following approval of the scope changes, the City is poised to manage the project towards completion.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>01/2012</td>
<td>05/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>07/2011</td>
<td>04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>07/2012</td>
<td>10/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>01/2017</td>
<td>07/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>08/2017</td>
<td>12/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>