Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

William Mulholland Conference Room – 15th floor

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

2. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees
   
   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

3. Chairperson's Report
   
   • June Board Recap (Handout) (Fanny Pan)

4. Consent Calendar
   
   • Approval of Minutes
   Attachment 3: Draft June 1, 2016 Minutes

5. Metro Transfer Point Design Criteria
   
   Attachment 4: Transfers Design Study (Georgia Sheridan)
   10 min

6. Potential Ballot Measure Update
   
   15 min (Wil Ridder)

7. Call for Projects Management
   
   10 min (Fanny Pan)

8. Future Call for Projects Restructuring
   
   60 min (TAC)
   *Please be prepared for discussion*

9. Other Business
10. Adjournment

TAC Minutes and Agendas can be accessed at: 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 August 3, 2016 at 9:30 a.m. in the William Mulholland Conference Room.
Attachment 1

Subcommittee Agendas
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

REVISED

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

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

2. Approval of May 17, 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 Update  (10 minutes)  
   Information  
   Arianna Valle/Adam Stephenson

6. 2017 Call for Projects Update  (10 minutes)  
   Information  
   Brad McAllester

7. Potential Ballot Measure  (10 minutes)  
   Information  
   Jody Feerst Litvak

8. Universal College Student Transit Pass (U-Pass)  (10 minutes)  
   Information  
   Devon Deming

9. Taptogo.net Q1 Review  (10 minutes)  
   Information  
   Kyle Holland/Natalie Glasman

10. Access Update  (10 minutes)  
    Information  
    Matthew Avancena
11. Legislative Report
   (10 minutes)
   Information
   Raffi Hamparian/Marisa Yeager
   Michael Turner

12. Transit Industry Debriefing/Updates
    (5 minutes)
    Information
    All

13. New Business
    Information
    All

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

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, July 19, 2016, at 9:30 am in the Mulholland Conference Room, 15th Floor of the Metro Headquarters Building.
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE

Call in (213) 922-4930
In house call ext. 24930

1. Call to Order
   Action
   Sebastian Hernandez, Chair

2. Approval of Minutes
   Action
   Sebastian Hernandez, Chair

3. Transfers Design Study - (email attachment)
   Information
   Georgia Sheridan, Metro

4. New Business, Date of Next LTSS Meeting
   Sebastian Hernandez, Chair
Thursday, June 16, 2016 9:30 a.m.

Agenda

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

**Mulholland Conference Room, 15th Floor**

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

2. Approval of Minutes
   
   Action *(Subcommittee)*
   
   Attachment 1: May 19, 2016 Minutes
   
   Attachment 2: Sign-in Sheet/Attendance Sheet
   
   Attachment 3: 90-Day Rolling Agenda

3. Chair Report
   
   Information *(Bahman Janka)*
   
   5 min

4. Metro Report
   
   Information *(Fulgene Asuncion)*
   
   - CTC Update (Handout)
   
   5 min

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

6. Call for Projects
   
   Information *(Brad McAllester)*
   
   15 min

7. Potential Ballot Measure Update
   
   Information *(Mark Linsenmayer)*
   
   20 min

8. Link Union Station
   
   Information *(Vincent Chio)*
   
   20 min
9. Active Transportation Strategic Plan
   Information (Katie Lemmon)
   10 min

10. ATP Cycle 3 Update
    Information (Shelly Quan)
    10 min

11. State and Federal Legislative Update
    Information (Raffi Hamparian/Michael Turner)
    10 min

12. New Business
    5 min

13. Adjournment
    1 min

The next meeting for the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee will be held on July 21st 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

June 2016

Bus Operations Subcommittee:

- Approved the May 17, 2016 meeting minutes.

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:

- Approved the April 21, 2016 meeting minutes.

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:

- Approved the May 19, 2016 meeting minutes.

TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee:

- Did not meet in June 2016.
Attachment 3

Draft June 1, 2016 Minutes

June 1, 2016 Sign-In Sheets
1. Call to Order/Roll Call
Brian Lam (Alternate Chair) called the meeting to order at 9:36 A.M., took roll and declared a quorum was present.

2. Office of Extraordinary Innovation (OEI) (Joshua Schank, Metro)
Mr. Schank introduced himself and noted that he previously worked in Washington DC as President and CEO of the Eno Center for Transportation. Prior to that, he worked in Washington DC in transportation policy for both the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) and as Transportation Policy Advisor for Senator Clinton. Mr. Schank reported that the OEI was formed by CEO Phil Washington to bring best practices in transportation from around the world to Los Angeles County. The OEI has two specific tasks: (1) to create Public Private Partnerships (P3) between Metro and private sector innovators, and (2) to develop a Strategic Plan for Metro.

P3 has been of great interest to Metro for their potential of accelerating the development and construction of our transportation infrastructure. To help incentivize P3s, OEI has implemented a new Unsolicited Proposal process that is intended to encourage the private sector to approach Metro with their ideas about how to build and accelerate construction projects and with new ideas and technologies that can improve the current operation of Metro’s system. Mr. Schank noted that the Unsolicited Proposal process has been working well and over a dozen unsolicited proposals have been submitted so far. An example is the two week pilot partnership with Uber around the new Expo Line Phase 2 stations. Metro promoted Uber service in exchange for Uber providing discounts on fares to and from the new Expo Line Phase 2 stations. Mr. Schank reported that staff is also expecting to receive unsolicited proposals on large infrastructure projects such as the Sepulveda Pass and High Desert Corridor.

Mike Behen (League of California Cities – North Los Angeles County) asked if staff could disclose which private sector companies have been interested in the High Desert Corridor? Mr. Schank replied that he is not allowed to disclose which companies at the moment, but noted that they are large, well known firms.
Mr. Schank explained that Strategic Planning is another function of the OEI. Many different departments have their own individual Strategic Plans, but OEI will be developing an all-encompassing Strategic Plan for the organization in order to help break down silos between departments and work towards a common goal. The Strategic Plan will have over-arching missions, goals, and visions for Metro that will be developed with departments within Metro and with the outside community as a whole. Staff will be doing extensive outreach to solicit ideas and feedback for the Strategic Plan. The development of the Strategic Plan will be a public and transparent process that will continue after the Plan is finished to ensure that the agency is accomplishing the goals set forth in the Plan.

Jane Leonard (BOS) thanked Mr. Schank for including the Municipal Bus Operators in the development of the Strategic Plan. Mr. Schank emphasized that a main goal of Metro is to provide better mobility for Los Angeles County, regardless of the operator. Partnering with local municipalities is critical to the County’s success. Ms. Leonard asked how Metro ensures that there is a competitive process for projects submitted through the Unsolicited Proposal process? Mr. Schank replied it is highly unlikely that there would be an unsolicited proposal that did not eventually result in a competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) process. He noted that the two-week Uber partnership was unique because of the time constraint of the Expo Line Phase 2 opening schedule. Unsolicited proposals would typically go through a competitive RFP process, unless there is a compelling reason why it would be a sole source agreement (i.e., if the proposal was for technology that a company has a patent that no other company can use).

Ellen Blackman (Citizen Representative on ADA) asked if the partnership with Uber had discussions about providing transportation for people with disabilities? Mr. Schank replied that Uber claims that they are able to accommodate passengers with disabilities by requesting specific Uber vehicles. One of the things that Metro has been looking at extensively is how to partner with Transportation Network Companies (TNC), such as Uber or Lyft, in a way that is effective for all passengers.

Perri Goodman (LTSS) noted that the Metro organizational structure is confusing and asked if there is an organizational chart that is available to the public? Mr. Schank replied that the organizational structure has changed significantly during the transition to a new CEO, and things will likely change more after the Strategic Plan is completed. Part of what the Strategic Plan is trying to accomplish will be to create a better understanding of the organizational structure of the agency and eliminate silos between departments.

Larry Stevens (League of California Cities – San Gabriel Valley COG) requested that the Strategic Plan consider how new technologies and opportunities relate to the construction of transit facilities. For example, there may be opportunities to reduce parking in anticipation of greater use of TNCs. Mr. Schank agreed and acknowledged Mr. Steven’s request. He noted that the Metro Board has made first/last mile connections a strong priority that is critical to Metro’s success. Mr. Stevens added that the most cost effective way to do that is to build those types of facilities at the time projects are built as opposed until waiting until after the fact. Mr. Schank agreed.
Mr. Stevens requested that the Strategic Plan be aware of the inherent conflicts between goals set forth by laws. He specifically noted the conflict between the goals of SB 375 and Congestion Management requirements. Mr. Schank agreed. He noted that he does not believe congestion reduction is a worthy goal of any transportation agency. He explained that a better goal is to improve mobility and access across all modes for all users. Travel time reliability would be a better metric than congestion.

David Feinberg (League of California Cities – Westside Cities COG) noted that the Big Blue Bus has had coordination issues over the last three years trying to work with the Expo Line Construction Authority and City of Los Angeles. Mr. Schank replied that there is not a lack of good ideas that prevents things from getting accomplished, but rather challenging obstacles to overcome. He noted that the advantage of the OEI is that they are mandated from the Board and CEO to work to overcome those obstacles.

Linda Evans (LTSS) asked whether Metro required Uber to obtain permits during the two week pilot program? Mr. Schank replied no.

David Kriske (League of California Cities – Arroyo Verdugo Cities) requested that the Strategic Plan consider more coordination with the California High Speed Rail Authority. Mr. Schank replied that High Speed Rail will definitely be in the Strategic Plan.

3. Call for Projects (Therese McMillan, Metro)
Ms. McMillan noted that this is an ideal time to consider potential revisions to the existing Call for Projects (Call) structure since the Potential Ballot Measure (PBM) decision is coming in November, should the Board elect to put it on the ballot. The basic objective of the Call revision is to have a greater shared project evaluation and selection process between Metro and the jurisdictions. Ms. McMillan noted that there was a very similar local/regional partnership program that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in the San Francisco Bay Area implemented which she believes is a good starting point to revise the Call process from. She explained that under current federal rules, federal dollars cannot be directly subvented based on a predetermined formula. However, a competitive needs based evaluation process can be used to subvent federal funds. For example, Metro and the COGs/Subregions could determine how the federal funds are distributed to each region, and then the COGs/Subregions would develop a competitive needs based evaluation process that would determine how the funds would be awarded to the projects within their member agencies.

Ms. McMillan explained that the only way this process worked in the San Francisco Bay Area was that the COGs/Subregions must unanimously agree on the subregional target funding levels. If the decision is not unanimous, decisions end up having to be vetted and the entire process collapses. Another critical piece of the revised Call process is a significant timely use of funds requirement. The Call is a project delivery program and funds are not meant to sit unused for extended periods of time. Ms. McMillan noted that in the San Francisco Bay Area, it was recognized that some areas lacked the technical capacity to effectively develop and implement a competitive decision making process. In those cases, the MTC would allow a percentage to be taken off the top of the COG/Subregional funding target in order to provide technical assistance and administration.
Ms. McMillan noted that staff has not made any decisions regarding this revised Call framework, but she would like to have a revised Call schedule to align with the LRTP update. She explained that staff can begin working with the COGs/Subregions and TAC this summer to work through the details on the revised Call process.

Mr. Stevens asked which groups has staff met with regarding the revised Call structure? Ms. McMillan clarified that staff has only been having internal discussions. Mr. Stevens noted that in order to achieve consensus for a more regionalized Call process, it is important to have a very broad outreach effort. The COGs/Subregions should ensure that all their members participate to achieve consensus. He added that the nine COGs/Subregions are all very different and have different technical capabilities. Ms. McMillan reiterated a few key points. In the San Francisco Bay Area, MTC negotiated with the counties on what the regional split would be. All the counties agreed to subvent the funds based on population of the counties. Then within the amount each county got, they were in charge of developing their needs based competitive process. How they chose to conduct the needs based assessment was up to the counties, and each county’s method varied. MTC realized that one size would not fit all with each county. Those same sensitivities translate to Los Angeles County and the nine Subregions.

Mr. Behen noted that the idea sounds great and utopic, but a consensus seems difficult to achieve. He asked how the Bay Area resolved issues in order to reach consensus on the distribution of funds? Ms. McMillan replied that if the Bay Area counties could not reach consensus, the funds went back to MTC. That was a big motivator for the Bay Area counties. Ms. McMillan explained that in initial discussions, San Francisco wanted the funds distributed based on population density, while Santa Clara wanted it based on number of lane miles. Each county came to initial discussions with the one parameter that would benefit them the most. After discussions, they realized that was not going to be something that could be worked out. Discussions continued until the point that basically the middle ground was agreed upon. It comes down to whether or not the COGs/Subregions will be able to come up with a position that moves the ball forward. If not, the Call process stays the same. Ms. McMillan noted that this summer staff can begin developing working groups with the COGs/Subregions/TAC to discuss key factors for the revised Call process.

Dan Mitchell (City of Los Angeles) noted that a significant difference between the Bay Area framework and the Los Angeles region is that the City and County of Los Angeles span multiple Subregions. Ms. McMillan replied that that is the kind of thing we will have to discuss and work through.

Brad McAllester (Metro) noted that the revised Call framework is currently at a very high level of detail. As we move forward, the COGs/Subregions will need to figure out how they want to proceed.

Mohammad Mostahkami (League of California Cities – Gateway Cities COG) expressed interest in Metro remaining an impartial application evaluator in the revised Call process. He noted that the Gateway Cities COG is very interested in beginning discussions on the revised Call framework.
Mr. Mitchell requested that the revised Call process be agendized for a future TAC meeting so that the COGs/Subregions can deliberate.

Ted Semaan (League of California Cities – South Bay Cities COG) asked what are the next steps? Mr. McAllester replied that there have been meetings with the COGs/Subregions Executive Directors on the Potential Ballot Measure and the revised Call process has come up as an agenda item at those meetings. The COGs/Subregions Executive Directors have been briefed on the general framework that Ms. McMillan discussed today. Staff can agendize this item for the July 6, 2016 meeting so that we can begin working out the framework as soon as possible. Mr. Semaan requested that discussions with the COGs/Subregions begin as soon as possible. Renee Berlin (Metro) replied that at the last COGs/Subregions Executive Directors meeting on the PBM, Jacki Bacharach (South Bay Cities COG) specifically said that she would like to hear from the COG’s TAC representative. Each of the COGs/Subregions Executive Directors had their own points of view and are looking to their TAC representatives to provide them some guidance.

Mr. Stevens cautioned not to rely completely on the COGs/Subregionals coordinators on how to restructure the Call. He noted that they may not have much direct experience with the Call process. The cities/TAC know where pitfalls are in the current process and how improvements can be made.

John Walker (County of Los Angeles) stated that the Mobility Matrix process wherein Metro guided the COGs/Subregions through the process of prioritizing their needs was a good precursor to this proposed Call restructuring process, and may be a good model from which to initiate discussions.

Pat Proano (County of Los Angeles) asked the origin of revising the Call process? Heather Hills (Metro) replied that the Board made a motion in October 2014 that staff revise the Call process and examine the possibility of using a subregional subvention formula. The Motion also directed staff to solicit an assessment of both the strengths and weaknesses of the current Call process from cities, COGs, and other stakeholders. Mr. Proano requested that staff put together background information on the proposed Call restructuring to help new TAC members better understand the evolution of the Call restructuring request. (Staff sent the background information to the TAC members on June 8, 2016.)

Ms. Pan noted that the Metro Board will be dark this July so the July 6th TAC meeting can focus on discussing the restructured Call process.

4. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees

Bus Operations Subcommittee (BOS)
- Last met on May 17, 2016
- Approved the FAP Funding Marks
- Received updates on:
  - FTA
  - Metro FY 17 Budget
- Metro All Door Boarding Study
- Transportation Security by the Transportation Security Administration (TSA)
- Metro Transfer Design Study
- Access Services
- Next meeting is scheduled for June 21, 2016

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee (LTSS)
- Did not meet in May
- Next tentatively scheduled meeting is June 16, 2016

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee
- Last met on May 19, 2016
- Received updates on:
  - Union Station Master Plan
  - Metro Transfer Design Study
  - Metro FY 17 Budget
  - Arterial Performance Measurement Framework
  - Caltrans Dynamic Corridor Congestion Management (DCCM)
- Next meeting is scheduled for June 16, 2016

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Sustainability Subcommittee
- Last met on May 18, 2016
- Received updates on:
  - Expo Line Phase 2
  - Federal Earmark Repurposing
  - Active Transportation Strategic Plan
  - Metro Open Streets Grant Program
  - Bikeshare
- Next meeting is tentatively scheduled for June 2016

5. Chairperson’s Report (Fanny Pan, Metro)
Handouts of the May 26, 2016 Metro Board meeting recap and May 18, 2016 CTC meeting were distributed in lieu of oral reports.

Ms. Pan announced that there are two new TAC members: Perri Goodman (City of West Hollywood) is an alternate member representing LTSS, and Jason Smisko (City of Santa Clarita) is a primary member representing the League of Cities - San Fernando Valley COG.

Mr. Stevens commented on the May 26, 2016 Board action on the Active Transportation Strategic Plan (ATSP). He noted that the motion says that First/Last Mile improvements should be started as early as the Purple Line Extension Section 2, which is very early on. This is much earlier than what TAC had recommended in their motion at the March 2016 meeting. Mr. Stevens commented that this shows that sometimes it’s okay for TAC to make bold recommendations and stir the pot to try and get positive things accomplished.
Ms. Pan announced that during the TAC Call Recertification/Deobligation process in May, TAC recommended that several projects have until May 18th to provide staff with any outstanding items. All project sponsors met the deadline; however, some of the scope changes are beyond staff’s administrative authority and will require Board approval. Staff will include those proposed scope changes in the TAC Annual Recertification/Deobligation Board Report in August.

6. Consent Calendar
A motion to approve the May 4, 2016 TAC minutes was made by Mr. Stevens and seconded by Ms. Leonard. Mr. Mitchell abstained. The minutes were approved.

7. FY 17 Transit Fund Allocation (Carlos Vendiola, Metro)
Mr. Vendiola reported on the FY 17 Transit Fund Allocation. The methodology used in the development of the report complies with state, federal, local laws, and Metro Board policies and regulations. BOS and LTSS have approved the proposed FY 17 Transit Fund Allocations at their May 2016 meetings.

Motion
Mohammad Mostahkami (League of California Cities – Gateway Cities COG) made a motion to approve the FY 17 Transit Fund Allocation. David Feinberg (League of California Cities – Westside Cities COG) seconded the motion. The motion was approved with no objections.

8. Potential Ballot Measure Update (Wil Ridder, Metro)
No update was provided due to schedule conflicts. The Potential Ballot Measure update presentation was shared with TAC and is available online at [http://theplan.metro.net/](http://theplan.metro.net/).

9. Repurposing Older Federal Earmarks (Steven Mateer, Metro)
Mr. Mateer reported that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Caltrans have been working to repurpose Federal Earmarks that are at least a decade old. Metro staff has been working with the cities on repurposing the earmarks that are within each jurisdiction. The Board approved the Metro Earmark Exchange Program on May 26th, which will take earmarked funds and return local funds to the jurisdictions, less a 3% administration fee. The exchange program is voluntary, but cities must opt out of the program. Staff requires a letter by June 30, 2016 either opting out or telling staff how the jurisdiction would like to repurpose the earmarks. If staff does not receive a letter by June 30th, the jurisdiction will be automatically opted in and Metro will exchange the earmark.

Mr. Mostahkami thanked Metro for having the exchange program.

Mr. Kriske asked whether eligible repurposed projects can be anything that Prop C is eligible for? Mr. Mateer replied yes.

Mr. Walker asked if the jurisdiction can opt out of some projects, but exchange others? Mr. Mateer replied yes, please delineate in the letter for which projects the jurisdiction would like to opt out of and which they would like to repurpose. Mr. Mateer added that there is also a third option: a jurisdiction can opt out of the Metro exchange program and repurpose the funds themselves; however, Metro staff must know the jurisdiction’s intentions by June 30th.
Kevin Minne (City of Los Angeles) asked if there will be a local match requirement? Mr. Mateer replied no.

Mr. Mostahkami asked who would jurisdictions work with to repurpose their federal earmarks if they opt out of the exchange program? Mr. Mateer replied that the jurisdiction would need to work with Caltrans. Mr. Mostahkami asked when money will be available to cities if the funds are exchanged in Metro’s exchange program? Mr. Mateer replied September 2016 is probably the earliest funds will be available.

10. Metrolink Annual Work Program/Budget (Yvette Reeves, Metro)
Ms. Reeves reported on the various funding sources for Metrolink, such as Prop C 10% which generates $72 million per year and Measure R 3% which generates $25-26 million per year. Metro is the majority member of the Metrolink Joint Powers Authority (JPA), so it is responsible for 51% of Metrolink funding. The other JPA members include: Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG), and Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC). Ms. Reeves reported that Metrolink carries about 42,000 passengers per day throughout the five member counties and the majority of the rides end in Los Angeles County.

Ms. Reeves reported that there was not a significant difference between the Operating Budget from FY 15-16 and FY 16-17. There are some cost increases for FY 16-17. A full year of service for the 91/Perris Valley Line Extension will have a cost increase of $2.6 million and is expecting about 4,000 passengers per day. Rolling stock parts cost will increase by $4.3 million; increased mechanical costs will increase $2.4 million; increased administrative salaries and related fringe will increase $3.4 million, decreased operations and maintenance-of-way (MOW) costs will result in a credit $8.1 million; and decreased insurance costs will result in a $1.3 million credit. The total net cost increases for FY 16-17 total approximately $3.3 million.

Ms. Reeves outlined Metro’s subsidy of Metrolink. Operations received $71.9 million; Rehabilitation/Renovation $10 million; AVL Fare Reduction & Enforcement $2.4 million; Rotem Reimbursement $1.5 million; ROW Security $2.4 million; and Capital Projects (PSRs) $0.6 million.

Mr. Stevens asked if the Lone Hill to White Double Track project is budgeted only for design and environmental this year, or if construction is included? Ms. Reeves replied that it is only budgeted for environmental.

Mr. Stevens stated that there have been a number of issues identified on the San Bernardino Line associated with noise from BNSF trains which has resulted in numerous complaints from the community. He hopes that Metrolink will offer something to address the issue at the community meeting with the San Gabriel Valley COG. Ms. Reeves replied that BNSF’s lease on the property is expiring in six months and that Metro Board is very adamant on not renewing the lease. Mr. Stevens replied that other solutions also need to be considered.
11. Legislative Update (Raffi Hamparian, Metro)
Federal
Mr. Hamparian provided an update on the appropriations and authorizations from the Federal Government. He reported on grant authorizations provided from the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. The four major grants pending are the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER), Fostering Advancements in Shipping and Transportation for the Long-term Achievement of National Efficiencies (FASTLANE), Bus and Bus Facilities, and Low or No Emissions Grant Programs.

Mr. Hamparian reported that the Senate and House of Representatives have both passed different forms of Appropriations bills. Metro’s New Starts projects are funded in full: $100 million for the Purple Line Extension Phase 1, $100 million for the Purple Line Extension Phase 2, and $100 million for the Regional Connector. The Freight Grant Program remains at $1.5 billion per year, $800 million in the FASTLANE program that goes directly to transportation entities, and approximately $400 million goes to the State.

Mr. Hamparian reported that Metro is currently working on the Mendoza Bill, which would expand the Metro Board to include eight new members.

(The TIGER and FASTLANE grants project fact sheets and Federal Register Notices were emailed to TAC members on June 1st.)

Adjournment
Ms. Pan adjourned the meeting and reported that the next scheduled TAC meeting is July 6, 2016 in the William Mulholland Conference Room on the 15th floor at 9:30 am. If you have questions regarding the next meeting, please contact Brian Lam at (213)922-3077 or email lamb@metro.net.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>1. Marianne Kim/Stephen Finnegan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICYCLE COORDINATOR</td>
<td>1. Rich Dilluvio/Michelle Mowery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (BOS)</td>
<td>1. Michelle Caldwell/Susan Lipman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Jane Leonard/Gloria Gallardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>1. Gary Slater/Steve Novotny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Robert So/Kelly Lamare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVE ON ADA</td>
<td>1. Ellen Blackman/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</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. Vacant/Corinne Ralph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Dan 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. Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Gateway Cities COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Las Virgenes Malibu COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. North Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. San Fernando Valley COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. South Bay Cities COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Westside Cities COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td>David Kriske/Roubik Golanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities COG</td>
<td>Mohammad Mostahkami/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes Malibu COG</td>
<td>Robert Brager/Elizabeth Shavelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Mike Behen/Allen Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
<td>Larry Stevens /Craig Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley COG</td>
<td>Jason Smisko/Wayne Ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td>Robert Beste/Ted Semaan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Cities COG</td>
<td>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>1. Sebastian Hernandez/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Justine Garcia/Linda Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (Metro)</td>
<td>1. Fanny Pan/Brian Lam Countywide Planning &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Diane Corral-Lopez/Carolyn Kreslake Metro Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDESTRIAN COORDINATOR</td>
<td>1. Valerie Watson/Dale Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Susan Price/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY (SCRRRA - Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Anne Louise Rice/Karen Sakoda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SCAQMD -- Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Eyvonne Drummonds/Kathryn Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG - Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Warren Whiteaker/Annie Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Lupe Valdez/LaDonna DiCamillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/</td>
<td>1. Vacant/Phil Aker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>2. Mark Hunter/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSICA MERRY</td>
<td>INVESTING IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN GUEVARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 4

Transfers Design Study
**Transfer Points**

**Project Goal:** Develop Recommendations to Improve Transfer Points

When using Metro transit...

Most (64%) riders make a transfer

Getting to rapid transit

91% walk, roll or bus To Rail or BRT

Only 9% Drive

Source: First/Last Mile Strategic Plan
LA County Metro & SCAG, 2013
Measure R Funded Transfer Points
12 Additional Tier 2 & 3 under construction
Coordination is Critical

To improve **transfer points** for:

- Passengers
- Operations
- Maintenance

Partnership is needed.
Transfer zone requires coordination among many parties.
Metro to provide all facilities on Metro property.
Metro provides bus stop signage within public ROW.
Jurisdiction provides all other amenities within public ROW.
Project Deliverables

- Design Recommendations to Improve Transfers at Metro Facilities
- Implementation Strategy

Final Study will be a design tool, not a mandate or requirement for funding.
Ridership levels and transfer activities differ according to type of transit stop or station within the Metro system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIER 1</th>
<th>TIER 2</th>
<th>TIER 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Bus-to-Bus</td>
<td>Bus-to-Rail</td>
<td>Rail-to-Rail + Bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Intersection</td>
<td>Site: Mid-Line Stations</td>
<td>Site: Terminus / Interchange Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property: Public Right of</td>
<td>Property: Metro-owned parcel, City-owned sidewalk</td>
<td>Property: Metro-owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way (City-owned)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Images of various transit stops and stations]
Guiding Principles

At transfer points, how can we improve:

- Efficiency
- Clarity
- Access
- Comfort
Project Timeline

Spring/Summer
- Gather Feedback from Metro Staff and TAC members
- Complete 4 Focus Groups
- Meet with City Staff

Summer/Fall
- Develop Recommendations
- Prepare & Circulate Draft Study for Review

Winter
- Finalize Study with Recommendations
- Host Workshop for Local Jurisdictions

we are here
Clarity
Real-time transit info
Pictograms
Too much signage
Better wayfinding

Access
Eliminate sidewalk clutter

Comfort
Lighting Seating
Shelters/shade
Cleaner sidewalks
Public restroom

Efficiency
Reduce pedestrian crossings (rail to bus)
Vertical pathways (Bike to rail)
Proximity (Rail to parking)

Maintenance
Durable equipment
Resources

Metro Stakeholders
30 Staff from variety of Metro departments
Focus Group Input
4 Focus Groups: Metro HQ, Pacoima, South LA

**Clarity**
- Real-time info
- Signage - Larger letters and icons

**Access**
- Bicycle amenities (lockers, racks, racks on buses)

**Comfort**
- Lighting
- Seating
- Security Presence

**Efficiency**
- Coordinated payment system between operators

**Maintenance**
- Keep spaces clean
Local Input
Provide opportunity for local agencies to review draft recommendations

Agency Neutral
Recommendations should be applicable across county
Accommodate local and Metro operators at new facilities

Funding & Implementation
Should not be held as criteria for grant funding
Should not favor urban over rural areas

Regional Real Time Transit Info
Lead effort to coordinate transit info across County

Sharing Ridership Data
Lead effort to share ridership data between transit agencies

Design Guidance Needed
Would like best practices guide for local operators.
Help Us Prioritize Improvements

Metro is developing design considerations for transfer points and would like your input. The table below provides a preliminary set of potential improvements and amenities at transfer points. Please:
1. Add (or delete) amenities and/or improvements to be included in the list, and
2. Rank the elements in their respective categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier (Type of Transfer Point)</th>
<th>Clarity</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Comfort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1: Bus-to-Bus</td>
<td>□ Metro signage</td>
<td>□ Crosswalk treatments</td>
<td>□ Street furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections (Public ROW)</td>
<td>□ Bus-to-bus transfer signage</td>
<td>□ Curb cuts</td>
<td>□ Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Real time arrival info</td>
<td>□ ADA ramps</td>
<td>□ Shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Curb height / color</td>
<td>□ Pedestrian lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Bicycle racks / lockers</td>
<td>□ Sidewalk quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2: Bus-to-Rail</td>
<td>□ Tier 1 Improvements +</td>
<td>□ Tier 1 Improvements +</td>
<td>□ Tier 1 Improvements +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-line Rail Stations (Metro Owned)</td>
<td>□ Station ID signage</td>
<td>□ Bike share</td>
<td>□ Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Bus-to-rail transfer signage</td>
<td>□ Ride share</td>
<td>□ Landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Neighborhood wayfinding</td>
<td>□ Kiss and Ride</td>
<td>□ Seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Park and Ride</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3: Rail-to-Rail and/or Bus</td>
<td>□ Tier 2 Improvements +</td>
<td>□ Tier 2 Improvements +</td>
<td>□ Tier 2 Improvements +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminus and Interchange Rail Stations</td>
<td>□ Rail-to-rail transfer signage</td>
<td>□ Car share</td>
<td>□ Adjacent retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Metro Owned)</td>
<td>□ Customer service kiosk</td>
<td>□ Bicycle hub</td>
<td>□ Transit-supportive development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(particularly with regard to Efficiency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Contact: Georgia Sheridan, Metro
sheridang@metro.net | 213.922.1259
- Design Recommendations to Improve Transfers at Metro Facilities
- Implementation Strategy