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
   5 min

3. Chairperson's Report
   Information (Fanny Pan)

4. Consent Calendar
   - Approval of Minutes
     Attachment 3: Draft September 7, 2016 Minutes
   Action (Fanny Pan)

5. Guidelines for Adjacent Development to Metro Right of Way
   15 min (Georgia Sheridan)

6. Metro Parking Demand Model
   20 min (Frank Ching)

7. Open Streets Grant Program – Cycle 2
   10 min (Avital Shavit)

8. FY 17-18 Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant
   Attachment 4: FY 17-18 Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Flyer and Presentation
   15 min (Dan Kopulsky, Caltrans)
9. Legislative Update
   Information
   15 min
   (Raffi Hamparian/Michael Turner)

10. Other Business

11. 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 November 2, 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  
   Judy Fry

2. Approval of June 21, 2016 Minutes  
   (1 minute)  
   Action  
   BOS

3. Chair’s Report  
   (5 minutes)  
   Information  
   Judy Fry

4. Metro Report  
   (5 minutes)  
   Information  
   Annelle Albarran

5. BOS Officers Nomination  
   (5 minutes)  
   Information  
   Judy Fry

6. FTA Update  
   (10 minutes)  
   Information  
   Arianna Valle/Adam Stephenson

7. TAP Update  
   (10 minutes)  
   Information  
   David Sutton

8. Metro Bus Procurement Update:  
   Municipality Options  
   (10 minutes)  
   Information  
   John Drayton

9. ExpressLanes Net Toll Revenue  
   Reinvestment Grant Program – Round 2  
   (10 minutes)  
   Information  
   Philbert Wong
10. Update on Vermont & North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor Studies (10 minutes) Information Annelle Albarran

11. Access Update (10 minutes) Information Matthew Avancena

12. Legislative Report (10 minutes) Information Raffi Hamparian/Marisa Yeager Michael Turner

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

14. New Business
   • Triennial Review Handout Information All

15. Adjournment

Information Items:

90-day Rolling Agenda
Summary of Invoices FY 2016 and FY 2017
Summary of EZ Pass Invoices FY 2016 and FY 2017
Subsidy Matrix FY 2016 and FY 2017
TDA-STA Capital Claims FY 2016 and FY 2017
TDA-STA Claims FY 2016 and FY 2017

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, October 18, 2016, at 9:30 am in the Mulholland Conference Room, 15th Floor of the Metro Headquarters Building.
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

William Mulholland Conference Room – 15th Floor

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

2. Approval of Minutes
   Attachment 1: August 18, 2016 Minutes
   Attachment 2: Sign-in Sheet/Attendance Sheet
   Attachment 3: 90-Day Rolling Agenda
   Action (Subcommittee)

3. Chair Report
   5 min
   Information (Bahman Janka)

4. Metro Report
   5 min
   Information (Fulgene Asuncion)

5. CTC Update
   5 min
   Information (Patricia Chen)

6. Caltrans Update
   5 min
   Information (Steve Novotny)

7. LADOT Innovative People Street Program
   15 min
   Information (Nat Gale)

8. Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project
   15 min
   Information (Isidro Panuco)
9. 2016 Metro ExpressLanes Net Toll Revenue Reinvestment Expenditure Plan
   Information (Silva Mardrusian)
   10 min

10. Rail to River Project Update
    Information (Roberto Machuca)
    10 min

11. Open Streets Grant Program – Cycle 2
    Information (Avital Shavit)
    10 min

12. ATP Cycle 3 Update
    Information (Shelly Quan)
    5 min

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

14. New Business
    5 min

15. Adjournment
    1 min

The next meeting for the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee will be held on October 20th 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

September 2016

Bus Operations Subcommittee:

- Approved the June 21, 2016 meeting minutes

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:

- Did not meet in September

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:

- Approved the August 18, 2016 meeting minutes

TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee:

- Did not meet in September
Attachment 3

Draft September 7, 2016 Minutes

September 7, 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 9:37 A.M., took roll and declared a quorum was present.

2. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees
   Bus Operations Subcommittee (BOS)
   - Did not meet in August
   - Next meeting is scheduled for September 20, 2016

   Local Transit Systems Subcommittee (LTSS)
   - Did not meet in August
   - Next meeting is scheduled for September 13, 2016

   Streets and Freeways Subcommittee
   - Last met on August 18, 2016
   - Received updates on:
     o 2016 Call Recertification/Deobligation/Extension
     o Connected Corridors – Interstate 210 Corridor
     o Los Angeles River Bike Path Gap Closure Feasibility Study
     o ATP Cycle 3
   - Next meeting is scheduled for September 15, 2016

   Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Sustainability Subcommittee
   - Did not meet in August
   - Mike Bagheri (City of Pasadena) was elected Chair and will be introduced at the next meeting

3. Chairperson's Report (Fanny Pan, Metro)
A handout of the August 25, 2016 Metro Board meeting recap was distributed in lieu of an oral report.
Ms. Pan reported that the Board approved staff’s 2016 Call for Projects
Recertification/Deobligation/Extension List, the Revised Lapsing Policy and the Project-
Readiness Criteria. Notification letters are in the process of being mailed to project sponsors
and will also include a template of the required items for the Project-Readiness Criteria.

Ms. Pan introduced two new TAC members: Gregory Farr (Caltrans) who is replacing Robert
So as a primary representative for Caltrans, and Richard Marshalian (County of Los Angeles)
who is replacing Tina Fung as a primary representative for the County of Los Angeles,
Regional Planning.

4. Consent Calendar
A motion to approve the August 3, 2016 TAC minutes was made by Robert Brager (League of
California Cities – Las Virgenes Malibu COG) and seconded by Mark Hunter
(TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee). Richard Dilluvio (Bicycle Coordinator) and Kevin Minne
(City of Los Angeles) abstained. The minutes were approved.

5. 2016 Public Participation Plan (Bronwen Keiner, Metro)
Ms. Keiner, Senior Community Relations Officer, reported that staff will be seeking Board
adoption of Metro’s 2016 Public Participation Plan on September 22, 2016.

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requires Metro to issue a Public Participation Plan
(Plan) every three years as part of the FTA Title VI Program Update. Ms. Keiner stated that the
Plan meets and exceeds the FTA’s direction to “incorporate environmental justice principles
into plans, projects and activities that receive funding from FTA” (FTA Circular 4702.1B) and
is consistent with Title VI’s non-discrimination regulations of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Plan guides all of Metro’s outreach processes to gather public input on possible changes
to bus and rail service, new projects, fares, and other programs. The Plan starts with the role
Metro plays in Los Angeles County as the Planner, Funder, Builder, and Operator of
transportation services; serving an area of 4,751 square miles and nearly 10 million residents.

Ms. Keiner stated that the Goals and Guiding Principles of Metro’s Community Relations
team ensures the agency’s connectivity to stakeholders for daily issues, operations, studies,
initiatives, construction activities, transit safety programs, and interagency
communications—all of which require some degree of public participation.

Ms. Keiner outlined the life cycle of the Community Outreach process, beginning with
Community and Municipal Affairs, Construction Relations, Transit Safety Programs, and
Metro Service Councils and Advisory Committees. The public outreach milestones in the
environmental process involve Pre-Scoping, Alternatives Analysis and Review, Scoping, Pre-
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Outreach,
Draft EIS/EIR Outreach and Comment Period, and the Final EIS/EIR.

Ms. Keiner reported that the Draft Plan was circulated for a 30-day comment period in early
2016 and was posted online in nine languages. Metro received 46 public comments and the
Draft Plan was revised in response to those comments.
The 2016 Plan is different from previous versions because Staff established eight minimum baseline thresholds for public outreach, which include community meeting and public hearing noticing, community meeting and public hearing locations and times, community meeting language translation, public hearing language translation and documentation, neighborhood/community lenses, non-traditional popular education methods, online language translation, and telephone interpretation.

Next Steps involve seeking Board approval at the September 2016 meeting, and submitting the Plan to the FTA in October 2016 as part of the Title VI Program Update. Staff will then broadly inform public-facing Metro departments of the newly established Minimum Baseline Thresholds for Public Outreach and continue implementation of strategies identified in the Plan.

Larry Stevens (League of California Cities – San Gabriel Valley COG) asked if the Plan was completed in-house or through the work of consultants? Ms. Keiner replied that it was done in-house.

Mr. Stevens asked how the cost of exceeding FTA minimum public outreach requirements was evaluated? He cited an example from his own agency in which they exceeded minimum outreach requirements, which led to an increased cost of public resources. Ms. Keiner replied that Metro aims to exceed minimum requirements for public outreach, but within the resources of the agency.

Mr. Stevens asked if the Plan also applies to Metrolink? Ms. Keiner replied that it does not.

6. RTPA and CTC Update (Zoe Unruh, Metro)
A handout of the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPA) and California Transportation Commission (CTC) Meeting Notes were distributed to TAC members.

Ms. Unruh reported that there has been ongoing discussion regarding Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act Implementation to outline funding distributions between the state, local agencies, and between programs. The California State Association of Counties (CSAC) requested that additional funding be made available for local bridge projects. As a result, $5 million of Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) has been made available.

Ms. Unruh reported that 204 earmark repurposing requests worth $162 million were submitted to Caltrans Local Assistance, which included $62 million from Los Angeles County. Obligation will begin in 2017, with the deadline for obligation in September 2019.

Ms. Unruh reported that 88% of The Regional Obligation authority was delivered by July 2016, amounting to $918 million out of $1.2 billion. The August redistribution list submitted to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requested an additional $73 million of obligation authority. The September list from FHWA was $293 million for California, with $108 million of the requested amount going to the regions.
The California Road Charge Pilot Program is currently in effect and the CTC has exceeded its participation goal of 5,000 vehicles. Ms. Unruh stated that there will be a Road Charge TAC meeting on September 16th, where they will discuss the potential of electric vehicle engagement and the impacts of road charge on electric vehicle policies.

Regarding Budget and Allocation Capacity, Ms. Unruh reported that the State Controller’s Office delayed two payments to the State Transit Assistance Program, totaling $75 million each in May and August due to an issue regarding interpretation of the statute, but payment will be made soon.

Regarding Innovations in Transportation, Ms. Unruh reported that Qualcomm Technologies came to discuss a new technology platform called V2X (Vehicle to Anything), which enhances Advanced Driver Assistance Systems. The new platform would allow vehicles to charge themselves wirelessly between uses. The Commissioners were interested in the charging technology and how it could support electric car growth and the future of charging stations.

Ms. Unruh reported that Item 63 at the CTC meeting proposed a policy that would guide scope change decisions and guide the advancement of construction funds for Active Transportation Program (ATP) projects. There was some support from the regions for making advancement possible for all project phases. Two CTC Commissioners strongly opposed using ATP funds for phases other than construction. Ms. Unruh reported that Commissioner Yvonne Burke made a motion to allow the advancing of preconstruction phases possible starting January 2017 by using remaining funds that were not used for construction advancements. Commissioner Burke accepted amendments to the motion to incorporate Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) evaluation into the process.

Michelle Caldwell (BOS) asked if the California Road Charge Pilot Program was the same as the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Pilot Program? Ms. Unruh confirmed.

7. ATP Cycle 3 Update (Shelly Quan, Metro)
Ms. Quan reported that 456 applications were received in ATP Cycle 3 with an average funding request of $2.1 million. In comparison, 617 applications with an average funding request of $1.7 million were received in Cycle 2. Ms. Quan announced that Cycle 3 will only have two years of funding versus three years of funding in Cycle 2. The Los Angeles County area submitted 70 applications with an average funding request of $2.6 million for Cycle 3, compared to 90 applications with an average funding request of $2.6 million in Cycle 2.

Ms. Quan reported that statewide recommendations will be released on October 28, 2016. The CTC will adopt the recommendations on December 7-8, 2016 and adopt the MPO program on March 15-16, 2017. ATP Cycle 3 will provide funding for FY 2020 and FY 2021. Funds will not be allocated until July 2019 or later unless advance allocation is secured.

Ms. Quan reported that the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has a new Supplemental Regional Program for non-infrastructure projects that they will be using for the MPO program. The new Supplemental Regional Program will be utilized for non-infrastructure projects, planning projects, and project level planning exercises that position local agencies to compete for future ATP cycles or other funding. Infrastructure projects not
selected in the statewide competition will be considered for funding from the Los Angeles County share of the SCAG competition. In Los Angeles County, Metro will assign up to 10 additional points to the CTC score for consistency with regional and Metro plans. Projects will then be ranked and selected. SCAG is still finalizing the supplemental application, but anticipates releasing it at the end of September 2016. Applications will be due in November 2016, recommendations will be made in December 2016, and the SCAG Regional Council will approve recommendations on February 2, 2017. The CTC will then adopt the ATP Planning portion of SCAG’s supplemental Call on March 15-16, 2017.

Ms. Quan reported that the new ATP policies adopted at the August 2016 CTC meeting provide guidelines for project scope amendments and advance project allocations. Advance allocations for construction will be considered on a first come, first served basis beginning in October 2016. If there is sufficient allocation capacity remaining, the CTC will consider advance project allocations for pre-construction phases on a first come, first served basis in January 2017, up to the amount of remaining allocation capacity.

Ms. Quan reported that Metro staff has been meeting with ATP TAC representatives in the Los Angeles County area regarding project delivery issues due to the high numbers of time extension requests at the end of FY 2016. Staff developed a draft survey in an effort to understand the issues relating to project delivery and what Metro can do to assist. The draft survey has been shared with the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee for feedback. Ms. Pan suggested soliciting feedback from TAC members as well. (The draft survey was shared with the TAC via email on September 8, 2016.)

Mr. Stevens asked if the ATP guidelines prohibited allocation of funds to a recipient who has already received an ATP award from a previous Cycle? Ms. Quan replied that the Guidelines are unclear and that SCAG will need to clarify.

Mr. Minne commented that the extension requests to the CTC were to be expected because agencies were only given a year to design their projects. He asked how the survey Metro is drafting will help when the main issue is the lack of time given? Ms. Quan replied that the objective of the survey is to figure out how Metro can assist at the local and regional level, as well as identify policies that Metro can help push at the state level in order to make the process easier for applicants. Allan Abramson (County of Los Angeles) elaborated that the purpose of the survey is to collect feedback to present to the ATP TAC, which currently is the only channel where local jurisdictions can voice their concerns. Therefore, presenting feedback to the ATP TAC could possibly lead to the CTC and Caltrans providing program changes to future Cycles.

Carlos Rios (City of Los Angeles) asked what is the source of funds for SCAG’s supplemental Call? Ms. Quan replied that the funds are from a consolidation of SCAG’s existing Sustainable Planning Grant Program and the ATP Regional Program. She elaborated that SCAG has not yet released their funding plan, but have stated that $9 million is available overall, with approximately $2.5 million from the ATP.

Mr. Stevens commented that SCAG’s procedure suggests that the CTC still has to finalize the decision after the SCAG Regional Council authorizes an award. Mr. Rios asked if the
procedure would still be subject to the CTC guidelines? Mr. Stevens replied that it depends on the type of project.

8. LA River Bike Path Gap Closure Feasibility Study (Laura Cornejo, Metro)

Ms. Cornejo reported that staff will be presenting the findings of the LA River Bike Path Gap Closure Feasibility Study to the Metro Board in September 2016. The Board requested staff to study the possibility of closing an eight-mile bike path gap that exists along the LA River.

Ms. Cornejo reported that staff conducted high level engineering and a feasibility study in response to the Board’s request. The study also looked into neighborhood connectivity, the regional significance of the gap closure, preliminary safety and hydraulic performance, environmental, permitting, real estate requirements, and construction and maintenance costs.

The study area covers Riverside Drive in the City of Los Angeles to Atlantic Boulevard in the City of Vernon. Closing the gap would provide a continuous 32-mile separated bike path that would connect the San Fernando Valley to Long Beach.

The study proposed three options for closing the gap: creating a bike path at the top of the bank; creating a side cut; or placing the path on the channel bottom. The top of bank option is the most common method currently used along other segments of the LA River. Challenges for the top of bank method include electrical towers, historic bridges, adjacency to rail facilities, and California Public Utilities Commission (CPU) clearance requirements. Challenges for the channel bottom option include managing the flow of water along the path. Ms. Cornejo reported that the project team has proposed elevating the bike path six inches off the ground in order to accommodate the water flow. Major considerations for the bottom channel option are ingress and egress issues relating to access points to the bottom of the channel. There would need to be a sense of safety so that riders feel they can easily exit the bottom of the channel. Another issue is an increase in maintenance, since there would be accumulation of debris in times of rain. The side cut option would cut into the channel wall to accommodate the path and would be the best option for sections of the LA River with a trapezoidal angle along the wall.

Ms. Cornejo reported that while the study found the study area to be the most challenging segment of the LA River, the findings determined that closing the gap along the LA River is still feasible with creative engineering and close coordination with adjacent rail operations and development projects. Preliminary hydraulic studies have found that no impacts are to be expected, but further studies would need to be conducted in the next project phase. Ms. Cornejo stated that it would be necessary to coordinate with the numerous agencies and organizations involved with impacted historical bridges and LA River restoration efforts. The estimated cost for the project would be between $200-320 million, which would include eight miles of grade-separated path, 16 access points, and 40% cost for contingency, engineering, permitting, real estate, and construction administration. Ms. Cornejo stated that the cost per mile is consistent with other similar LA River Bike Path segments.

Next Steps include developing a scope of work for the Project Approval/Environmental consultant team, and developing an Advance Letter to the Army Corps of Engineers.
Mohammad Mostahkami (League of California Cities – Gateway Cities COG) asked what is the timeline for the next phase of the project? Ms. Cornejo replied that based on procurement procedures, the next phase would not be initiated until spring or summer 2017.

Mr. Abramson asked if the total cost estimate included the 40% contingency? Ms. Cornejo confirmed that it does. Mr. Abramson asked how the cost per mile is still consistent with other bike path segments of the LA River if the study found that this was the most challenging segment? Ms. Cornejo clarified that the cost is consistent with segments that have similar characteristics, such as historic bridges and electrical towers.

Ms. Caldwell asked if funding sources have been identified? Ms. Cornejo replied that the project is included in Measure M, but funding sources have not been identified.

Mr. Abramson asked how much funding is identified for the project in Measure M? Ms. Cornejo replied $365 million.

9. Rail to Rail/River Project Update (Roberto Machuca, Metro)

Mr. Machuca reported that the Rail to Rail/River Project underwent a Feasibility Study in 2014, in which it was determined that implementing an active transportation corridor was very feasible. The findings of the study also allowed Metro to apply for Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) and ATP grants, both of which were awarded in 2015. As a result, there is funding available for construction of Segments A1, A2, and A3, which stretch 6.4 miles and connect the future Metro Crenshaw/LAX Line to the Metro Blue Line. Staff is currently working on 30% engineering as well as environmental clearance, which they are hoping to receive a Categorical Exclusion (CE) through the CEQA and NEPA processes by June 2017. FTA representatives are currently taking the lead on the NEPA clearance. The segment is scheduled to open by June 2019 to coincide with the Crenshaw/LAX Line opening.

Mr. Machuca reported that staff is conducting an Alternatives Analysis (AA) on Segments B1, B2, B3, and B4. Developing the criteria for determining the preferred alternative will take place in the next nine months, which will provide beneficial standing when applying for future funding.

Mr. Machuca reported that staff has hired a consultant for outreach efforts on Segments A and B. A project TAC and a Community Advisory Committee have been established and have been successful in getting feedback from stakeholders. The project staff also conducted community outreach meetings in the City of Huntington Park for Segment B and received feedback from the community and city officials on how they would like to see the connection to the LA River in the future.

Mr. Hernandez asked for elaboration on the design of Segment A. Mr. Machuca replied that there is a railway running along the north side of Slauson Avenue, and staff is currently working on an existing conditions analysis to determine whether to pave over the existing tracks or to extract the tracks and lay new materials for the Class I bike path. Mr. Machuca commented that bicycle usage is very high in the area, so the objective of the project is to improve bicycle connectivity for users.
Corinne Ralph (City of Los Angeles) asked if the TIGER and ATP grants received were for Segment A, B, or both? Mr. Machuca replied that they were granted specifically for Segment A. Staff is looking to Metro-provided local funds for Segment B.

Mr. Abramson asked if the railway was abandoned? Mr. Machuca replied that it is not technically abandoned by BNSF. He elaborated that even though Metro owns the Right-of-Way, BNSF still has an operating easement. Metro is currently in negotiations with BNSF to start the abandonment process, which will allow for the construction phase to begin. Mr. Abramson asked if BNSF has been receptive to the negotiations so far? Mr. Machuca replied that BNSF has been in contact with Metro’s Real Estate and Legal team and have been receptive. Mr. Abramson asked if the railway can ever be reestablished after the bicycle path is completed? Mr. Machuca replied that once Metro accepts the funding from the TIGER and ATP grants for Segment A, Metro will be dedicated to creating an active transportation corridor for this area for the next 20 years, but it does not preclude other modes such as rail or Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) after 20 years.

Jane Leonard (BOS) asked the length of Segment A? Mr. Machuca replied that all of Segment A is approximately 6.4 miles. Segment B ranges from 2.4 to 4 miles, depending on the alignment. He noted that Sections B3 and B4 connect to the existing LA River Bike path. Ms. Leonard asked the funding amount of the TIGER and ATP grants? Mr. Machuca replied that Metro received $15 million from the TIGER grant, and received $8.3 million from ATP. Metro contributed $10.9 million of local funds.

Valerie Watson (Pedestrian Coordinator) asked if staff has been soliciting community feedback for how the project can improve crossings at major arterials? Mr. Machuca replied that staff is in regular contact with various City of Los Angeles departments and bureaus in order to receive feedback. He reported that there are 27 crossings in the study area and staff will be paying close attention to how signal synchronization, foot traffic, and bike traffic will be going through the path.

10. Open Streets Grant Program – Cycle 2 (Avital Shavit, Metro)
Ms. Shavit reported that staff will be seeking Board approval on September 22, 2016 to award Cycle 2 of grant funding for Open Streets events in Los Angeles County. Ms. Shavit stated that she will return to the October 2016 TAC meeting to provide an update on which projects were awarded.

Ms. Shavit announced that the City of Los Angeles will be hosting a CicLAvia event called “The Heart of LA” on October 16, 2016 that will go through Downtown Los Angeles, Exposition Park, Chinatown, MacArthur Park, and East Los Angeles. She noted that attending this event will be a good opportunity for TAC members who are considering applying for a grant for their city to see what an Open Streets event is like.

David Feinberg (League of California Cities – Westside Cities COG) asked if the 626 Golden Streets event that was canceled in June 2016 has plans to be rescheduled. Ms. Shavit replied that staff has been working with the City of Pasadena and Bike SGV to reschedule the event.
Staff will be providing an update on rescheduling efforts to the Board at the September 2016 meeting.

Ms. Caldwell congratulated Ms. Shavit and the bike team on the successful launch of Metro Bike Share. Ms. Shavit thanked Ms. Caldwell and encouraged TAC members to attend the upcoming CicLAvia event and utilize Metro Bike Share if they do not own a bike.

11. ExpressLanes Net Toll Revenue Reinvestment Grant Program – Round 2 (Philbert Wong, Metro)
A list of the approved and funded projects for the ExpressLanes Net Toll Revenue Reinvestment Grant Expenditure Plan for the I-10 and I-110 corridors was distributed to TAC members.

Mr. Wong reported that funding for Round 2 was derived from net toll revenues from the Metro ExpressLanes on the I-10 and I-110. Eligible agencies are public agencies that provide transportation facilities or services within Los Angeles County and whose programs must be within three miles of the I-10 or I-110 ExpressLanes corridors. Funding was allocated to three modes: active transportation/system connectivity, transit, and roadway improvements. The overall goal of the program is to improve mobility along the I-10 and I-110 corridors.

Mr. Wong reported that Metro received 28 applications totaling $60 million in funding requests. Staff and Metro’s Corridor Advisory Group (CAG) evaluated and scored the applications. Scores from staff and the CAG were then combined to form a composite score and ranked. Staff is recommending 21 projects: six for active transportation (40% of allocated funding), nine for transit (40% of allocated funding), and six for roadway improvements (20% of allocated funding). Project funding in the I-110 corridor is approximately $17.6 million and the I-10 corridor is $11 million. Mr. Wong noted that Caltrans received approximately $5.5 million, which was not listed in the handout. The staff and CAG recommendations were approved at the August 25, 2016 Board meeting.

Mr. Farr asked for elaboration on the funding reserve for the I-10 corridor. Mr. Wong replied that there was remaining funding from the I-10 in Round 1, so it was put into a reserve fund to be used for a future round.

Mr. Rios asked what was the total amount of funding requested? Mr. Wong replied approximately $60 million: $11.8 million for the I-10 corridor and $48.4 million for the I-110 corridor.

Mr. Rios asked when agencies can start the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) process for the awarded projects? Mr. Wong replied that funding is available for FY 2016 and FY 2017 so the funding agreements can start immediately.

Ms. Leonard asked how often the grant program takes place? Mr. Wong replied that Round 1 took place two years ago, but the schedule for Round 3 could change in the future.

Marianne Kim (Automobile Club of California) asked why the Dodger’s shuttle was eliminated from eligibility, while the Galaxy shuttle was able to remain? Mr. Wong replied that the goal of
the program is to fund new service and enhancements to existing service. The Dodger’s shuttle was funded in Round 1 and was therefore not eligible for Round 2. Ms. Kim asked for clarification that if a transit agency wanted to operate a new service would it only be eligible in its first year of operation? Mr. Wong clarified that they would be eligible for incremental upgrades or enhancements in service, but if an agency is requesting funding for operations of the same project it would be ineligible.

Mr. Hernandez asked what was the available funding for the Round 1? Mr. Wong replied approximately $19-20 million.

Mr. Stevens asked when the reserve funds will be available? Mr. Wong replied Round 3. Mr. Farr asked if there was a way to release those funds through an interim call? Mr. Wong replied that it would be possible, but would require Board approval.

12. Legislative Update (Marisa Yeager, Michael Turner, Metro)

Federal
Ms. Yeager reported that the Senate and House of Representatives returned to session on September 6th and will try to close the session by the end of the month. It is expected that a Continuing Resolution will be passed to allow Appropriations to continue until December 2016. With regard to the Authorization process, she noted that there have been numerous requests on various issues relating to implementation of the FAST Act. In addition, Metro is anticipating receiving an update on the Bus and Bus Facilities Grant Program within the week.

Ms. Yeager announced that Metro will be hosting the American Public Transportation Association’s (APTA) 2016 conference in Los Angeles from September 11-14.

Ms. Caldwell asked for an update on the Bus and Bus Facilities award results. Ms. Yeager replied that there is a 40-day hold on officially announcing the awards. Official announcements are anticipated on September 7, 2016.

State
Mr. Turner reported that staff has been working on two Bills: AB-1889 (High-Speed Rail Authority: High-Speed Train Operation) and AB-2170 (Trade Corridors Improvement Fund: federal funds). AB-1889 involves investment plans to “Bookend” projects. Bookend projects are those needed in Northern and Southern California in order to build high-speed rail such as grade separations, track improvements, and the electrification of Caltrain in Northern California. There was a lack of clarity in the adopted 2012 budget, so staff needed to clarify language in order to fund the necessary improvements in Los Angeles County. Metro’s main projects under the investment plan include the Rosecrans/Marquardt Grade Separation Project and improvements to Union Station. Mr. Turner reported that the Bill is currently at the Governor’s Office for consideration.

Mr. Turner reported that there were a number of technical complications when the State Assembly was voting on AB-2170 making it unclear on which version of the Bill was being voted on. Due to this, the original version of the Bill was passed without any amendments. The original version allocates funding through a regional process, which the administration
and regions did not want. Mr. Turner stated that there is uncertainty on what the Governor will do.

Mr. Turner reported that the State Assembly extended the AB-32 (California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006) objectives, which requires the state to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Mr. Turner reported that one of the main issues of the Cap and Trade program was the overall long term existence of the State’s GHG goals. As a result, the State Assembly also passed a companion measure with some reforms to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) because there were concerns that CARB had too much authority and was not responsive to the Legislature.

Mr. Turner reported that the California Chamber of Commerce filed a lawsuit against the State of California arguing that the emissions fee from the Cap and Trade program is a tax, which should have required two-thirds voter approval. Mr. Turner reported that the lawsuit is working its way through the process and is threatening the existence of the program. The last Cap and Trade auctions had expected to trade $500 million, but only traded $10 million. Mr. Turner reported there is still $1.4 billion in unallocated Cap and Trade revenues remaining from other auctions. The Legislator passed a bill allocating approximately $600-$700 million, of which $135 million can be used for transit capital projects through a discretionary program agencies can apply for. Mr. Turner noted that the Secretary of Transportation recently announced a package of projects that were not fully funded, so it is unclear how much of the $135 million can be used for new transit projects.

Mr. Turner reported that the State Assembly did not take any action on the transportation funding proposals that were introduced in the regular session. Assembly Member Brian Dahle and Assembly Member Jim Frazier both introduced bills for transportation funding, and both Assembly Members had reached an agreement on a funding package that reconciled differences between the two individual proposals. The funding package includes raising gas taxes, raising diesel taxes, and creating a series of funding mechanisms through ATP, State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), and State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). Staff will be taking the funding package to the Board so that they can take a position. Staff is also working on a summary chart detailing the tax increases, how funding will flow, and how much Los Angeles County can expect to receive.

Ms. Leonard asked for an update on the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA). Mr. Turner replied that there is money in CalSTA and staff has had discussion amongst the statewide agencies about how funding will be allocated. Mr. Turner noted that staff felt information was not always reported equally and therefore wants to see funding allocated more consistently. Ms. Caldwell noted that if there are going to be changes to the allocation, everyone should be informed and should conform consistently across the state. She stated that she was at the CalSTA meeting and it was a very amenable discussion.

Mr. Turner reported that the Governor has been strict with the California Public Employees' Reform Act (PEPRA) and is not allowing any exemptions. He elaborated that the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) challenged the California Public Employees' Retirement System’s (PERS) interpretation of PEPRA. They went to the Legislature which resulted in a bill
that was opposed by PERS and was on its way to getting vetoed. The bill has resulted in PERS suing VTA for improperly implementing PEPRA.

Mr. Stevens commented that perhaps local agencies could provide road improvements more easily if they were just given funding instead of going through a labor intensive application process. Mr. Turner replied if the San Gabriel Valley COG shares the same view then they should communicate it to the San Gabriel Valley Legislative Delegation. Mr. Stevens commented that if an application process is too complicated, cities will never be able to actually spend the money to make the transportation improvements that are needed.

**Adjournment**
Ms. Pan adjourned the meeting and reported that the next scheduled TAC meeting is October 5, 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>Marianne Kim/Stephen Finnegan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rich Dilluvio/Michelle Mowery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICYCLE COORDINATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michelle Caldwell/Susan Lipman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Leonard/ Gloria Gallardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (BOS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL</td>
<td>Sgt. Dave Nelms/Ofc. Christian Cracraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>Gary Slater/Steve Novotny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greg Farr/Kelly Lamare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVE ON ADA</td>
<td>Ellen Blackman/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>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. Corinne Ferrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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. Richard Marshallian/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>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td>2. Mohammad Mostahkami/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities COG</td>
<td>3. Robert Brager/Elizabeth Shavelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes Malibu COG</td>
<td>4. Mike Behen/Allen Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td>5. Larry Stevens/Craig Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
<td>6. Jason Smisko/Wayne Ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley COG</td>
<td>7. Robert Beste/Ted Semaan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td>8. David Feinberg/Sharon Perlstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Cities COG</td>
<td></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/Perri Goodman</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. Carolyn Kreslake/Diane Corral-Lopez</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 (SCRRA - 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/ SUSTAINABILITY SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>1. Vacant/Phil Aker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Mark Hunter/Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TAC Audience Attendance
*September 7, 2016*

<table>
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<th></th>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shely Quan</td>
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<td></td>
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Attachment 4

FY 17-18 Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant

Flyer and Presentation
The California Department of Transportation invites you to participate in the

**FY17/18 SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING GRANT**

All potentially interested applicants, such as, MPO’s, RTPA’s, Cities, Counties, Transit Agencies, University/Colleges, Native American Tribal Governments Special Interest Groups, and the Public, interested in the application process and eligibility requirements for the Strategic Partnership and Sustainable Communities Planning Grants provided by the State of California, Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

The FY 17/18 combined grant amount available statewide is $9.3 million, and all funding for these grant programs are available on a statewide, competitive basis.

**Strategic Partnerships Grants** - encourage regional agencies to partner with Caltrans to identify and address statewide/interregional transportation deficiencies in the state highway system, strengthen government-to-government coordination, and result in programmed system improvements that achieve the State’s overarching goals. Interested sub-recipients may also partner with their regional agencies for this grant.

**Sustainable Communities Grants** - funds transportation planning to identify and address mobility deficiencies in the multimodal transportation system, encourage stakeholder collaboration, involve active public engagement, integrate Smart Mobility 2010 concepts, and ultimately result in programmed system improvements, and achieve the Caltrans Mission and overarching objectives.

**Important Dates:**

- **August 26, 2016** – Call for applications. The Grant Application Guide and application form are available at: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html)
- **October 7, 2016** – Sub-applicants in the SCAG region must submit their application(s) to SCAG by 5:00p.m. Please send grant package in original format along with signed signature page via email to SCAG: grants@scag.ca.gov
- **November 4, 2016 - Application deadline to Caltrans** (SCAG submits to Caltrans) **at 5:00PM** Please submit your application package to: Regional.Planning.Grants@dot.ca.gov & a copy for the District contact

**DISTRICT CONTACTS:**

**District 7 (Los Angeles) - Charles Lau**  
E-mail: charles.lau@dot.ca.gov  
(213) 897-0197

For more information on the - what, when, where and how to apply for these grants please refer to the Transportation Planning webpage at [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html).
Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Program

FY 2017-18

Strategic Partnerships & Sustainable Communities

Presented by

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
FY 2017-18 Update - Revised Grant Program

*Several recent major efforts prompted a realignment of the Grant Program:*

- Caltrans Mission: *Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability*
- California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities Vision and Core Concepts
- State Smart Transportation Initiative Assessment and Recommendations
- Caltrans Program Review Major Actions
- California Transportation Plan 2040 Vision and Goals
- Smart Mobility 2010 Principles
Grant Program Overarching Objectives

*Identified to ensure consideration of State priorities/objectives:*

- Sustainability
- Preservation
- Mobility
- Safety
- Innovation
- Economy
- Health
- Equity
Strategic Partnerships

Who May Apply?

Eligible Primary Applicants Include: Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) with a current Master Fund Transfer Agreement with Caltrans Headquarters Office of Regional Planning

Eligible sub-applicants include:

- MPOs/RTPAs
- Universities & Community Colleges
- Native American Tribal Governments
- Cities & Counties
- Community-Based Organizations
- Non-Profit Organizations (501.c.3)
- Other Public Entities
Strategic Partnerships

Budget

- The Strategic Partnerships Grants are funded by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA State Planning and Research, Part I). The FHWA has authorized Caltrans to distribute these grant funds.
- Approximately $1.5 million will be available for the FY 2017-18 grant cycle.
- 20% minimum non-federal local match of the total project amount.
- Minimum grant $100,000;
- Maximum grant only MPOs $1,000,000; All others $500,000.
Strategic Partnerships

Grant Specific Objective

- To achieve the Caltrans Mission and Grant Program Overarching Objectives;
- Encourage regional agencies to partner with Caltrans to identify and address statewide/interregional transportation deficiencies in the state highway system;
- Strengthen government-to-government relationships; and,
- Result in programmed system improvements.

- “Climate-Ready Transportation” connects Grant program into the Governor’s EO B-30-15
Strategic Partnerships

Example Project Types

- Studies that identify interregional, inter-county, and/or statewide mobility and access needs
- Corridor studies and corridor performance/preservation studies
- Studies that evaluate transportation issues involving ground access to international borders, seaports, airports, intermodal facilities, freight hubs, and recreational sites
- Studies for relinquishment of state routes
- Statewide research or modeling tools
- Transportation demand management plans
- System investment prioritization plans
Sustainable Communities

Who May Apply?

Eligible Primary Applicants Include:

- MPOs/RTPAs with a current Master Fund Transfer Agreement with Caltrans Headquarters Office of Regional Planning
- Cities & Counties
- Transit Agencies
- Native American Tribal Governments

Eligible sub-applicants include those listed above, as well as:

- Universities & Community Colleges
- Community-Based Organizations
- Non-Profit Organizations (501.c.3)
- Other Public Entities
Sustainable Communities

Budget

The Sustainable Communities Grants are funded by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA § 5304) and the State Highway Account. The FTA has authorized Caltrans to distribute these grant funds.

Approximately $7.8 million will be available for the Fiscal Year 2017-18 grant cycle. Funding distribution will depend on the quality and quantity of applications in each applicant pool, i.e., (1) MPOs/RTPAs; and, (2) cities and counties, transit agencies, and Native American Tribal Governments.

11.47% local match of the total project amount.

Minimum grant $50,000;

Maximum grant only MPOs $1,000,000; All others $500,000.
Sustainable Communities

Grant Specific Objective

- To achieve the Caltrans Mission and Grant Program Overarching Objectives;
- Identify and address mobility deficiencies in the multimodal transportation system including the needs of environmental justice and disadvantaged communities;
- Encourage stakeholder collaboration;
- Involve active public engagement;
- Integrate Smart Mobility 2010 concepts; and,
- Ultimately result in programmed system improvements.
Sustainable Communities

**Example Project Types**

- Studies that advance a community’s effort to reduce transportation related greenhouse gases
- Studies that assist transportation agencies in creating sustainable communities
- Community to school studies or safe routes to school plans
- Studies that advance a community’s effort to address the impacts of climate change and sea level rise
- Studies that address environmental justice issues in a transportation related context
- Jobs and affordable housing proximity studies
- Context-sensitive streetscapes or town center plans
- Bike and pedestrian safety enhancement plans
- Traffic calming and safety enhancement plans
Sustainable Communities

*Example Project Types*

- Corridor enhancement studies
- Complete street plans
- Studies that evaluate accessibility and connectivity of the multimodal transportation network
- Health equity transportation studies
- Climate change adaptation plans for transportation facilities
- Transit plans, surveys and research
- Identification of policies, strategies, and programs to preserve transit facilities and optimize transit infrastructure
- Short range transit development plans
- Transit marketing plans
- Social service improvement studies
# Local Match Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Partnerships (FHWA SPR, Part I Funds (MPO/RTPAs))</th>
<th>Sustainable Communities (FTA 5304 Funds (MPO/RTPAs))</th>
<th>Sustainable Communities SHA funds (Cities/Counties, Transit Agencies, Tribal Governments)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-federal match source</td>
<td>Non-federal match source</td>
<td>Any source, including federal if the source allows for this purpose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minimum local match is a percentage of the total project cost (i.e., minimum local match amount plus the grant amount).

The minimum local match must be rendered during the invoicing period of requested reimbursement and must be provided with every invoice.

The local match can be all cash, all third party in-kind contributions, or a combination of the two.

In-kind contributions require an In-Kind Valuation Plan to be submitted for approval as a condition of grant acceptance.

The Local Match Calculator is accessible at: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/orip/Grants/2015/Match_Calculator.xlsx](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/orip/Grants/2015/Match_Calculator.xlsx)
## Characteristics of Competitive Applications

### Tips for Writing a Competitive Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Include Caltrans’ Roles</th>
<th>Receive feedback from Caltrans District staff prior to the deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide letters of support</td>
<td>Provide photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly demonstrate how the project promotes State and Federal Transportation Planning Goals</td>
<td>Clearly define the transportation problem and address every aspect of the Grant Specific Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative tasks do not exceed 5 percent of the grant request</td>
<td>Support the problem with concrete data, if available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants require to describe how they met goals under State Transportation &amp; Federal Transportation Goals Checklist</td>
<td>Describe how this project will lead to implementation of future projects and the impact of not funding the grant application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anticipated Schedule for FY 2017-18 Grant Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• August 29, 2016 - Grant Application Guide Release Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• November 4, 2016 - Grant Applications Due via E-mail by 5 PM to <a href="mailto:Regional.Planning.Grants@dot.ca.gov">Regional.Planning.Grants@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• November / December - District Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• January / February - Headquarters Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• February / March - Management Approval of Funding Recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary Notifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• March / April - Preliminary E-mail Notices Inform Applicants of the Outcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Award Letters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• April - Award Letters with Conditions of Grant Acceptance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Start Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• July/September - Grantees may begin grant-funded work, pending State Budget approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Start Dates

MPO/RTPAs

Consider these dates when developing the Scope of Work and Project Timeline:

- **July 2017** - Anticipated start date, pending State Budget approval
- **June 30, 2020** - Project end date when reimbursable work must be completed
- **Final Request for Reimbursement** - Final Request for Reimbursement must be filed no later than 60 days after the end of the fiscal year to coincide with the submission of the Overall Work Program (OWP) Final Expenditure Report.
Project Start Dates

_Cities/Counties, Transit Agencies, Native American Tribes_

Consider these dates when developing the Scope of Work and Project Timeline:

- **September 2017** - Anticipated start date, pending State Budget approval
- **February 28, 2020** - Project end date when reimbursable work must be completed
- **April 28, 2020** - All final invoices must be submitted to Caltrans for approval and reimbursement. This allows Caltrans sufficient time to comply with the State Controller’s Office payment requirements.
Grants Website:
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html
Questions?

Dan Kopulsky - Chief, Regional Planning & Goods Movement
(213) 897-0213
Dan.kopulsky@dot.ca.gov

Charles Lau - Associate Transportation Planner
(213) 897-0197
charles.lau@dot.ca.gov