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
   Information (Jane Leonard)
   Local Transit Systems
   Information (Sebastian Hernandez)
   Streets and Freeways
   Information (Fulgene Asuncion)
   TDM/Sustainability
   Information (Neha Chawla)
   Attachment 1: Subcommittee Agendas
   Attachment 2: Subcommittee Actions
   5 min

3. Chairperson’s Report
   Information (Fanny Pan)

4. Consent Calendar
   Action
   • Approval of Minutes
   Attachment 3: Draft October 5, 2016 Minutes

5. CTC Update
   5 min
   Information (Patricia Chen)

6. ATP Update
   5 min
   Information (Shelly Quan)

7. Metro Countywide Bike Share Update
   10 min
   Information (Avital Shavit)

8. Airport Metro Connector/96th Street Station Update
   5 min
   Information (Cory Zelmer)

9. FTA Section 5310, 5316, and 5317 Update
   Attachment 4: FY 17 Pass-Through Grants Schedule
   Attachment 5: Working Group Recommendation
   15 min
   Information (Jami Carrington)
10. Federal Transportation Earmark Repurposing Update  Information
    Attachment 6: Draft Guidelines  (Steven Mateer)
    Attachment 7: Project/Program Request Form
    15 min

11. Transit to Open Space and Parks  Information  (Jacob Lieb)
    15 min

12. Legislative Update  Information  (Raffi Hamparian/Michael Turner)
    15 min

13. Other Business

14. 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 December 7, 2016 at 9:30 a.m. in the Gateway Conference Room.
Attachment 1

Subcommittee Agendas
Agenda

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

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

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

2. Approval of September 20, 2016 Minutes (1 minute)  
   Action  
   BOS

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

4. Metro Report (5 minutes)  
   Information  
   Annelle Albarran

5. BOS Officers Elections (5 minutes)  
   Action  
   Annelle Albarran

6. FTA Section 5310 Working Group Recommendation (10 minutes)  
   Action  
   Jami Carrington

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

8. State Transit Assistance Efficiency Standards - Update (10 minutes)  
   Information  
   Susan Richan

9. Nextrip Bus Arrival Electronic Signage (10 minutes)  
   Information  
   Al Martinez
10. Regional Ridership Improvement Task Force – Update (10 minutes)  Information  Conan Cheung/Pari Ahmadi

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  Information  All

15. Adjournment

Information Items:

- 90-day Rolling Agenda
- Summary of Invoices FY 2017
- Summary of EZ Pass Invoices FY 2017
- Subsidy Matrix FY 2017
- TDA-STA Capital Claims FY 2017
- TDA-STA Claims 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, November 15, 2016, at 9:30 am in the Mulholland Conference Room, 15th Floor of the Metro Headquarters Building.
NOTE TIME: 1:30 PM

Thursday, October 20, 2016, 1:30 P.M.

Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE
Gateway Building – Huntington Conference Room (3rd floor – off of cafeteria)

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. Group Transit Asset Management (TAM) Targets for Local Provider Sub-recipients
Action
Randy Lamm, Metro
Ashad Hamideh, Metro

4. FTA Section 5310 Working Group Recommendation
Action
Cossette Stark, Metro

5. Status of five year MOUs for FY17-21
Information
Susan Richan, Metro

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

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

William Mulholland Conference Room – 15th Floor

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

2. Approval of Minutes
   Action (Subcommittee)
   Attachment 1: September 15, 2016 Minutes
   Attachment 2: Sign-in Sheet/Attendance Sheet

3. Chair Report
   5 min
   Information (Bahman Janka)

4. Metro Report
   5 min
   Information (Fulgene Asuncion)

5. Metro’s Parking Management Plan
   15 min
   Information (Frank Ching)

6. Caltrans Update
   5 min
   Information (Steve Novotny)

7. LADOT Innovative People Street Program
   15 min
   Information (Brian Oh)

8. Vermont and North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor Studies
   15 min
   Information (Michael Richmai)
9. ATP Update
   Information (Shelly Quan)
   5 min

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

11. New Business
    5 min

12. Adjournment
    1 min

The next meeting for the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee will be held on November 17th 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/
Agenda

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)

TDM/ SUSTAINABILITY SUBCOMMITTEE

Metro HQ
19th floor, Palos Verdes Conference Rm.

1. Call to Order/Roll Call
   Action (Mike Bagheri, Chair)
   All

2. Introductions
   All

3. Metro Call for Projects Revised Lapsing Policy
   Update (Fanny Pan, Metro)

4. Metro Transfers
   Presentation (Georgia Sheridan, Metro)
   (Tyler Bonstead, STV)

5. Bikeshare Program Update - Metro/Pasadena
   Update (Jenny Cristales-Cevallos, Metro)
   (Mike Bagheri, Pasadena)

6. Metro Complete Streets and First/Last Mile Trainings
   Update (Katie Lemmon, Metro)

7. Future Agenda Items
   All

8. Adjournment
   All

Please call Neha Chawla at (213) 922-3984 or e-mail to chawlan@metro.net, if you have questions regarding the agenda or the meeting.
Attachment 2

Subcommittee Actions
Disposition of Subcommittee Actions

October 2016

Bus Operations Subcommittee:

- Approved the September 20, 2016 meeting minutes
- Elected the following BOS Officers:
  - Chair – Jane Leonard (Culver CityBus)
  - Vice Chair – Michelle Caldwell (Foothill Transit)
  - Secretary – Judy Fry (Antelope Valley Transit Authority)
- Elected the following new TAC Alternate Representatives:
  - Dana Pynn (Long Beach Transit) – Alternate to Jane Leonard
  - Robert Portillo (Montebello Bus Lines) – Alternate to Michelle Caldwell
- Approved the FTA Section 5310 Working Group Recommendations

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:

- Approved the June 16, 2016 meeting minutes
- Approved the FTA Section 5310 Working Group Recommendations

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:

- Approved the September 15, 2016 meeting minutes

TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee:

- No actions were taken
Attachment 3

Draft October 5, 2016 Minutes

October 5, 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 9:34 A.M., took roll and declared a quorum was present.

2. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees
   Bus Operations Subcommittee (BOS)
   - Last met on September 20, 2016
   - Received updates on:
     - BOS Officer Nominations
     - Metro Bus Procurement
     - ExpressLanes Net Toll Revenue Reinvestment Grant
     - Vermont and North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor Studies
     - Transit Industry Debriefing
     - FTA Triennial Review
   - Next meeting is scheduled for October 18, 2016

   Local Transit Systems Subcommittee (LTSS)
   - Did not meet in September
   - Next meeting is scheduled for October 20, 2016

   Streets and Freeways Subcommittee
   - Last met on September 15, 2016
   - Received updates on:
     - LADOT Innovative People Street Program
     - Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project
     - Metro ExpressLanes Net Toll Revenue Reinvestment Grant
     - Rail to River Project
     - Open Street Grant Program – Cycle 2
     - ATP Cycle 3
   - Next meeting is scheduled for October 20, 2016
Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Sustainability Subcommittee
- Did not meet in September
- An email election was held and Mike Bagheri, City of Pasadena, was elected as the new Chair of the Subcommittee
- Next meeting is scheduled for October 19, 2016

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 Metro is currently conducting a beta test for an updated Metro website and soliciting comments. The new site is anticipated to launch in January 2017.

Ms. Pan reported that Metro has launched a new podcast series titled “Off Peak”, which covers Los Angeles’ untold transportation stories. Podcasts will be posted bi-weekly and are available online through iTunes, GooglePlay, SoundCloud, YouTube, and Stitcher.

4. Consent Calendar
A motion to approve the September 7, 2016 TAC minutes was made by Jane Leonard (BOS) and seconded by Sebastian Hernandez (LTSS). Justine Garcia (LTSS) abstained. The minutes were approved.

5. Guidelines for Adjacent Development to Metro Right of Way (Georgia Sheridan/Marie Sullivan, Metro)
Ms. Sullivan reported that staff is developing guidelines to help inform cities and developers about the common issues that occur when developing adjacent to a Metro Right of Way (ROW). The goal of the guidelines is to enhance safety and avoid conflicts between private development and Metro operations, as well as to improve coordination with cities and developers to avoid design conflicts and delays in the development process.

Ms. Sullivan noted that setbacks have been the most common issue when developing adjacent to Metro ROW. For example, a developer wanted to develop up to the property line adjacent to the Metro Orange Line ROW and thus requested a Right of Entry permit from Metro to put scaffolding within the Metro ROW. This development would have interrupted service and become a safety issue. Metro staff worked with the developer and the City of Los Angeles to shift the development five feet from the property line so that all construction could take place within their property. In this case, the City of Los Angeles required a 15 foot setback along the front property line which the developer was able to use to shift the development away from the Metro ROW. Ms. Sullivan noted that if the 15 foot dedicated setback had not existed, the developer would have had to redesign their entire building; thus Metro is hoping to achieve early coordination in the development process.

Ms. Sheridan reported that staff is in the process of creating presentation materials for outreach efforts to cities and developers concerning these adjacency issues. Staff will create a hardcopy or downloadable handbook of the guidelines to distribute to the cities. So far staff
has presented to the Cities of Azusa, Culver City, Duarte, Monrovia, Pasadena, Santa Monica, as well as the Urban Land Institute. Staff plans to continue outreach to the Cities of Los Angeles, Inglewood, Long Beach, Irwindale, South Pasadena, Compton, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Redondo Beach, and Los Angeles County.

Ms. Sheridan noted that Metro’s Engineering Department currently has its own Adjacent to Metro ROW Construction Manual; however, it is a technical document that can be complicated to read or understand. The goal of these new guidelines is to create easier to understand, graphic-based guidelines, and incorporate new ideas. Staff is coordinating with cities to institutionalize a five foot setback into the development process for projects adjacent to Metro ROW. Metro does not want to grant Right of Entry permits due to possible disruptions to transit service.

Sight lines are another major issue with adjacent development. Ms. Sheridan cited the Metro Gold Line Del Mar Station as an example, where the train coming out of the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) building and onto the pedestrian and roadway crossing has limited visibility. The guidelines would propose a sight line setback for operator visibility. Catenary wire clearance is another issue that could easily interrupt Metro Light Rail Transit (LRT) service. The guidelines would propose that a clear envelope around catenary wires be maintained in order to protect Metro infrastructure and to avoid service delays/shutdowns.

Developers excavating in adjacent property also present the potential for disrupting the structural integrity of Metro ROW. The guidelines would propose additional safety requirements if excavation is done within Metro’s track “foul zone” (area under the track that could pose a threat to track stability).

Many existing properties have driveways near Metro ROW and crossings, creating safety concerns and increasing the potential for train delays. The guidelines would propose relocating the driveways to reduce pedestrian/driveway conflicts near stations and tracks.

Ms. Sheridan elaborated that the guidelines are meant to help cities and developers through the design and construction process. The goal is to integrate these guidelines early in the development process, so that conflicts can be avoided later on.

Current resources for cities and developers include Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and Google Earth (KML) files that show all of Metro’s current ROW, a draft presentation to cities, and the existing Metro Adjacent Construction Manual. The next steps will be developing the Adjacent Development Handbook, a Metro Web Portal containing all the guidelines and necessary forms, and boilerplate policy language for Specific Plans and City Ordinances to protect Metro ROW.

Ms. Leonard asked which city departments were contacted by staff for this outreach? Ms. Sheridan replied that staff contacted the Planning Departments, but also requested that the department invite other city staff members they thought would benefit from the information. Ms. Leonard noted that many municipal transit agencies have service that extends beyond their respective city limits, which could potentially be along Metro’s ROW. She suggested that
staff also reach out to municipal transit agencies about the guidelines. Mr. Hernandez concurred with Ms. Leonard.

Ms. Sullivan asked who has control over those bus stops? Michelle Caldwell (BOS) replied that it depends on the location. She noted that Foothill Transit was not contacted by staff for outreach.

Larry Stevens (League of California Cities – San Gabriel Valley COG) asked if these guidelines are meant to serve as suggestions or requirements? He noted that Metro does not have any jurisdiction outside its ROW. Ms. Sheridan replied that the topic has been discussed internally with Metro’s Legal team. The main goal of these guidelines is safety, and she hopes these guidelines will help to educate cities and developers.

Mr. Stevens asked if exceptions for a Right of Entry permit will be made for maintenance of existing structures that have been built up to the Metro property line. Ms. Sheridan replied that the matter would be handled on a case by case basis.

Mr. Stevens asked if landscaping is allowed in the five foot setback, or is it meant to be completely empty? Ms. Sheridan replied that landscaping is allowed as long as the developer can construct and maintain the building without encroaching into Metro ROW. Mr. Stevens replied that walls cannot then be constructed along the property line because maintenance of those walls from graffiti would require encroachment. He commented that Metro’s guidelines should be very clear about what can and cannot be done in the five foot setback. Ferdy Chan (City of Los Angeles) added that the five foot setback does not belong to Metro. Ms. Sullivan elaborated that Metro cannot dictate what can or cannot occur within the setback, but would ask that any landscaping or objects do not encroach into Metro’s ROW or inhibit operator line of sight. Mr. Stevens replied that it is unreasonable to ask for a five foot setback while not allowing a developer to build a property line wall since that wall cannot be maintained without encroachment. Ms. Sullivan replied that Metro usually has a wall to protect their ROW. Mr. Stevens asked where such walls exist? Ms. Sullivan cited along the Gold Line. Mr. Stevens agreed the Gold Line has walls, but no other lines do. Ms. Sullivan asked if there was a specific example Mr. Stevens had in mind. Mr. Stevens replied that any property along the Metrolink Line from San Bernardino to Downtown Los Angeles. Ms. Sullivan replied that this project only focuses on ROW along Metro Lines.

David Kriske (League of California Cities – Arroyo Verdugo Cities) asked who would be the lead agency to contact for adjacent property development issues along Metrolink ROW? Ms. Sullivan replied that Metrolink would be the lead. She reiterated that these guidelines focus only on ROW along Metro Lines.

Mr. Stevens asked what is the expected turnaround time when cities submit plans to Metro for review? Ms. Sheridan replied that it would depend on the nature and scope of the project.

Mohammad Mostahkami (League of California Cities – Gateway Cities COG) asked if these discussions with cities and developers will turn into agreements? Ms. Sheridan replied that there could be maintenance agreements if there is landscaping or beautification that may occur along the edge of Metro ROW.
Mr. Stevens asked if the existing Adjacent Construction Manual is a draft or final? Ms. Sheridan replied that it is an existing final version, but staff is hoping to include design considerations with those guidelines. Mr. Stevens asked for clarification that the goal of this project is to produce a more user-friendly document. Ms. Sheridan confirmed. She elaborated that the current manual focuses exclusively on construction, and staff would instead like to inform cities and developers much earlier in the design phase.

Mr. Stevens suggested presenting these efforts to the Council of Governments (COGs) instead of presenting to each city individually.

Allen Abramson (League of California Cities – North Los Angeles County) asked how these guidelines will affect future Metro infrastructure developments. Will Metro be widening their own ROW width in order to avoid conflicts with adjacent developments? Ms. Sheridan replied that this is still being determined internally. With the current Purple Line Extension project, Metro has an agreement with the City of Los Angeles to review all projects that come within 500 feet of the Purple Line to ensure that nothing will disrupt the construction and operation of the project. This could be a template for future developments.

6. Metro Parking Demand Model (Frank Ching, Metro / Bernard Lee, Walker Parking Consultants / Sam Morrisey, Iteris)

Mr. Ching reported that the Metro Parking Demand Model was developed as part of the Parking Master Plan. Mr. Lee provided an overview of the Parking Demand Model. He reported that the model is based on current parking demand, so having parking occupancy data is key to the model.

The model components include base data, station typology assignment, demand ratios, and elasticity curve. Base data includes parking occupancy data, weekday boardings by hour, and TAP card activity (percentage of first tap of day on rail). The six station typologies include mid-point, terminus, terminus-urban, terminus-overflow, transfer, and transit hub.

The demand ratios looked at the peak number of parked cars as a percentage of weekday boardings, and riders who parked as a percentage of first tap rail riders from the time of a line's start of operations until 10:00 am. The demand elasticity curve looked at a baseline of free parking compared to the reductions in parking demand based on parking rate increments of $1.00 per day, up to a maximum of $30.00 per day. The elasticity curve applies only to transit rider parking behavior, but does not consider the behavior of non-transit riders who park.

Additional assumptions in the model are that each parking space accommodates an average of 1.1 cars per day and that there is an average of 1.1 transit riders per car. Mr. Lee reported that these assumptions are based on current literature on parking, but can be adjusted as needed.

Mr. Lee provided an example of the model with a hypothetical terminus station. The station assumed 1,000 weekday boardings, 350 of which are from the line's start of operations until 10:00 am, with 1.1 cars per parking space and 1.1 riders per vehicle. The assumptions yielded
parking demand results from low, high, and average, ranging from $0.00 per day to $3.00 per
day, in $1.00 increments.

Staff will continue to update and refine the model including: incorporating the Expo Line
Phase 2 and Gold Line Foothill Extension stations, refining typologies to reflect demographics
of station area or transit parker catchment area, updating demand ratios after Parking
Management Pilot Parking occupancy data becomes available, project schedule updates, and
the ongoing policy questions of planning for free parking or using pricing to manage demand.

Ms. Caldwell asked if the model can be used in the planning phase to better prepare for
parking demand of a new line? Mr. Morrissey replied that this model is used as an additional
tool to help better understand the parking demand at a station and refine the amount of
parking to be located at that station. The model looks at the existing parking characteristics of
people riding transit which will give a much better refined parking demand for new lines
based on station typologies.

Eric Widstrand (City of Long Beach) asked how often staff plans to reconsider the pricing
policy? Mr. Ching replied that staff will be reevaluating it every three months and noted that it
takes about three to four months to see parking shifts after pricing adjustments. He reported
that Metro is in the process of installing parking guidance systems so that staff can receive
daily real time parking data. He noted that because the turnover rate is so low, the amount of
change will not be comparable to models of on-street parking demand, and therefore staff
does not anticipate changes in pricing.

Dan Mitchell (City of Los Angeles) asked if the model considered the quality of service of a
particular station, such as a station served by rail versus one served only by rapid bus service.
Mr. Morrissey replied that by taking into account TAP card usage, the current station
typologies reflect how people are accessing each station. He elaborated that the model is
based on people riding rail, but also looks at where they came from to get to the rail.

Mr. Mitchell stated there has been an ongoing mindset that an increasing number of people
arrive at rail stations arrive by modes other than driving, so there is no need to provide for
parking. Since the model is only looking at riders who park at rail stations, Mr. Mitchell asked
how this study takes this into account? Mr. Morrissey stated that while that is true, there is
still a percentage of rail riders who need parking. The model is meant to help staff determine
what is the appropriate amount of parking to provide at each station. Mr. Ching replied that
as part of the Parking Master Plan, staff conducted surveys on the percentage of people
connecting to stations via bus, active transportation, or being dropped off, so those riders are
taken into consideration. He stated that the typologies acknowledge the different
characteristics of each station that will affect parking demand. He cited how the high number
of bus connections at the North Hollywood station would result in a lower parking demand
compared to the APU/Citrus College station.

Mr. Stevens asked for clarification that the goal of the model is to analyze existing Metro
parking facilities to help accommodate future parking demand? Mr. Morrissey confirmed.
Mr. Stevens commented that not all LRT stations are necessarily commuter-based and stated there may be a higher parking turnover rate than the 1.1 included in the model assumption. Mr. Morrissey agreed and replied that the parking turnover rate can be adjusted as more data becomes available.

Mr. Stevens commented that one way to influence parking demand is to have effective first last mile strategies. For instance, some universities and larger employers offer shuttle services to and from rail stations. Mr. Morrissey replied that the parking demand model is part of a broader project for the Parking Master Plan and is meant to look at people who park their cars in order to take transit.

Mr. Stevens suggested paying attention to terminus stations that might be classified into at least one additional station typology. He cited that the Sierra Madre Villa station is twice the size it needs to be now that it is no longer a terminus station; while the APU/Citrus College station has too little parking as a terminus station. He noted that APU/Citrus College station may be correctly sized if the Gold Line is extended beyond; however, the APU Citrus College station could remain the terminus for the next 15 years if Measure M does not pass. He suggested being able to distinguish the parking demand difference between a temporary terminus and a permanent terminus. Mr. Morrissey replied that this is an important topic that was brought up when the project team presented to Metro's planning staff. He noted that this model will be an important tool to help planners decide what type of parking facility will be the most cost-effective and appropriate for a station, such as investing in a parking structure for a permanent terminus or creating only surface parking for a temporary terminus that can later be redeveloped into a TOD. The model is meant to be a tool to better help planners when making these decisions in the planning process.

Mr. Stevens suggested that Metro could have partnered with Azusa Pacific University and Citrus College to build parking on their property and then turn the land back over when the APU/Citrus College station is no longer the terminus. Ms. Caldwell noted that Foothill Transit has also offered Metro land to develop parking. Mr. Ching noted that staff has been working with Foothill Transit.

Mr. Abramson asked if the model has identified a price cap for parking demand? Mr. Ching replied that the current price cap is $5.00. He elaborated that staff is trying not to have the parking price exceed the overall commuting cost. He noted that the biggest factor influencing parking demand was not the price of parking, which was $2.00 per day in the Paid Parking Pilot Program, but rather the TAP card identifier that requires proof of using the transit system in order to receive the discounted parking rate.

Mr. Abramson asked if the project team looked into where riders were coming from when they parked? Mr. Ching replied that the only data they have is the riders’ address from Metro parking permits. He noted that he will contact the survey team to see if they have any additional data.

Valerie Watson (Pedestrian Coordinator) asked if the Parking Master Plan will be quantifying benefits from a public health or sustainability perspective when comparing the costs and benefits of building parking versus first last mile improvements? Mr. Ching replied that the
Parking team incorporates sustainability and transportation demand management (TDM) elements into Metro’s Long Range Transportation Plan to reduce parking demand and encourage TOD redevelopment of surface parking space when it is no longer needed.

Mr. Stevens asked how the model will apply to transit lines that have been approved but have not yet been built? Ms. Caldwell commented that Metro could also decide against meeting the parking demand because it is too expensive for a project that has already been approved. Mr. Morrissey replied that the planning staff is looking to see how they can use the model to get a more refined idea of the parking demand for their projects. Planning staff should be consulted for more details on how they will apply the model.

Mr. Stevens asked if the project team has looked into how autonomous vehicles will affect parking demand. Mr. Ching replied that he recently attended a National Parking Association conference that had discussion on autonomous vehicles. The general consensus was that autonomous vehicles will somewhat reduce parking demand, but not by much. He noted that autonomous vehicles still need to be parked. Mr. Stevens stated that autonomous vehicles may not need to be parked if they are operated by a car sharing service. Mr. Ching replied that is why it may reduce parking demand by a small amount.

7. **Open Streets Grant Program – Round 2 (Brett Thomas, Metro)**

Mr. Thomas reported that an Open Streets event is a car-free event where the street is opened to pedestrians, bikes, and other forms of non-automobile transport. Los Angeles County has the largest Open Streets program in North America, with some events drawing close to 100,000 people. The goals of the Open Streets Grant Program are to have people participate in active transportation in an urban environment for the first time, encourage sustainable transportation and mode sharing, and encourage cities to further develop their multi-modal policies.

Mr. Thomas reported that Metro implemented 10 out of 12 approved events from the Open Streets Cycle 1 grant. One event in the City of Carson was canceled due to financial constraints and the 626 Golden Streets was postponed due to the wildfires in June 2016. On the day of Open Streets events, there is a 10% increase in systemwide ridership and a 17% increase in TAP day pass purchases. Mr. Thomas noted that on the day of CicLAvia Pasadena, Gold Line ridership increased 35%. The Board directed a Cycle 1 evaluation study and ridership analysis. Staff is currently in the procurement process for that study.

The Board approved the Open Streets Cycle 2 grant program in September 2016, with a total of $4.14 million to award to 17 new Open Streets events through December 2018. The Board also approved a budget amendment of up to $200,000 to provide the funding required for the 626 Golden Streets event that was postponed in June 2016 as well as reprogram $100,000 towards Cycle 2 from the canceled event in Carson.

Mr. Thomas reported that Metro received 19 applications for Cycle 2, of which 17 were recommended for funding. The funding requests totaled $4.25 million, of which $4.04 million was recommended. The Board directed that extra points be applied to cities that had never held an Open Streets event, disadvantaged communities, and multi-jurisdictional events. Of the recommended applications, 23 cities were represented, 11 first-time cities, 13
disadvantaged communities, and seven multi-jurisdictional events. Funding was programmed from FY 2017 to FY 2019. The grant cycle length is 2.5 years.

The next steps for Cycle 2 are to execute the Funding Agreements, to work with Metro Community Relations on an engagement strategy, and to stage the first Cycle 2 event on November 12, 2016 in the City of Long Beach.

Mr. Mostahkami asked how businesses are impacted during the Open Streets events? Mr. Thomas replied that there is typically a 10% overall increase in business activity along an Open Streets route, but the increase varies depending on the type of business. Mr. Thomas reported that restaurants typically see a 20% increase. Staff encourages cities applying for a grant to place the Open Streets route directly on a commercial corridor so they may take advantage of those economic benefits.

Mr. Mitchell asked if there have been any attempts from cities who hosted an event in Cycle 1 to share information to the newer cities hosting an Open Streets event? He noted that he has seen great discrepancies in the staffing and preparation levels at different Open Streets events from different cities. Mr. Thomas replied that staff wrote guidelines in the Cycle 2 application to create a more standardized Open Streets event for all of Los Angeles County. The guidelines include a standard cost per mile and standard length of route. He noted that staff required cities to collect and present a certain amount of data for evaluation in the Cycle 1 application process which helped to develop these standardizations. That requirement was removed in Cycle 2 and instead staff will have one vendor conduct the data collection for all applicants so that there is a uniform set of data. Mr. Mitchell commented that standardizing a cost per mile is a good idea.

Mr. Mitchell suggested dedicating the increased transit revenue generated from the Open Streets event back into the Open Streets Grant Program.

Mr. Stevens commented that it is difficult for cities to calculate a cost per mile because they don’t have enough experience with these events. He suggested creating a more common strategy for dealing with cost per mile. He commented that there is still a lot of work to be done in convincing elected officials and businesses about the benefits of Open Streets events, especially in suburban communities. He suggested that staff create more educational material in order to attract new applicants and more multi-jurisdictional events. Justine Garcia (LTSS) agreed and suggested that Metro reach out to businesses, non-profit organizations, and youth groups to educate them about the benefits and get them involved.

Ms. Leonard asked what is the source of the Open Streets Grant funds? Mr. Thomas replied that Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funding was used for Cycle 1, and Local Funds will be used for Cycle 2.

8. FY 17-18 Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant (Dan Kopulsky/Charles Lau, Caltrans)
A copy of the Caltrans FY 17-18 Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant presentation was included in the October 5, 2016 TAC agenda.
Mr. Kopulsky reported that there are two grants available as part of the Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant: Strategic Partnerships and Sustainable Communities. Both grants are meant for the planning phase only, not engineering or environmental.

The California Transportation Plan 2040 was released in June 2016 and is more aligned with the state's goals in the grant program. Applicants need to identify at least one of the following Overarching Objectives to be considered for grant funding: sustainability, preservation, mobility, safety, innovation, economy, health, and equity.

Mr. Kopulsky reported that $1.5 million will be available for the FY 2017-2018 Strategic Partnerships grant cycle, with a 20% minimum Local Match of the total project amount. The minimum grant is $100,000 and the maximum grant is $1 million for Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and $500,000 for all others. For the Sustainable Communities grant, $7.8 million will be available, with a 11.47% Local Match of the total project amount. The minimum grant amount is $50,000 and the maximum grant is $1 million for MPOs and $500,000 for all others. It is funded by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the State Highway Account. The FTA has authorized Caltrans to distribute the grant funds. The purpose of the grant is 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 achieve programmed system improvements.

Eligible primary applicants for both the Strategic Partnerships grant and Sustainable Communities grant include: MPOs and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) with a current Master Fund Transfer Agreement with Caltrans Headquarters Office of Regional Planning. Universities, community colleges, Native American Tribal Governments, cities and counties, community-based organizations, non-profit organizations, and other public entities are eligible to apply as sub-applicants.

Mr. Kopulsky reported that the Local Match requirement can be in cash, third party in-kind, 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.

Mr. Kopulsky reviewed a list of example project types that would qualify as well as competitive applications. He stated that only about one-third of applications receive awards. He encouraged applicants to contact him and submit a draft for him to review before final submission.

Mr. Kopulsky announced that the deadline for grant applications is November 4, 2016 by 5:00 pm via email. Applicants will be notified of application decisions via email in March or April 2017. Awarded projects may begin grant-funded work in either July or September/October 2017, pending State Budget approval. Mr. Kopulsky reported that if an applicant applies through an MPO or RTPA, they can anticipate a start date of July 2017 (pending State Budget approval), a project end date of June 30, 2020, and file a final request for reimbursement no more than 60 days after the end of the fiscal year to coincide with the submission of the Overall Work Program Final Expenditure Plan. Cities, counties, transit agencies, and Native
American Tribes who do not apply through an MPO or RTPA will have an anticipated start date of September/October 2017 (pending State Budget approval), a project end date of February 2020, with all final invoices submitted to Caltrans for reimbursement by April 28, 2020.

Mr. Mostahkami asked to whom applicants should send the draft applications for review? Mr. Kopulsky said to email him at dan.kopulsky@dot.ca.gov or Mr. Lau at charles.lau@dot.ca.gov.

Ms. Caldwell asked for clarification that applying through the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is optional but not required. Mr. Kopulsky confirmed that is correct. He stated that going through SCAG has many administrative advantages. They will take care of all invoicing, hiring of consultants, and assigning a project manager; and the project schedule will also be given an additional six months.

Mr. Kopulsky announced that the 2017 Active Transportation Program (ATP) Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund Guidelines Workshop will be taking place on October 5, 2016, from 1:00 – 4:00 pm at Sacramento City Hall. Mr. Kopulsky provided the phone number for anyone to call in to participate in the workshop.

9. Legislative Update (Michael Turner/Raffi Hamparian, Metro)
State
Mr. Turner reported that the Legislative session is over. 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 the previous uncertainty of AB-32 had led to low levels of cap and trade auctions. Another contributing factor was the lawsuit being filed by the California Chamber of Commerce. 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.

Mr. Turner reported that the Legislature passed a bill allocating approximately $900 million that was held over from previous cap and trade auctions, of which $135 million can be used for transit capital projects through a discretionary program for which agencies can apply. Mr. Turner stated that it is unclear how much of the $135 million will be used for projects already authorized and how much will be used for new transit projects. Staff is waiting for California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) to sort it out.

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). Mr. Turner reported that 54 votes are required in the State Assembly and
27 votes are required in the State Senate to pass the bill. So far one Assembly Member and one Senator have agreed on the proposal, so 53 more Assembly Members and 26 more Senators are needed. Mr. Turner reported that the regular session is over but the extraordinary session can continue at least through the end of November 2016. There has been some discussion that the Legislature may return and reconvene a special session to vote. Mr. Turner also reported that the Public Private Partnership authorization and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) delegation are expiring and may not be resolved if the special session does not take place.

Federal
Mr. Hamparian reported that the Federal Legislature postponed most decisions until after November 8, 2016 (Election Day). They passed a Continuing Resolution to continue operating the federal government, which expires on December 9, 2016. Congress will reconvene 31 days after Election Day.

The United States Department of Transportation allocated the following federal grants: Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER), Fostering Advancements in Shipping and Transportation for the Long-term Achievement of National Efficiencies (FASTLANE), TOD Pilot Program, and Bus and Bus Facilities. Almost all but three grants under the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act have been announced for 2016. Mr. Hamparian reported that there has been discussion of conducting another round of FASTLANE grants.

Mr. Hamparian reported that Congresswoman Karen Bass worked to get an amendment of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Bill adopted. The amendment would prioritize Local Hire for projects that use federal funds. The Obama Administration started a pilot program for Local Hire in 2015 which was extended from March 2016 to March 2017. Mr. Hamparian reported that staff is trying to petition the federal government to make the program permanent, which is also in the purview of the Executive Branch.

Adjournment
Ms. Pan adjourned the meeting and reported that the next scheduled TAC meeting is November 2, 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.
## TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
### Sign in Sheet
### October 5, 2016

<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>BICYCLE COORDINATOR</td>
<td>1. Rich Dilluvio/Michelle Mowery</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>CALTRANS</td>
<td>1. Gary Slater/Steve Novotny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Greg Farr/Kelly Lepare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVE ON ADA</td>
<td>1. Ellen Blackman/Vacant</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>
</tbody>
</table>
| CITY OF LOS ANGELES          | 1. K. Redler  
Vacant/Corinne Ralph  
2. G. Lamorous  
Dan Mitchell/Carlos Rios  
3. Ferdy Chan  
Ferdy Chan/Kevin Minne |
| COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES        | 1. Richard Marshall  
Richard Marshall/Ayala Ben-Yehuda  
2. John Walker  
John Walker/Inez Yeung  
3. Pat Proano  
Pat Proano/Allan Abramson |
| LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES  | 1. Arroyo Verdugo Cities  
David Kriske/Roubik Golanian  
2. Gateway Cities COG  
Mohammd Mostahkami/Lisa Rapp  
3. Las Virgenes Malibu COG  
Robert Brager/Elizabeth Shavelson  
4. North Los Angeles County  
Mike Behen/Allan Thompson  
5. San Gabriel Valley COG  
Larry Stevens/Craig Bradshaw  
6. San Fernando Valley COG  
Jason Smisko/Wayne Ko  
7. South Bay Cities COG  
Robert Basta/Ted Semaan  
8. Westside Cities COG  
David Feinberg/Sharon Perlstein |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE (LTSS)</td>
<td>Sebastian Hernandez/Perri Goodman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justine Garcia/Linda Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (Metro)</td>
<td>Fanny Pau/Brian Lam Countywide Planning &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane Corral-Lopez/Carolyn Kreslake Metro Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDESTRIAN COORDINATOR</td>
<td>Valerie Watson/Dale Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>Susan Price/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY (SCARRA - Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>Anne Louise Rice/Karen Sakoda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SCAQMD -- Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>Eyvonne Drummonds/Kathryn Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG -- Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>Warren Whiteaker/Annie Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>Lupe Valdez/LaDonna DiCamillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/ SUSTAINABILITY SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>Vacant/Phil Aker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Hunter/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Koplicky</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Peretzissey</td>
<td>I-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Levy</td>
<td>Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocelyn Levy</td>
<td>Union Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Loughy</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Kim/Stephen Finnegan (A)</td>
<td>AUTO CLUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Dillavou/Michelle Mowery (A)</td>
<td>BOYSCOLE COORDINATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Caldwell/Susan Lipman (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Leonard/Gloria Gallardo (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgt. Dave Neilson/Oc. Christian Cragg (A)</td>
<td>CHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Slater/Steve Novotny (A)</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Farn/Kelly Lamare (A)</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Blakeman/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>CITIZEN REP ON ADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Widstrand/Nathan Baird (A)</td>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant/Corrine Ralph (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Mitchell/Carlos Rios (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferdy Chan/Kevin Minne (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Marshalian/Ayala Ben-Yehuda (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Walker/Inez Yeung (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Proano/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kriske/Roubik Golarian (A)</td>
<td>ARROYO VERDUGO CITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Mostahkami/Lisa Rapp (A)</td>
<td>GATEWAY CITIES COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Brager/Ramiro Adeva (A)</td>
<td>LAS VIRGENES MALIBU COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Behen/Allen Thompson (A)</td>
<td>NORTH LA COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Stevens/ Craig Bradshaw (A)</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL VALLEY COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Newman/Wayne Ko (A)</td>
<td>SAN FERNANDO VALLEY COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bestle/Ted Semaan (A)</td>
<td>SOUTH BAY CITIES COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Feinberg/Sharon Perlstein (A)</td>
<td>WEST SIDE CITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian Hernandez/Pern Goodman (A)</td>
<td>TSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justine Garcia/Linda Evans (A)</td>
<td>LTSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanny Pan/Brian Lam (A)</td>
<td>METRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Corral-Lopez/Carolyne Kreslak (A)</td>
<td>METRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Watson/Deb Benson (A)</td>
<td>PED COORDINATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH COORDINATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Louise Roe/Karen Sakoda (A)</td>
<td>SCORRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyvonne Drummond/Kathryn Higgins (A)</td>
<td>SCAG MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Whiteaker/Annie Nam (A)</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupe Valdez/LaDonna DiCamillo (A)</td>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Bagenh/Phil Aker (A)</td>
<td>TDM/SUST SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hunter/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>TDM/SUST SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FY 2017 Pass-Through Grants Schedule
### FY 2017 Pass-Through Grants (S.5310, S.5316, S.5317)

**Tentative Timeline of Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop Working Group Recommendations</td>
<td>Sept. 14, Sept. 21, Oct. 5,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee Approval (AAC – 11/10, BOS – 10/18, LTSS – 10/20)</td>
<td>October/November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee/Board Approval: Allocation Process, Solicitation, Application, Evaluation Criteria, Access Services Funding</td>
<td>January 4, 19, and 26, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Solicitation/ Release Application; FTA Grant Application - (Access Services)</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convene Potential Applicant Workshops (min. 3)*</td>
<td>February - March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5310/5317 Applications Due</td>
<td>April 28, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Complete</td>
<td>May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Notifications &amp; Appeals</td>
<td>May/June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee/Board Approval: Solicitation Funding Awards</td>
<td>June 15/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Grant Application - (5310) &amp; FTA Grant Amendment (5317)</td>
<td>July 1, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Grant Approval</td>
<td>September 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5316 JARC Applications Due</td>
<td>June 22, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Complete</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Notifications &amp; Appeals</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee/Board Approval: Solicitation Funding Awards</td>
<td>August /September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Grant Amendment- (5316)</td>
<td>November/December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Grant Approval</td>
<td>March 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Additional workshops organized by supervisory district, audience, category, and one-on-one meetings with potential applicants may be organized as requested.
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Section 5310 Working Group
Recommendations
Section 5310 Working Group Recommendation
FY 2017 Allocation Process for Section 5310, 5316 and 5317 Funds

The Section 5310 Working Group comprised of members from the Accessibility Advisory Committee, BOS and LTSS recommends the following 2017 allocation process for federal Section 5310 fund apportionments, and repurposed Section 5316 and Section 5317 funds:

1. Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program funds:

Metro will manage a competitive Solicitation for Proposals for the urbanized areas (UZAs) of Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, Lancaster-Palmdale, and Santa Clarita for 3 federal fiscal year apportionments (2015, 2016, and 2017) totaling $20,875,471.

- Metro will receive 5% of funds for administration and program support.
- Access Services will receive 49% of funds for eligible “Traditional Capital” projects.
- 46% of funds will be allocated through a competitive Solicitation for Proposals for “Traditional Capital” and “Other Capital & Operating” (New Freedom type) projects.
- Up to 5% of Solicitation funding will be set-aside for appeals. Unused set-aside balances will be re-allocated to projects underfunded within that UZA.
- The funding split between Traditional Capital and Other Capital & Operating is 87%/13% respectively.
- Funding recommendations will be flexible between the two Solicitation funding categories if one is undersubscribed and the other is oversubscribed.

2. Section 5316 Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) Program funds:

- Metro will concurrently manage a competitive solicitation for capital and operating projects eligible for $7,607,181 in repurposed JARC funds in the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim UZA.
- Up to 5% of funds will be set-aside for appeals. Unused set-aside balances will be re-allocated to underfunded projects.

3. Section 5317 New Freedom (NF) Program funds:

- Metro will concurrently manage a competitive solicitation for capital and operating projects eligible for $665,306 in repurposed NF funds in the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim UZA.
- Up to 5% of funds will be set-aside for appeals. Unused set-aside balances will be re-allocated to underfunded projects.

Balances remaining from competitive solicitations (1-3 above) shall be rolled-over to future solicitations.

See attached proposed 2017 Funding Allocation (S.5310, S.5316, S.5317) tables
### FY 2017 Funding Allocation (S.5310, S.5316, S.5317)

#### Section 5310 APPORTIONMENTS - FEDERAL FY 2015, 2016, and 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urbanized Area</th>
<th>FFY 15 Apportionment (MAP-21)</th>
<th>FFY 16 Apportionment (FAST Act)</th>
<th>FFY 17 Apportionment (FAST Act)</th>
<th>Total Apportionment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles UZA</td>
<td>6,449,653</td>
<td>6,586,219</td>
<td>6,717,943</td>
<td>$19,753,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster-Palmdale UZA</td>
<td>210,462</td>
<td>222,958</td>
<td>227,417</td>
<td>$660,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita UZA</td>
<td>147,182</td>
<td>155,266</td>
<td>158,371</td>
<td>$460,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td><strong>$6,807,297</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,964,443</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,103,731</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,875,471</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lapse date July 1, 2017.**

#### Section 5310 ALLOCATION - FY 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urbanized Area</th>
<th>FFY 15 / FFY 16 / FFY 17</th>
<th>Access Services</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Solicitation</th>
<th>Total Solicitation</th>
<th>Appeals Set-Aside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional Cap</td>
<td>Other Cap &amp; Operating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles UZA</td>
<td>19,753,815</td>
<td>9,679,369</td>
<td>987,691</td>
<td>6,716,297</td>
<td>2,373,458</td>
<td>9,086,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster-Palmdale UZA(^1)</td>
<td>660,837</td>
<td>271,101</td>
<td>33,042</td>
<td>224,685</td>
<td>132,009</td>
<td>356,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita UZA(^2)</td>
<td>460,819</td>
<td>188,940</td>
<td>23,041</td>
<td>156,678</td>
<td>92,159</td>
<td>248,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td><strong>$20,875,471</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,139,411</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,043,774</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,097,660</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,591,627</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,692,287</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percent Share**
- Los Angeles UZA: 100% (49%)
- Administration: 5%
- Solicitation: 34%

\(^1\)Adjusted to reduce 2015 advanced Access allocation by -$2,709; increase Solicitation allocation by +$52,709. Percent share adjusted by -/+ 1%

\(^2\)Adjusted to reduce 2015 advanced Access allocation by -$36,861; increase Solicitation allocation by +$36,861. Percent share adjusted by -/+ 1%

#### Section 5316/Section 5317 ALLOCATION - FY 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repurposed Fund Source</th>
<th>Los Angeles UZA</th>
<th>Solicitation</th>
<th>Total Solicitation</th>
<th>Appeals Set-Aside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.5316 JARC</td>
<td>7607181</td>
<td>7607181</td>
<td>7607181</td>
<td>380359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.5317 NF</td>
<td>665306</td>
<td>665306</td>
<td>665306</td>
<td>33265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td><strong>$8272487</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8272487</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8272487</strong></td>
<td><strong>$413624</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percent Share**
- Los Angeles UZA: 100%
- Solicitation: 100%

**Appeals Set-Aside:** 5%
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Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program
Draft Guidelines

I. Purpose

On May 26, 2016, the Metro Board of Directors approved the creation of the Metro Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program (Program). This program allowed local agencies to exchange their remaining federal transportation earmark dollar amount with Metro for local funds, less a three percent administration fee. In doing so, local agencies and Metro were able to strategically repurpose unused federal transportation earmarks, provide local agencies more flexible local funds, and accelerate critical transportation investments. These guidelines are intended to govern the Program from project development through reimbursement and final close out.

II. Program Goals

a. Expeditious execution of Funding Agreements between Metro and project sponsors;

b. Expeditious implementation of transportation projects in Los Angeles County; and

c. Maximize the amount of funds available to Los Angeles County to deliver transportation projects.

III. Eligible Agencies

Any local agency in Los Angeles County which agreed to exchange the value of their federal transportation earmark with Metro is eligible for the Program.

IV. Funding Availability and Timeline

Funding availability is determined by the value of the earmark for each respective agency, less three percent. Prior to submission of the Project/Program Request Form, Metro will confirm the funding amount with the project sponsor.

Metro anticipates funding being available in Spring 2017. Local agencies will have until July 1, 2019 to execute a Funding Agreement with Metro.
Project sponsors will be reimbursed on a quarterly basis consistent with the schedule described in Section VII. Project sponsors will have until July 1, 2019 to execute a Funding Agreement with Metro. Once a Funding Agreement is in place, project sponsors will have an additional 36 months to complete the project and submit final invoices.

V. Eligible Activities

To facilitate the exchange of federal transportation funds for local measure transportation funds. The proposed project or program must support transit and/or decrease single-occupancy vehicle trips. In all cases, transit service must be provided on the street or road on which the project or program is proposed. The following projects and programs are eligible for this fund source:

a. Arterial/Transitway lanes and arterial capacity enhancing projects;
b. Transportation Demand Management (TDM);
c. Incident Management Programs;
d. Park and Ride Lots;
e. Freeway/Arterial Transportation Systems Management (TSM);
f. Regional Bikeways

These broad eligible activities are intended to allow project sponsors to easily identify existing or new transportation projects.

VI. Exceptions

In some instances, the value of the earmark being exchanged is insufficient to deliver an eligible transportation project or program. Metro staff will work with project sponsors on a case-by-case basis to either identify a new project or to find a more compatible fund source to deliver the proposed transportation project or program.

VII. General and Administration Conditions

a. **Project/Program Request Form.** Project sponsor must complete the Project/Program Request Form prior to initiation of the Funding Agreement. The Project/Program Request Form must be signed by an authorized individual and be accompanied by a Council or other governing board resolution committing the sponsor to completing the project.
sponsors will need to secure an approved Project/Program Request Form prior to initiation of the Funding Agreement.

b. **Funding Agreement.** Each project sponsor must execute a Funding Agreement with Metro. The Agreement will include the statement of work, including objectives to be achieved, the financial plan reflecting funding amount as well as a schedule and deliverables. The schedule must demonstrate that the project will be completed within 36 months from the date of the full Fund Agreement execution (both parties). Before and after photographic documentation will be required.

c. **Duration of Projects.** Schedule must demonstrate that the project or program can be completed, including related actions by the project sponsor, within 36 months from the date of the full Funding Agreement execution. A project will be considered complete by the submittal of the final invoice.

d. **Funding Reimbursements.** Project sponsors will be reimbursed on a quarterly basis subject to satisfactory compliance to schedule as demonstrated in a quarterly progress/expense report supported by a detailed invoice demonstrating the staff and hours charged to the project, any consultant hours, materials, etc. An amount equal to five percent (5%) of each invoice will be retained until final completion of the project and audit. In addition, final retention payment will be withheld until the project is complete and approved by Metro and all audit requirements including before and after photographs have been satisfied. All quarterly progress/expense reports will be due on the last day of the months of November, February, May and August.

e. **Audits.** All program funding is subject to Metro audit. The findings of the audit are final.

**VIII. Funding Agreement Lapsing Policy**

Project sponsor must demonstrate timely use of Funds by:

a. Executing a Funding Agreement by July 1, 2019 of receiving approval of the Project/Program Request Form from Metro staff;

b. Meeting the Project milestones due dates as stated in the Scope of Work;

c. Submitting the Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Reports within 60 days after the close of each quarter on the last day of the months November, February, May and August; and,
d. Expending the Funds within 36 months from the date of the full Funding Agreement execution.

If the Project sponsor fails to meet any of the above conditions, the Project shall be considered lapsed and will be submitted to the Board for deobligation. Expenses that are not invoiced within 60 days after the lapsing date are not eligible for reimbursement.

Administrative extensions may be granted under the following conditions:

1. Project delay due to an unforeseen and extraordinary circumstance beyond the control of project sponsor (legal challenge, act of god, etc.). Inadequate staffing shall not be considered as a basis for administrative extensions;

2. Project delay due to action that results in a change in project scope or schedule that is mutually agreed upon by Metro and the project sponsor prior to the extension request; and

3. Project is contractually obligated, however, a time extension is needed to complete construction that is already underway.

Metro will extend the project only once, for a period of up to 20 months. Appeals to any recommended deobligation will be heard by Metro’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

If Project sponsor does not complete an element of the Project, as described in the Scope of Work, due to all or a portion of the Funds lapsing, the remaining project funds may be subject to deobligation at Metro’s sole discretion.

IX. Metro Staff Contact

Steven Mateer
Manager, Transportation Planning
213-922-2504
mateers@metro.net

Wil Ridder
Executive Officer, Strategic Financial Planning and Programming
213-922-2887
ridderw@metro.net
Attachment 7

Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program Project Request Form
Metro Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange
Project/Program Request Form

This form is intended to assist Metro staff determine the eligibility of your agency’s proposed projects and/or programs for the Metro Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program. Please fill out this form in its entirety.

1. Project/Program Description and Scope of Work
   a. Please provide a short description of the proposed project/program, including project limits, transit lines, and anticipated benefits.

   b. Please indicate under which of the following categories your project/program falls (you may select more than one):

     - Arterial/Transitway lanes and arterial capacity enhancing projects
     - Transportation Demand Management (TDM)
     - Incident Management Programs
     - Park and Ride Lots
     - Freeway/Arterial Transportation Systems Management (TSM)
     - Regional Bikeways
     - Other (Please describe below how your project support transit and/or reduced single-occupancy vehicle trips):

   [Blank space for project description]
2. Project/Program Schedule and Funding

a. Please indicate the anticipated completion date of the following milestones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Please indicate the proposed funding by phase and fiscal year (fill out to nearest dollar):

**Funding Source: Proposition C 25% (Exchanged Funds)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>FY2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Source: Other (including other federal, state, local)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>FY2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Signature and Council Resolution

A person duly authorized to sign for the organization (city manager, general manager, executive director, planning director, or authorized official) must sign and certify the application. The information contained in this application will become the foundation for the funding agreement with Metro.

Please attach City Council’s (or similar governing board’s) resolution committing to completing the proposed project/program.

I certify that I have reviewed the Guidelines and that the information submitted in this application is true and correct and in accordance with the guidelines. I agree that I will adhere to the requirements and guidelines of the program.

___________________________  ___________________________
Name       Title

___________________________  ___________________________
Signature      Date