Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

William Mulholland Conference Room

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  (Sebastian Hernandez)
   Streets and Freeways  (Fulgene Asuncion)
   TDM/Sustainability  (Mike Bagheri)
   Attachment 1: Subcommittee Agendas
   Attachment 2: Subcommittee Actions

3. Chairperson's Report
   5 min  Information (Fanny Pan)

4. Consent Calendar
   • Approval of Minutes  Action
   Attachment 3: Draft June 7, 2017 Minutes

5. Measure M Guidelines
   http://theplan.metro.net/  Information (Kalieh Honish)
   15 min

6. LRTP Update
   10 min  Information (Kalieh Honish)

7. Federal Earmark Repurposing Update
   15 min  Information (Steven Mateer)

8. CTC’s Local Streets and Roads Program
   10 min  Information (Zoe Unruh)

9. ATP Update
   5 min  Information (Shelly Quan)
10. Legislative Update
   Information
   15 min
   (Raffi Hamparian/Michael Turner)

11. Other Business

12. Adjournment

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

Please call Brian Lam at (213) 922-3077 or e-mail lamb@metro.net with questions regarding the agenda or meeting. The next meeting will be on September 6, 2017 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
William Mulholland Conference Room – 15th Floor
9:30 am

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

2. Approval of April 18, 2017 Minutes
   (1 minute)   
   Action
   BOS

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

4. Metro Report
   (5 minutes)   
   Information
   Scott Hartwell

5. FTA Update
   (10 minutes)   
   Information
   Arianna Valle/Adam Stephenson/Stacy Alameida

6. Regional Marketing Presentation
   (10 minutes)   
   Information
   Dia Turner

7. TAP Update
   (15 minutes)   
   Information
   David Sutton

8. Metro Office of Extraordinary Innovation Update
   (10 minutes)   
   Information
   Joshua Schank

9. Regional Ridership Task Force Update
   (10 minutes)   
   Information
   Conan Cheung

10. Access Update
    (10 minutes)   
    Information
    Matthew Avancena
11. Transit Industry Debriefing/Updates | Information  
* (5 minutes)  

12. New Business | Information  

13. 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
- FY2016 Section 5307 Balance
- FY2017 Section 5307 Balance
- Combined FY2016 & FY2017 Section 5307 Balance

BOS Agenda Packages can be accessed online at: [https://www.metro.net/about/bos/](https://www.metro.net/about/bos/)

Please call SCOTT HARTWELL at 213-922-2836 or ANNELLE ALBARRAN at 213-922-4025 if you have questions regarding the agenda or meeting. The next BOS meeting will be held on Tuesday, August 15, 2017, 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

2. Approval of Minutes
   Action (Subcommittee)
   Attachment 1: May 18, 2017 Minutes
   Attachment 2: Sign-in Sheet/Attendance Sheet
   Attachment 3: 90-Day Rolling Agenda

3. Chair Report
   Information (Bahman Janka)
   5 min

4. Metro Report
   Information (Fulgene Asuncion)
   5 min

5. Caltrans Update
   Information (Steve Novotny)
   5 min

6. CTC Update
   Information (Zoe Unruh/Patricia Chen)
   5 min

7. 2017 Call Recertification/Deobligation/Extension
   Information (Fanny Pan)
   5 min
   Attachment 4: Recertification List
   Attachment 5: Deobligation List
   Attachment 6: Extension List
   Attachment 7: May 3, 2017 TAC Appeals Summary
8. Westside Purple Line Extension Update  
   Information (Roger Martin)  
   15 min

9. Eastside Gold Line Extension Update  
   Information (Laura Cornejo/Jill Liu)  
   15 min

10. Metro Bike Share Update  
    Information (Avital Shavit/Brett Thomas)  
    15 min

11. ATP Update  
    Information (Shelly Quan)  
    5 min

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

13. New Business  
    5 min

14. Adjournment  
    1 min

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

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

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

William Mulholland Conference Room – 15th Floor

1. Call to Order
   
   Action (Bahman Janka)

2. Approval of Minutes
   
   Attachment 1: June 15, 2017 Minutes
   Attachment 2: Sign-in Sheet/Attendance Sheet
   Attachment 3: 90-Day Rolling Agenda

   Action (Subcommittee)

3. Vice Chair Election

   Action (Subcommittee)

4. Chair Report

   Information (Bahman Janka)

5. Metro Report

   Information (Fulgene Asuncion)

6. Measure M Guidelines Update

   Information (Kalieh Honish)

7. Caltrans Update

   Information (Steve Novotny)

8. CTC Update

   Information (Zoe Unruh/Patricia Chen)
9. ATP Update  
5 min  
Information (Shelly Quan)

10. SR-91 (Central Avenue to Paramount Blvd) PSR-PDS  
15 min  
Information (Lucy Olmos)

11. Northwest 138 Corridor Update  
15 min  
Information (Isidro Panuco)

12. Regional Integration of Intelligent Transportation Systems  
15 min  
Information (Kali Fogel)

13. First-Last Mile Update  
10 min  
Information (Jacob Lieb)

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

15. New Business  
5 min

16. Adjournment  
1 min

The next meeting for the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee will be held on August 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/
Attachment 2

Subcommittee Actions
Disposition of Subcommittee Actions

June 2017

Bus Operations Subcommittee:

- Did not meet in June

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:

- Did not meet in June

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:

- Approved the May 18, 2017 meeting minutes

TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee:

- Did not meet in June

July 2017

Bus Operations Subcommittee:

- Approved the April 18, 2017 meeting minutes

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:

- Did not meet in July

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:

- Approved the June 15, 2017 meeting minutes
- Elected Nicole Benyamin (Las Virgines Malibu COG) as Vice Chair

TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee:

- Did not meet in July
Attachment 3

June 7, 2017 TAC Minutes

June 7, 2017 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 9:36 A.M., took roll and declared a quorum was present.

2. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees

   Bus Operations Subcommittee (BOS)
   - Last met on May 16, 2017
   - Received updates on:
     - Formula Allocation Procedure (FAP) Approval
     - New Low Income Fare Program
     - FY 18 Budget Funding Marks
     - Access Services
   - Next meeting is scheduled for June 20, 2017

   Local Transit Systems Subcommittee (LTSS)
   - Last met on May 18, 2017
   - Received updates on:
     - Metro Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Presentation
     - FY 18 Budget Funding Marks for FAP
     - Measure M Local Return Guidelines
     - NTD Shared-Ride Policy on Taxicabs
   - Next meeting is scheduled for July 20, 2017 (tentative)

   Streets and Freeways Subcommittee
   - Last met on May 18, 2017
   - Received updates on:
     - West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor
     - Rail to Rail/River Active Transportation Corridor
     - I-710 South Corridor
     - I-605 Corridor Hotspot Program
• Next meeting is scheduled for June 15, 2017

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Sustainability Subcommittee
• Did not meet in May
• Next meeting is scheduled for September 2017

3. Chairperson’s Report (Fanny Pan, Metro)
A handout of the May 3, 2017 Metro Board meeting recap was distributed in lieu of an oral report.

Ms. Pan reported that Metro will be hosting four workshops for the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Planning Grant Round 5, taking place on June 7th, June 20th, June 22nd, and June 27th. She noted that the application deadline is on July 31st at 5 PM.

Ms. Pan reported that the Metro Purple Line Extension Section 2 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) will be released on June 2nd. Project staff will be hosting a meeting on Thursday, June 22nd at the Roxbury Park Community Center.

Ms. Pan announced that there are two new TAC members: Kari Derderian (LADOT) as an alternate for the City of Los Angeles and Nicole Benyamin (City of Malibu) as an alternate representing the League of California Cities – Las Virgenes Malibu COG.

Ms. Pan introduced Manjeet Ranu, the new Senior Executive Officer for Metro’s Countywide Planning and Development. Mr. Ranu welcomed the TAC members and stated that he looked forward to working with the members in the future.

4. Consent Calendar
A motion to approve the May 3, 2017 TAC minutes was made by Mohammad Mostahkami (League of California Cities – Gateway Cities COG) and seconded by John Walker (County of Los Angeles). The minutes were approved.

5. FTA Section 5310/5316/5317 Appeals (Jami Carrington/Cosette Stark, Metro)
Ms. Carrington reported that in January 2017, the Board approved the release of the FY 17 Solicitation for Proposals, which consisted of a combination of three federal funding sources: Section 5310 – Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities; Section 5316 – Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC); and Section 5317 – New Freedom (NF). Ms. Carrington noted that the JARC and NF funds were a result of repurposed funds. She reported that the collective purpose of these programs is to improve mobility for seniors and individuals with disabilities, to provide tools to reduce barriers to transportation for seniors and individuals with disabilities, and improve services to employment and employment-related activities for welfare recipients and low-income individuals. Metro hosted three in-house informational workshops for the solicitation, which was attended by over 75 interested applicants throughout the region.

Ms. Carrington reported that the combined funding marks for the FY 17 solicitation were approximately $21 million amongst all three programs. A total of 49 applications were
received, however one application was found to be incomplete and was not evaluated further. The applications received requested a total of $23 million in federal grant funds and were evaluated by three external evaluation panels using the Board-adopted evaluation criteria and scoring values. Funding consideration was limited to applicants who scored in the competitive scoring range of 70-100 points. Where eligible, Metro was able to apply funds across federal grant programs to maximize the funds available and the number of project proposals recommended for funding. Ms. Stark noted that NF funds had similar eligibility requirements as some elements of Section 5310, and some projects submitted for JARC could also be funded with NF funds, so flexibility was allowed for funding recommendations.

Ms. Carrington reported that 36 projects totaling $18.6 million in federal grants are recommended for funding. Of those 36 projects, 35 were recommended for full funded, with one project partially funded. The partially funded project could be fully funded pending the outcome of the appeals process. The remaining balance of $2 million in unsubscribed federal grant funding includes $75,000 in the Los Angeles Urbanized Area (UZA) funds, $1.5 million in JARC funds, $350,000 in the Lancaster-Palmdale UZA funds, and $129,000 in the Santa Clarita UZA. Ms. Carrington noted that the remaining balances are eligible to be rolled over to future solicitations.

Ms. Carrington reported that the notification of preliminary funding awards was distributed to the BOS and LTSS Subcommittees for comment, but no comments have been received to date.

Ms. Carrington reported that the notification of preliminary funding award recommendations were delivered to each of the 48 eligible applicants, and included the opportunity and guidelines to appeal the project rankings and funding recommendations. She noted that three applicant agencies have elected to appeal their Section 5310 ranking or funding award.

Ms. Stark reported that the JARC and NF programs were repealed with the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21). These funds have more restrictions because they are older. She noted that there are approximately $1.7 million JARC funds remaining, and no NF funds remaining. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has worked closely with staff to ensure that all grant application submittals are eligible. Ms. Stark noted that the FTA has urged staff to conduct another solicitation, which may take place soon.

Ms. Stark thanked the panel members who evaluated and scored the applications. The panel members represented transit agencies, non-profits, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), LTSS, and BOS.

Michelle Caldwell (BOS) asked when the JARC funds expire? Ms. Stark replied that as long as the projects Metro will submit are eligible, then that would not be an issue.

Logan Marsh Neal Care Foundation Vehicle Replacement Appeal
This proposal application requests traditional capital assistance to purchase and replace one (1) accessible Class C Large Bus providing door-to-door transportation services to seniors and persons with disabilities.
LaVerne L. Neal explained that the Logan Marsh Neal Care Foundation was created to support seniors and individuals with developmental disabilities by providing transportation services. They provide door-to-door assistance that removes all barriers of affordability, connectivity, and language. She stated that their services address the issue of affordability because it is a free service.

Ms. Neal stated that the reason for their appeal was to show that the bus replacement with a new Class C large bus will allow for a ridership increase of 25%. She noted that there is an overwhelming market for their services, citing the aging Baby Boom generation that will require transportation assistance. She noted that over 78% of individuals with disabilities in their service area live at home and not at an institution, which creates a demand for their service.

Ms. Neal stated that to increase ridership, the Foundation staff will begin providing services on weekends and extending hour of operations. They will meet with social services directors at the various senior citizen homes in the service area, in order to establish senior activities and community integration. They will also be connecting with transportation agencies to take advantage of their downtime in ridership increases. They will establish programs with local hospitals to increase their ridership. Ms. Neal stated that the replacement vehicle will allow the foundation to increase ridership by 25%, provide specialized services, and sustain the life of the project beyond 10 years.

Ellen Blackman (ADA) asked Ms. Neal what areas of the application did she believe the evaluators did not consider or were scoring unfairly? Ms. Neal replied that the problem was not that the evaluators did not score fairly, but that the project application did not provide enough information on how the project would increase their ridership.

Ms. Caldwell asked where is the geographic location of their service area? Ms. Neal replied that it is in the cities of Lynwood and Compton, along with some areas of Downey, Bellflower, Long Beach, and Los Angeles.

Robert Brager (League of California Cities – Las Virgenes Malibu COG) asked if the application is for a bus replacement? Ms. Neal confirmed that is correct, stating that it will be replacing an aging bus vehicle that is in bad condition.

Sebastian Hernandez (LTSS) asked Ms. Neal if the foundation has already established contact with the local hospitals in their effort to increase ridership? Ms. Neal replied that they have and that the foundation has some existing clients that have had difficulty getting to and from hospital services.

Administrative Services Cooperative Service Expansion Appeal
This proposal application requests other capital assistance to purchase ten (10) accessible Class M minivans to provide taxi service to seniors and persons with disabilities.

Marco Soto stated that the Administrative Services Cooperative is comprised of five taxi companies that operate 1,350 taxi cabs in Los Angeles County. Mr. Soto stated that he believes this project meets and exceeds the purpose of the grant. The taxi cab fleets provide...
paratransit services in the County as Dial-A-Ride service providers, as well as provide supplemental transportation to Access Services. Their drivers provide full service for medical transportation for over one-quarter of the cities in the County, and no other taxi company operates as many municipal programs.

In May 2017, the Cooperative transported 1,156 passengers with mobility issues. They also subsidize fares for wheelchair-accessible transportation totalling $385,000 per year. Their goal is to provide service equivalence to passengers in need of specialized service. In the past, they were awarded a grant of $160,000 for Fiesta Taxi. In 2010, their Yellow Cab and United Checker Cab fleets were awarded 25 of the 50 wheelchair-accessible vans from Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) through the New Freedom Grant. Mr. Soto stated that even with these awards, the Cooperative is still challenged with meeting demand. Sometimes passengers have to wait two hours or longer for transportation, and same-day service is difficult to accomplish. Their dispatch center also receives referral calls from other cab companies. They are most challenged in meeting their demand in the South Bay United Checker Cab fleets.

Mr. Soto stated that although the application request was for 10 vehicles, an award of any size for wheelchair-accessible vans would be of great assistance.

Ms. Caldwell asked if the company dispatches the accessible taxis to non-accessible passengers when there is no demand for accessible passengers? Mr. Soto confirmed that they do.

Transportation Program at Good Samaritan Hospital Appeal

This proposal application requests traditional capital assistance for up to three years to implement a Mobility Management program for patients that are seniors and persons with disabilities.

Brian Thorne explained that the project will allow the hospital to serve more patients with their transportation needs and provide the community with resources to inform and navigate various transportation options. The hospital recently completed a three-year community needs assessment, and transportation was specifically identified as one of 18 health-related needs. He cited that the FTA Coordinated Transit Human Services Transportation Plan also identified providing access to and from medical trips and regional doctors as a top priority. Mr. Thorne stated that he feels the project addresses both of those top needs by providing better access to care. He noted that their current transportation program is fragmented, and this plan will enable Good Samaritan Hospital to optimize all transportation resources, such as care vans for paratransit, taxis, and public transit.

Mr. Thorne stated that the project delivers key components of value by adding paratransit services not currently within the Metro system or the National Transit Database and allowing the hospital to be ready to deploy the proposed capacity enhancements. The hospital is commitment to match 30% of the proposed project cost.
Mr. Mostahkami asked for more information concerning the local match of the project. Ms. Carrington replied that the minimum required local match is 20%, and Good Samaritan Hospital proposed an over-match of 30%, thereby reducing the total funding request.

Ms. Derderian asked Mr. Thorne if he was familiar with LADOT’s Cityride program? Mr. Thorne replied that he is not familiar with the program. Ms. Derderian stated that the program provides these same types of services.

Larry Stevens (League of California Cities – San Gabriel Valley COG) asked if the Good Samaritan Hospital project listed on bottom of Page 1 of the Attachment A-1 handout is the same as the Good Samaritan Hospital 1 project listed on Page 2. Ms. Carrington confirmed that they are the same project, elaborating that the first line is a partial award. The project on Page 2 is the remaining balance that could be fully funded pending the results of the TAC Appeals.

Mr. Stevens asked for clarification that this project is for operations and management and not for purchasing vehicles? Mr. Thorne confirmed that is correct.

Ms. Caldwell asked if the operating funds can be used without the vehicles? Mr. Thorne replied that the hospital contracts with care vans, taxi services, and transit agencies, and they do not own any vehicles.

Mr. Stevens asked if the hospital intends to subsidize the cost of those services with the grant funds? Mr. Thorne replied that they will not. The grant funds will allow the Transportation Director to coordinate the hospital’s transportation efforts. He stated that the hospital currently subsidizes the transport of patients.

**TAC Discussion**

Mr. Stevens asked if the $8.5 million total listed in Attachment A-1 is the maximum amount available, or if additional funds are available for this category? Ms. Carrington replied that this funding category has $314,183 set-aside for TAC appeals. Mr. Stevens asked for clarification if TAC could fund the Good Samaritan Hospital and Villa Esperanza Services projects with current funding availability? Ms. Carrington confirmed that is correct, and there is a still a remaining balance of approximately $78,000 after those two set-aside projects are funded.

Ms. Caldwell asked why funding is set-aside for Appeals instead of awarding all available funds? Ms. Pan replied that the Appeals process sets aside a reserve for TAC Appeals. If a reserve was not created, a project that was recommended for funding could potentially lose that funding based on a decision from the TAC Appeals. Ms. Caldwell replied that she believes the three-minute appeal from each project does not provide enough information to make an informed decision.

Mr. Stevens asked if the $78,000 balance can be allocated to other projects? Ms. Carrington replied that it would typically be added to the next project scored at 70 or above. She noted that there are two projects from the cities of Compton and Alhambra that scored within the competitive range, but were not recommended for funding due to a lack of available funding. However, their project requested funds exceed $78,000. Mr. Stevens asked what happens to
the balance if it is not spent? Ms. Carrington replied that any remaining balance would roll over to future solicitations. Mr. Stevens asked if the balance can go towards any of the other categories? Ms. Stark replied that it could theoretically go to any of the projects in the Section 5310 Other Capital & Operating category, but that category did not have any projects that scored 70 or above. Mr. Stevens asked if the City of Alhambra would be interested in purchasing one vehicle instead of eight with the remaining $78,000? Ms. Carrington replied that on the application, the City of Alhambra noted that they would be willing to re-scope to receive partial funding. Ms. Stark noted that there is a benefit to re-scoping a partially funded project, because the applicant will still be in the grant and funds can be rolled over to them if funding gets returned from another project.

Motion
Ellen Blackman (ADA) made a motion to accept the original evaluator’s scoring and fully fund the projects from the Good Samaritan Hospital (Transportation Program at Good Samaritan Hospital) and Villa Esperanza Services (Transportation for Adults with Intellectual/Developmental Disabilities). The remaining $78,000 of TAC Appeals set-aside would be offered to the City of Alhambra (Senior Ride Fleet Replacement Project) for partial funding of the project. If the City of Alhambra chooses not to accept the partial funding, the remaining balance will be carried over to future solicitations. Michelle Caldwell (BOS) seconded the motion.

Mr. Beste commented that even though the Logan Marsh Neal Care Foundation project did not meet the minimum score, the remaining $78,000 could entirely fund their project. Ms. Caldwell replied that the TAC members do not have all the information that went into the original scores. Ms. Pan noted that scores cannot be changed in TAC appeals. Ms. Stark summarized that the Logan Marsh Neal project’s evaluator notes included that the application sections were brief, not clearly defined, not fully explained, or non-existent, in terms of responding to the specifics of the evaluation criteria. There were specific notes regarding the contingency plans and management plans that were listed as not clearly defined, not fully explained or non-existent in the response. Mr. Beste noted that they are just looking to fund the purchase of one bus, and that their low score could have been the result of their grant writer. He noted that the objectives of the Logan Marsh Neal project seem to fit the goals of the grant. Ms. Carrington replied that each project was asked to be scored in accordance to keeping to the established criteria. Mr. Stevens noted that the other two projects that scored higher are equally meritorious in keeping with the goals of the grant. He suggested that TAC accept the evaluator scores, and offer the remaining TAC Appeals set-aside to partially fund the City of Alhambra’s project since they are next on the list based on score.

20 members voted Yes; The Motion passed.

Mr. Stevens asked if any appeals need to be held for the Section 5310 Other Capital and Operating Projects or for Sections 5316 and 5317? He also asked if projects on this list are eligible for the $78,000 balance? Ms. Stark explained that staff was able to interchange some projects amongst the two Section 5310 categories to maximize funding eligibility and left the $78,000 in the Traditional Capital Projects category because there were two projects
remaining that scored over 70. Ms. Pan added that Sections 5316 and 5317 do not have any appeals, so no further action is needed on those Sections.

6. **FY 18 Transit Fund Allocations (Manijeh Ahmadi, Metro)**
Ms. Ahmadi reported on the FY 18 Transit Fund Allocation. The methodology used in the development of the report complies with state, federal, local laws, and Metro Board policies and regulations. BOS and LTSS have approved the proposed FY 18 Transit Fund Allocations at their May 2017 meetings.

Motion
Michelle Caldwell (BOS) made a motion to approve the FY 18 Transit Fund Allocation, but added that she would like current fund allocations to be amended this year if more State Transit Assistance (STA) funds become available as a result of Senate Bill 1 (SB-1). Justine Garcia (LTSS) seconded the motion. The motion was approved with no objections.

7. **Draft Measure M Guidelines (Kalieh Honish, Metro)**
Ms. Honish reported that staff met with the Policy Advisory Council (PAC) regarding the comments they had provided in May on the Measure M Guidelines. The PAC will provide revised comments to the Board directly and request adoption of the revised Guidelines at the June Board meeting. Staff received more than 60 submissions from persons or agencies, totaling approximately 300 comment items from all submissions. These comments will be summarized in the Board Report, along with staff comments regarding how they were addressed or will be addressed in the future. She noted that the Board Report will be available by June 9th.

Mr. Mostahkami asked if there were any changes to the Local Return policies in the Guidelines following the submitted comments? Ms. Honish replied that she is not aware of the PAC changing any recommendations regarding the Local Contribution minimum.

Mr. Mostahkami asked what types of actions the Board can take on the item? Ms. Honish replied that the Board can take any action, but the Board Report’s first item will be a Receive and File for the PAC comments. The next action item on the Board Report will be to adopt the Measure M Guidelines as revised. She noted that the Guidelines will show the tracked changes where revisions were made. In addition, the Board Report will contain the comment summary and a timeline of further administrative development areas.

8. **FY 18 Metrolink Budget (Yvette Reeves, Metro)**
Ms. Reeves reported that Metrolink is a five member agency joint powers authority (JPA), consisting of: LA Metro, Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG), and Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC). The seven Metrolink lines carry 42,125 daily passengers.

Ms. Reeves reported that Metro funds are approximately 51% of the overall Metrolink subsidy. Metrolink has had a significant increase in total operating budget over the last few years, but Metro is trying to keep them at current operating levels because the increase is not
sustainable. Metrolink revenues have either remained stagnant or declined in comparison to its operating costs.

Metro will provide Metrolink a subsidy of $84.1 million for FY 17-18. Of the total, $71.7 million will go to Operations; $3.2 million to Antelope Valley Line (AVL) Fare Reduction and Enforcement; $2.4 million to Right of Way (ROW) Security; and $6.8 million to Capital Project – Rail Car Overhaul.

Ms. Reeves noted that there is no rehabilitation listed in the subsidy, because there is a backlog of rehabilitation. Metrolink submitted a $700 million backlog of deferred maintenance, which none of the agencies can fund, and Metro’s share of that backlog would be approximately $300 million. Metro opted to fund $18 million for the deferred maintenance for FY 18.

Ms. Reeves reported that there has been a considerable increase of Metro subsidy to Metrolink over the past five years. She noted that Metro has programmed $18 million for rehabilitation in FY 17-18 but those funds have not been budgeted because there is a backlog in Metrolink’s project delivery. She stated that there are funds from FY 11 that have still not been spent. Including the Metro operations subsidy and rehabilitation, the total Metro subsidy for FY 18 is $89.7 million. Ms. Reeves noted that this figure may be adjusted due to the backlog in Metrolink project delivery.

Metrolink will not be increasing fares for FY 18. Metrolink’s operating assumptions for FY 17-18 include: 172 weekday trains, 42,125 weekday ridership, and 2.8 million train miles.

Ms. Reeves reported that Metrolink will receive an additional 1% in Measure M funding beginning in FY 18. Metrolink can use the Measure M funds for Operations, Rehabilitation, and/or Capital, similar to Proposition C 10% funds. When Measure R funds sunset in 2039, Metrolink will receive 2% in funding, under the condition that Metrolink meets certain performance criteria.

David Kriske (League of California Cities – Arroyo Verdugo Cities) asked if Metro has plans to help Metrolink complete capital projects in Los Angeles County? Ms. Reeves replied that Metro works very closely with Metrolink on assisting in project delivery.

Ms. Caldwell asked for clarification regarding the $72 million Metro subsidy to Metrolink. She noted that the $72 million subsidy to Metrolink’s operating budget is from Los Angeles County through Proposition C, not Metro. 10% of Proposition C is set-aside for commuter rail. She explained that if the total sales tax revenue is $800 million, then Metrolink’s share would be $80 million plus another 1% from Measure R, which would bring the total to $88 million. She asked why this figure was not represented in the presentation? Ms. Reeves replied that commuter rail funds do not go solely towards Metrolink. She cited that Los Angeles – San Diego – San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor (LOSSAN) and Metro commuter rail-related projects as examples.

Ms. Caldwell cited that the grade separation projects listed in the presentation are all capital projects, but that Ms. Reeves previously stated that there were capital funds going unused.
She commented that those capital funds could go towards those grade separation projects. Ms. Reeves replied that approximately $12 million in debt service was taken out of the Proposition C 10% funds for other projects. She stated that this is another reason why the Los Angeles County operations subsidy to Metrolink is only $72 million. Ms. Caldwell asked for clarification that this is debt service for Metrolink? Ms. Reeves replied that it is debt service for Metro, elaborating that there were other Metro projects/programs that were paid with this debt service money.

Ms. Caldwell asked what is the fare-box recovery ratio for Metrolink? Ms. Reeves replied that it is approximately 43%.

Mr. Kriske commented that the information presented is only Metro’s contribution to Metrolink, and that there are other commuter rail projects that Metro funds in addition to Metrolink.

Ms. Caldwell commented that the presentation should be corrected to say Los Angeles County subsidy, and not Metro subsidy. Ms. Reeves acknowledged and said that the change would be incorporated.

9. 2017 Call Recertification/Deobligation/Extension (Fanny Pan, Metro)
Ms. Pan reported that the 2017 Call for Projects Recertification, Deobligation, and Extension lists are attached in the agenda packet. She noted that the item is scheduled to go to the Planning and Programming (P&P) meeting on June 14th, and to the Board on June 22nd. (This item was approved at the June P&P meeting, but later deferred to the July 27th Board meeting).

Mr. Mostahkami asked if the project sponsors with deobligated projects were contacted? Ms. Pan replied that Metro staff either received a letter from the project sponsor requesting the project to be deobligated, or they received a final audit report in which the project sponsor concurred for an outstanding balance to be deobligated. She noted that the project sponsors will be notified again after Board approval.

Mr. Mostahkami asked what will happen to the Call fund balance? Ms. Pan replied that it will help fulfill funding for the 2015 Call for Projects. She explained that when the 2015 Call was awarded, only projects funded through FY 17, 18, and 19 were assigned a particular funding source. Projects starting in FY 20 and beyond did not receive a funding assignment due to the zero balance State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) in 2015. Now Metro is using the Deobligated fund balance to help fulfill those commitments. She noted that the funding group staff is working on the fund assignments on the FY 20 and beyond projects.

Mr. Mostahkami asked if TAC action was required for this item? Ms. Pan replied that it is not required, since TAC members already provided recommendations after the Appeals in May 2017.

10. West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor (Fanny Pan, Metro)
Ms. Pan reported that the West Santa Ana Branch (WSAB) Transit Corridor is a Measure R and Measure M project. She reported that staff has initiated the Scoping Period for the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/DEIR). SCAG had previously completed an Alternatives Analysis (AA) on the corridor from Downtown Los Angeles to Santa Ana in Orange County, and Metro completed a Technical Refinement Study focusing on issues within Los Angeles County in September 2015. Ms. Pan noted that as part of Measure M, the project will be breaking ground in 2022.

Ms. Pan reported that as a result of SCAG’s AA, light rail transit (LRT) was recommended for the corridor. The study area encompasses 98 square miles, 20 individual cities plus unincorporated Los Angeles County, and includes 1.2 million residents and 584,000 jobs.

Ms. Pan reported that the southern portion of the corridor utilizes the San Pedro ROW (owned by the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach) and the abandoned Pacific Electric ROW (owned by Metro). The SCAG AA studied the entire 34-mile corridor, with 20 miles in Los Angeles County and 14 miles in Orange County. However, she noted that this project is not currently on Orange County Transportation Authority’s (OCTA) priority list.

The SCAG AA determined two northern alternatives: East Bank and West Bank 3, which were subsequently screened out. Four new northern alignments were then identified in the Technical Refinement Study and the Metro Board received and filed the Northern Alignment Screening Report and recommended the four new northern alignments to be carried into the environmental phase.

The Technical Refinement Study focused on five key issues: the northern terminus at LA Union Station; refining the northern alignment options; variations to the alignment and stations in Huntington Park; a new Metro Green Line Station; and a revised southern terminus. The southern terminus station was moved north to the Pioneer station in the City of Artesia. The AA study had the southern terminus station in the City of Cerritos, but the City requested for that station to be removed from further study at the end of the AA. The Huntington Park Alignment shifted from Pacific Blvd. to Santa Fe Ave. and also shifted two station locations to Salt Lake Ave./Florence Ave. and Randolph St. (east of Pacific Blvd.). It was determined that a new Green Line Station is feasible, and that staff will be coordinating with Caltrans as the project progresses.

Several options are being evaluated for how the WSAB alignment would access Union Station. One option is to be aerial to the existing Gold Line station, and the other option is to be adjacent to the existing Gold Line station platform. Ms. Pan stated that staff is coordinating with the Link Union Station (Link US) project team, which is currently studying modifications to the Union Station platforms to accommodate future regional rail.

Ms. Pan noted that the WSAB alignment south of Huntington Park follows an existing ROW, however there are four Northern Alignment options north of Florence/Salt Lake. Both Options A and B follow Pacific Blvd. through Huntington Park and Vernon. Option A would then go west on 4th St. and then north on Alameda St. Option B would go north through the Arts District on Santa Fe Ave. Options C and D would follow Alameda St. parallel to the Blue Line. Both options will have three transfer stations with the Blue Line at the Slauson, Vernon, and Washington stations. Option C will then continue north through Little Tokyo, and Option D
will go north through the Arts District. Ms. Pan stated that these four options will be evaluated in the environmental phase.

The estimated daily boardings range from 52,550 to 75,800. The preliminary cost estimate is approximately $4.3-4.6 billion (2015$). Ms. Pan stated that staff will be revisiting the cost and ridership models in the environmental clearance process.

Ms. Pan reported that the scoping period was initiated on June 6th. Fliers for the scoping meeting dates and times were distributed to TAC members. Staff anticipates to go to the Board with a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the end of 2018. Ms. Pan stated that the project team will hold two rounds of project updates at community meetings, continue to be in touch with city and elected officials, hold quarterly Project TAC meetings, and attend community and pop-up events in order to maximize their outreach effort. Ms. Pan reported that the Scoping Meeting on Tuesday, June 20th in South Gate will also be a live webcast and posted on the Metro project website.

Ms. Pan reported that Public Scoping comments are due by Friday August 4th.

Dale Benson (Pedestrian Coordinator) asked where the southern terminus station is located? Ms. Pan replied that it is in the City of Artesia and there is a station north of the terminus that is located in the City of Cerritos. She elaborated that the initial terminus was in Cerritos on Bloomfield Ave., but the City opted out of having that station studied as a terminus. Ms. Pan stated that staff is continuing to have dialogue with the City of Cerritos in case future opportunities with OCTA allow for further expansion into Orange County.

Robert Brager (League of California Cities – Las Virgenes Malibu) asked which parts of the corridor are Metro-owned ROW? Ms. Pan replied that the southern portion from Artesia north to Paramount is Metro-owned ROW. The portion from Paramount to Huntington Park is owned by the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. Staff is coordinating with the Ports, and noted that they also participated in the SCAG AA.

Mr. Walker asked if this presentation will be posted online? Ms. Pan confirmed that it will.

Mr. Stevens asked if this project is part of Measure M? Ms. Pan replied that it is both a Measure R and Measure M project. She noted that the Expenditure Plan, which includes multiple funding sources, has $4 billion allocated to the WSAB project.

Mr. Mostahkami commented that he is glad to see that the project is moving forward, since it was on hold for a while pending Measure M.

Mr. Mostahkami asked what the Project TAC meeting schedule is? Ms. Pan replied that a Project TAC meeting was held in March 2017, but it conflicted with a Public Works Directors event in San Diego. She stated that project staff intends to hold quarterly Project TAC meetings. Mr. Mostahkami requested that project TAC meetings be scheduled so that city staff have the meeting on their calendars.
11. Airport Metro Connector 96th St Station (Meghna Khanna, Metro)

Ms. Khanna reported that the Airport Metro Connector (AMC) 96th St. Station is being built along the Crenshaw/LAX Line which is currently under construction and is scheduled to open in 2019. The AMC 96th St. Station project was approved by the Board in 2014 as the LPA to connect to Los Angeles World Airport’s (LAWA) Automatic People Mover (APM) system that will extend into Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). The AMC 96th St. Station will open in 2023, at the same time as LAWA’s APM.

Ms. Khanna reported that the AMC 96th St. Station will be a quarter mile from the Aviation/Century station, and will be served by both the Crenshaw/LAX Line and the Green Line.

Ms. Khanna reported that staff completed the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) clearance in December 2016, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) as a Categorical Exclusion (CE) in March 2017, and that the project is now currently in the Design phase. She reported that the project team has finished the schematic design and is now beginning the design development phase.

Ms. Khanna reported that the APM is part of LAWA’s LAX Landside Access Modernization Program (LAMP). She noted that the APM will be very similar to the APM’s of San Francisco International Airport, Oakland International Airport, and Newark Liberty International Airport. As part of the LAMP, LAWA will also be consolidating all rental cars to the Consolidated Rent-A-Car (CONRAC) facility, and developing two Intermodal Transportation Facilities (ITF) consisting of parking structures and shuttle/taxi pick up and drop off.

Ms. Khanna reported that the AMC 96th St. Station will also include a bus plaza and Metro Bike Hub. Metro will be consolidating all bus service, including municipal buses, that currently go to LAX to the new 96th St. Station.

Ms. Caldwell asked if the FlyAway shuttles will be redirected to the bus plaza? Ms. Khanna reported that the FlyAway will be redirected to ITF East because it is a LAWA service. She noted that both the AMC 96th St. Station and the ITFs will be connected by the APM.

The ground level of the AMC 96th St. Station will include the LRT platforms, Bike Hub, and vehicular drop-off/pick-up. Riders can then take elevators or escalators up to the mezzanine, also referred to as the Metro Hub, which will be 27 feet above grade. The APM is 50 feet above grade, so the mezzanine will bring together all the modes where people can transfer to the APM. Ms. Khanna reported that the Metro Hub will include a customer service center, as well as limited retail.

Ms. Khanna reported that staff is working with LAWA to design a multi-use path along the edge of the Metro Hub, which would be shared amongst pedestrians and bicyclists.

Ms. Khanna reported that the AMC 96th St. Station will include three LRT platforms, since it is anticipated to have many riders with luggage. The center platform will be for boarding and the other platforms will be for alighting. When the train stops at the AMC 96th St. Station, one side
of doors will open to let passengers alight to the side platforms, then the other side of doors will open for passengers to board from the center platform.

Ms. Khanna reported that the Metro Hub will not be fully enclosed, but there will be extensive canopies and screens to provide shading and noise barriers.

Ms. Blackman asked if the Metro Hub will have multiple elevators serving each level, so that if one breaks down, people with disabilities can still reach the mezzanine level? Ms. Khanna replied that the Metro Hub will have multiple sets of elevators and escalators. She noted that there are 13 elevators, 13 escalators, and 13 sets of stairs. In addition, the LRT platforms will have two sets of elevators.

Ms. Caldwell asked if riders would have to go outside to transfer from Metro Rail to the APM? Ms. Khanna replied that they would not because the LRT platforms, the mezzanine, and the APM platform have a seamless integration. Riders would take a set of escalators or elevators from one mezzanine to the other, but would not notice the transition. Ms. Caldwell asked if the bus plaza would provide the same seamless integration? Ms. Khanna replied yes, and that staff is working on placing the bus discharge zones as close to the escalators and elevators as possible.

12. Legislative Update (Michael Turner/Raffi Hamparian, Metro)
No Legislative update provided.

13. ATP Update (Shelly Quan, Metro)
Handout provided in lieu of oral report.

14. Adjournment
Ms. Pan adjourned the meeting and reported that the next scheduled TAC meeting is July 5, 2017 in the William Mulholland Conference Room on the 15th floor at 9:30 am. TAC members noted that the next meeting will be the day after the July 4th holiday. Ms. Pan noted that staff will communicate with members via email to decide whether a July meeting will be held. If you have questions regarding the next meeting, please contact Brian Lam at (213)922-3077 or email lamb@metro.net.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>1. Marianne Kim/Stephen Finnegan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICYCLE COORDINATOR</td>
<td>1. Rich Dilluvio/Michelle Mowery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (BOS)</td>
<td>1. Michelle Caldwell/Robert Portillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Jane Leonard/ Dana Pynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>1. Gary Slater/Steve Novotny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Greg Farr/Kelly Lamare</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>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Corinne Ralph/Kari Derderian</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Richard Marshall/Ayala Ben-Yehuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. John Walker/Inez Yeung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Pat Proano/Mary Reyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td>1. David Kriske/Roubik Golanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities COG</td>
<td>2. Mohammad Mostahkami/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes Malibu COG</td>
<td>3. Robert Brager/Nicole Benyamin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td>4. Trolis Niebla/Mike Behen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
<td>5. Larry Stevens/Craig Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley COG</td>
<td>6. Jason Smisko/Wayne Ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td>7. Robert Beste/Ted Semaan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Cities COG</td>
<td>8. David Feinberg/Sharon Perlstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE (LTSS)</td>
<td>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/Carolyn Kreslake Metro Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDESTRIAN COORDINATOR</td>
<td>1. Valerie Watson/Dale Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Susan Price/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY (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. Mike Bagheri/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Mark Hunter/Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TAC Audience Attendance

**June 7, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juanita Martinez</td>
<td>NCE</td>
<td>(714) 848-8897</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmartinez@ncenet.com">jmartinez@ncenet.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Shin</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>(213) 847-8493</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmissin@dot.ca.gov">jmissin@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Ramirez</td>
<td>ASC</td>
<td>(313) 884-7832</td>
<td><a href="mailto:szqimirez@aggie.com">szqimirez@aggie.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl L. Newell</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>(480) 223-5920</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tele1cash@clear.com">tele1cash@clear.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Thorne</td>
<td>Good Samaritan</td>
<td>213-482-2774</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bthorne@goodsamaritan.org">bthorne@goodsamaritan.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Aguas</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>213-977-2941</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vaguas@goodsamaritan.org">vaguas@goodsamaritan.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosette Smith</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>(213) 922-2822</td>
<td><a href="mailto:startcs@metro.net">startcs@metro.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jami Cunnington</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>213 922 3764</td>
<td>j <a href="mailto:nicknamed@metro.net">nicknamed@metro.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noemi Luna</td>
<td>MBI</td>
<td>626 967 1510</td>
<td><a href="mailto:n.luna@mbimedia.com">n.luna@mbimedia.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 10                  |        |                |                            |
| 11                  |        |                |                            |
| 12                  |        |                |                            |
| 13                  |        |                |                            |
| 14                  |        |                |                            |
| 15                  |        |                |                            |
| 16                  |        |                |                            |
| 17                  |        |                |                            |
| 18                  |        |                |                            |
| 19                  |        |                |                            |
| 20                  |        |                |                            |
|------|--------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Mar 2016 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Apr 2016 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| May 2016 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jun 2016 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jul 2016 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Aug 2016 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sep 2016 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Oct 2016 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nov 2016 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dec 2016 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan 2017 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Feb 2017 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mar 2017 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Apr 2017 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |