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  (Sebastian Hernandez)
   Streets and Freeways  (Fulgene Asuncion)
   TDM/Sustainability  (Mike Bagheri)
   Attachment 1: Subcommittee Agendas
   Attachment 2: Subcommittee Actions  5 min

3. Chairperson's Report
   Attachment 3: Sustainability Committee  Information (Fanny Pan)
   Nomination Form

4. Consent Calendar  Action
   • Approval of Minutes
   Attachment 4: Draft February 1, 2017 Minutes

5. FY 18 Budget Development Status  Information (Conan Cheung)
   15 min

6. LRTP Update  Information (Heather Hills)
   10 min

7. Federal Earmarks Repurposing Update  Information (Steven Mateer)
   10 min

8. ATP Update
   Attachment 5: ATP Survey Results  Information (Shelly Quan)
   10 min

9. Metro BRT Technical Studies Update  Information (Michael Richmai/Lauren Cencic)
   20 min
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 April 5, 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 January 17, 2017 Minutes  
   (1 minute)  
   Action  
   BOS

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

4. Metro Report  
   (5 minutes)  
   Information  
   Annelle Albarran

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

6. SCAG Asset Management Data Collection  
   Attachment 1: Asset Management Data Collection Staff Report  
   Attachment 2: FTA Letter  
   Attachment 3: Asset Management Data Collection Letter  
   Attachment 4: Compliance Information Table  
   (15 minutes)  
   Information  
   Matt Gleason

7. Regional TAP Program and Service Center Operating Rules, V.2017  
   (20 minutes)  
   Information  
   Joyce Rooney/David Sutton
8. Measure M Transit Operations 20% Working Group Update
   Information
   *Attachment 1:* Measure M Quarterly Report
   *Attachment 2:* Measure M Guidelines-Transit Operations
   *(10 minutes)*

9. Section 5307 Process Working Group Update
   Information
   Joyce Rooney/Michelle Caldwell
   *(10 minutes)*

10. FY18 Estimated Revenue and FAP Document Status Report
    Information
    Manijeh Ahmadi
    *(5 minutes)*

11. Access Update
    Information
    Matthew Avancena
    *(10 minutes)*

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

13. New Business
    Information
    All

14. 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 SCOTT HARTWELL at 213-922-2836 if you have questions regarding the agenda or meeting. The next BOS meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 21, 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*
   
   Action *(Bahman Janka)*

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

3. Bicycle Coordinator Primary Member Election
   
   Action *(Subcommittee)*

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

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

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

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

8. California High-Speed Rail Update
   
   *10 min*
   
   Information *(Michelle Boehm)*
9. Countywide Express Lanes Strategic Master Plan  
   Information (Philbert Wong)  
   10 min

10. ATP Update  
    Information (Shelly Quan)  
    5 min

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

12. New Business  
    5 min

13. Adjournment  
    1 min

The next meeting for the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee will be held on March 16th 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

February 2017

Bus Operations Subcommittee:

- Approved the January 17, 2017 meeting minutes

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:

- Did not meet in February

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:

- Approved the January 19, 2017 meeting minutes
- Appointed Eric Bruins (City of Culver City) as Primary Bicycle Coordinator

TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee:

- Did not meet in February
Attachment 3

Metro Sustainability Committee
Member Nomination Form
The mission of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA METRO) Sustainability Council (“Council”) is to advise LA METRO regarding its sustainability-related activities and projects; and to continually improve sustainability efforts by developing targets, metrics, and strategies to assist LA METRO achieve stated sustainability program goals.

The objectives of the Sustainability Council are as follows:

- To increase awareness of sustainability-related leading industry practices and best practices for inclusion in all public discussions and decision-making processes;
- To advise in the development of the LA METRO sustainability goals, established targets, and performance measures, and assist in the tracking and reporting on a quarterly basis;
- To increase involvement of local small business and inform the larger public on sustainability work and related training; and
- Improve the understanding of our constituents and stakeholders of the sustainability-related efforts and opportunities at LA METRO.

Please complete the following information for nomination to the LA METRO Sustainability Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Nominee to Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Click or tap here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Click or tap here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Position Applying For (See Below)</td>
<td>First Choice: Click or tap here to enter text.  Second Choice: Click or tap here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Member or Alternate?</td>
<td>Primary Member Alternate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominee to Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please describe why you want to be nominated for this position on the Council (Attach extra pages if necessary)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group/Organization/Business Representing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominee to Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Click or tap here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Required Documents to submit with this Nomination Form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Resume</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of Recommendations or Endorsements (if any)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nominee’s signature below indicates his/her commitment to the Council mission and objective and agreement to the adopted bylaws.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominee Name</th>
<th>Click or tap here to enter text.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Click or tap here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominee Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signature** | **Date**

### REQUIRED ENDORSEMENTS

**Signatures below indicates the Group/Organization/Business, approval and support of the Nominee to represent the sector/area on the Council. Email confirmation (attachments) from Group/Organization is acceptable in lieu of signatures below. It needs to identify, name of organization, name and title of endorser, and the position they are endorsing the nominee for.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Title</th>
<th>Click or tap here to enter text.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group/Organization</td>
<td>Click or tap here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Nomination Form for LA Metro Sustainability Council**

**Vers. February 22, 2017**

**Name/Title**

Click or tap here to enter text.

**Group/Organization**

Click or tap here to enter text.

**Recommendation Signature**

---

**Member Positions by Sector/Area:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>SECTOR/AREA</th>
<th>NO. SEATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Local Government members representing, one each, the County of Los Angeles, City of Los Angeles, and smaller cities/other jurisdictions</td>
<td>(3) Seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Non-Government Agencies (NGO) members representing each of the following areas:</td>
<td>(7) Seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Water Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Energy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Air Quality (including the urban heat island effect)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Habitat and Natural Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. Material and Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>NGO members representing Social Justice, Environmental Justice, and Equity</td>
<td>(1) Seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Design Professionals (Architects/Engineers) representing expertise on the implementation of sustainable solutions;</td>
<td>(2) Seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Member representing Landscape and Infrastructure Design</td>
<td>(1) Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Member representing Local Labor Unions (Non-Metro)</td>
<td>(1) Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Member representing Public Health</td>
<td>(1) Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Member representing LA METRO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)</td>
<td>(1) Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Member representing LA METRO Transportation Business Advisory Council (TBAC)</td>
<td>(1) Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Member representing the Associated General Contractors (AGC)</td>
<td>(1) Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Members representing the green building and services industry</td>
<td>(2) Seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Member representing the real estate development community</td>
<td>(1) Seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Academic Institutions member representing research and innovation</td>
<td>(1) Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Foreign organization representing ideas from foreign entities that would be useful for the interests of this group</td>
<td>(1) Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>LA METRO staff whose work and responsibilities pertain to the interests and issues of the COUNCIL; and</td>
<td>(3) Seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Future membership seats as dictated by these by-laws and voted by COUNCIL members</td>
<td>(3) Seats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Total Council Member Seats** (30) Seats
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 9:35 A.M., took roll and declared a quorum was present.

2. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees
Bus Operations Subcommittee (BOS)
- Last met on January 17, 2017
- Received updates on:
  - FTA 5307 Process Working Group
  - Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Collaboration: How to do Business with Metro
  - TAP (Marketing & Outreach Efforts)
    - BOS received a presentation on transfer-on-second-boarding technology
    - Sebastian Hernandez (LTSS) asked if there was a timeline for this effort? Michelle Caldwell (BOS) replied that it has been in discussion for some time and will most likely be around June 2017. BOS received mostly marketing information that will inform customers of the change.
    - Ferdy Chan (City of Los Angeles) asked if this effort will apply across all operators? Ms. Caldwell replied that this is the goal and all the General Managers voted to do so; however, the technical implementation nuances are still being developed.
  - Measure M Transit Operations 20% Working Group
    - The Working Group has completed the draft guidelines, which will be presented to BOS and the General Managers for approval.
- Next meeting is scheduled for February 21, 2017

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee (LTSS)
- Last met on January 26, 2017
- Received updates on:
- Group Transit Asset Management (TAM) Targets for Local Provider Sub-recipients
- Access Services
- Metro Strategic Plan Overview
- Status for Memorandum of Understandings (MOUs) for FY17-21 (voluntary & non-voluntary)
- Measure M Local Return

- Held nominations for 2017 LTSS Chair and Vice Chair positions. Elections are anticipated to occur at the next scheduled meeting
- Next meeting is scheduled for March 23, 2017 (tentative)

**Streets and Freeways Subcommittee**
- Last met on January 19, 2017
- Received updates on:
  - Election of 2017 Subcommittee Chair and Vice Chair remain the same as previous year
  - Measure M Local Return Guidelines Working Group
  - Metro Strategic Plan Overview
- Next meeting is scheduled for February 16, 2017

**Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Sustainability Subcommittee**
- Did not meet in January
- Next meeting is scheduled for February 15, 2017

3. **Chairperson’s Report (Fanny Pan, Metro)**
A handout of the January 26, 2016 Metro Board meeting recap was distributed in lieu of an oral report.

Ms. Pan announced that the Metro website has been redesigned.

4. **Consent Calendar**
A motion to approve the January 4, 2017 TAC minutes was made Ferdy Chan (City of Los Angeles) and seconded by Eric Widstrand (City of Long Beach). Robert Beste (League of California Cities – South Bay Cities COG), Mohammad Mostahkami (League of California Cities – Gateway Cities COG), Kelly Lamare (Caltrans), and Sebastian Hernandez (LTSS) abstained. The minutes were approved.

5. **Metro Sustainability Vision (Chris Liban, Metro)**
The February 18, 2016 Board Motion – Agenda Item #57 and October 20, 2016 Board Report – Agenda Item #36 were attached to the agenda packet.

Mr. Liban reported that Metro Board passed Motion Item 57 on February 18, 2016, which requested a report on Metro’s past, current, and future sustainability efforts in four key areas: Air Quality, Emission Reductions and Resiliency Efforts; Water Conservation and Green Infrastructure; First and Last Mile Connections to Our Transit Systems; and Technology and Green Jobs. Mr. Liban noted that Metro currently has two sustainability tracks: one is in the
Planning Department, which includes Long Range Planning and Active Transportation; and the second is in the Program Management Department, which includes Environmental Compliance and Sustainability. He noted that the Program Management Department focuses on green technology and low impact development.

Ms. Caldwell asked what is the Planning Department’s role in sustainability efforts? Ms. Liban replied that Planning’s role includes First and Last Mile Connections to the transit systems, the Long Range Transportation Plan, and Call for Projects.

Mr. Liban noted that two reports were submitted to the Board in response to Board Motion Item 57; the Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Resiliency Report, and the State of Metro’s Sustainability Strategies Report. The Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Resiliency report was submitted to the Board on May 31, 2016 and included Metro’s efforts to reduce nitrogen oxide (NOx) emissions; how to achieve carbon emission reduction by 2025, 2035, and 2050; efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita; increase agency infrastructure, resiliency, and reduce environmental liabilities; and reduce emissions on Metro’s vanpool program. Mr. Liban noted that Metro is installing NOx-reducing engines and procuring for bio-methane engines, which will reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 78% for Metro’s bus fleet and by 48% agency-wide. Metro’s resiliency efforts include modifying the design criteria, working with the City of Los Angeles’s Chief Resilience Officer, and drafting a Resiliency Policy for the agency.

Mr. Mostahkami asked what the policy is for replacing old vehicles? Mr. Liban replied that he would have check with staff of Vehicle Technology to know exactly what happens to old vehicles. He noted that Metro replaces its buses every 500,000 miles. Ms. Caldwell elaborated that all transit agencies, in general, replace buses after 12 years, or 500,000 miles, whichever comes first. This policy is controlled by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). When buses are replaced, the agencies have the option to sell the parts or put it on auction, but there isn’t much life left for the buses after 12 years or 500,000 miles.

Ms. Caldwell noted that Metro has over 2,500 buses so it will take a several years before the agency can convert to 100% electric vehicles. The small municipal bus agencies will be able to convert to 100% electric much sooner. She noted that Foothill Transit’s goal is to be 100% electric by 2030.

Mr. Liban noted that there was a study conducted by Metro comparing electric buses vs. ultra-low NOx plus biomethane buses. The study concluded that the agency can reach its emissions reductions goals sooner with the ultra-low NOx plus bio-methane buses than with electric buses.

The second report in response to Board Motion Item 57 was the State of Metro’s Sustainability Strategies Board Report submitted on October 20, 2016. The strategies listed in the report include: implementation of sustainability strategies since 2003; formalization of the sustainability process in 2007 with the formation of Metro Board Ad Hoc Sustainability Committee; various policies, plans, and initiatives; implementation of FTA Environmental Management System; Operations and Planning Tracks; coordination with other agencies and organizations; and Metro’s recognition in setting the standard in the transportation industry.
Regarding Water Conservation and Green Infrastructure, Mr. Liban reported that staff is in the pilot stage of capturing and treating stormwater in its capital projects. He noted that Metro has recently installed low-impact development stormwater strategies along the Crenshaw/LAX corridor and the 18 miles of the Orange Line corridor. Mr. Liban reported that staff is in the pilot phase of using sustainable building materials, but noted that the main challenge with implementing this strategy is the scale of Metro’s projects. He noted that staff is working with Metro’s Procurement Department to evaluate potential to increase the use of sustainable building materials. Mr. Liban reported that the requirement of including a project-specific Sustainability Coordinator for all future highway and transit projects has been implemented in the long-term. The project team will coordinate with the Sustainability Coordinator to produce a sustainability plan for all Metro capital projects, and that. Mr. Liban reported that staff is currently working to assist the agency’s Sustainability Officer in achieving Metro’s sustainability metrics. Staff has proposals on how they will reorganize themselves to address this goal. Mr. Liban reported that the goal of increasing the number, size, and scope of projects in Metro’s Urban Green Implementation Action Plan is being addressed by the Planning Department.

Regarding First and Last Mile Connections to the transit systems, Mr. Liban reported that Metro has a robust First/Last Mile program through the Planning Department. He noted that there are currently a number of plans and pilots being implemented. Staff is coordinating with local agencies to create a Regional Active Transportation Network.

Valerie Watson (Pedestrian Coordinator) commented that the language used in the Board Motions and Report are different from what Jacob Lieb (Metro) reported at the January 2017 TAC meeting on Metro’s First/Last Mile efforts. She noted that the language used by the Sustainability team seems non-committal, citing Section C, #3 in the Board Report that requires first/last mile components “when feasible.” She noted that Mr. Lieb’s presentation was more specific about what actions the agency will take. She emphasized the need for a philosophical shift in seeing first/last mile components as integral to mobility and the transportation infrastructure, not something to be considered if feasible. She suggested using the same language from Mr. Lieb’s presentation agency wide. Mr. Liban acknowledged the concern. He stated that this concern highlights staff’s effort to reorganize and to make these goals more cohesive.

Regarding Technology and Green Jobs, Mr. Liban reported that staff is currently trying to understand what resources and staffing levels the agency needs. Mr. Liban reported that staff is currently looking for opportunities to increase the use of alternative renewable energy. Metro currently produces seven megawatts (MW) of renewable energy throughout the agency and is continually looking for opportunities to increase renewable energy output. He noted that Metro is launching a Community Solar Program that allows for the installation of solar panels in communities that would otherwise not consider using renewable energy. Mr. Liban reported that staff is currently coordinating with the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach in efforts to use zero or near zero emission technologies in future transit and Goods Movement corridors.
Mr. Liban reported that Metro’s current commitments to sustainability efforts include forming an Interagency Sustainability Coordination Group in order to achieve more collaboration on sustainability efforts across the region. This group will be represented by Metro’s Sustainability Advisory Council, which will follow the concept of the TAC, and will advise staff and the agency on advancing sustainability at Metro and in the region. Council members will represent committee members, associate general contractors, Metro’s Transportation Business Advisory Council (TBAC), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), trade professional associations, City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, Metro TAC, and Metro. Staff is also looking to include academic institutions and representatives from foreign organizations.

Mr. Liban noted that staff would like to report back to the Board on financial strategies for sustainability efforts in Spring 2017. Staff is currently working on blended return on investment of past projects, understanding the costs of new regulatory impacts, and the feasibility of numerical sustainability goals and their costs. Staff is especially looking to understand the financial impacts of their projects.

Mr. Mostahkami asked for more details on the Interagency Sustainability Coordination Group. Mr. Liban elaborated that Metro will invite all the cities in the region to meetings in order to achieve three objectives: understanding the gaps of implementing regional sustainability strategies; understanding the resources that exist in these jurisdictions that the group can leverage to fill those gaps; and figuring out how to utilize that leveraging to fill those gaps. This could include discussions of what Metro currently does that other cities could follow as an implementation strategy. Mr. Liban cited permeable pavements as one strategy a city might consider implementing.

Mr. Mostahkami asked if staff has a schedule for these efforts? Mr. Liban replied that staff is still in the early stages but is currently working on forming the Interagency Sustainability Coordination Group and the Metro Sustainability Advisory Council. Staff has started by reaching out to the City of Los Angeles Mayor’s Office but has not contacted other cities yet.

Ms. Caldwell asked if the Interagency Sustainability Coordination Group will include transit operators? Mr. Liban replied that it will, as well as special jurisdictions.

Mr. Liban announced that a Metro Sustainability Advisory Council meeting will take place on February 15, 2017 from 2:30 PM – 4:00 PM, which will discuss formation of the Council, by-laws, membership, and nominations. Mr. Liban invited TAC members to attend and stated he will share further details with Ms. Pan and Mr. Lam for distribution to TAC members.

Next steps include outreach to other government agencies, and support to provide Envision training to small cities and small businesses beginning April 2017. Developed by the Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure, the Envision training program teaches professionals how to best incorporate sustainability principles into their infrastructure projects. Mr. Liban explained that when staff looked at the Envision framework, they felt it could help create a common language for implementation, could be used as a common framework for thinking through projects, and would help achieve optimum triple bottom-line benefits. Mr. Liban noted that staff has started the process for having trainers for Envision in the region. Staff’s goal for
Envision is to certify professionals. The price will be $100 for the first year, and $200 for the next three years. Staff will offer subsidized training to cities that are not able to provide training for their staff. Staff is also working with TBAC to identify small businesses that would qualify for subsidized training.

Ms. Pan suggested including a Metro Sustainability Advisory Council update as a standing item on TAC once the Council begins to meet regularly in order to keep all members up to date. Mr. Liban agreed.

6. Measure M Advisory Council Update (Vivian Rescalvo, Metro)
Ms. Rescalvo reported that the Measure M Advisory Council will represent three main groups: Transportation Consumers, Transportation Providers, and Accountable Jurisdictions. These groups will help formulate policy throughout Measure M and the Long Range Transportation Plan.

Transportation Consumers will include representatives from non-profit organizations that represent areas of social justice, environmental justice, and economic justice, as well as students, business interests, labor and the Chair of the CAC. Transportation Providers will include Municipal Transit Operators, Access Services, Metrolink, Caltrans, Ports, Airports, Federal, and the Auto Club. Accountable Jurisdictions will include agencies such as the City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles and multiple cities from Councils of Governments (COGs). There will be a total of 27 members, each with an alternate, on the council who will meet on a monthly basis. The first kickoff meeting will be held on April 5, 2017. Ms. Rescalvo noted that by that time, staff will have completed the draft guidelines and will be seeking input from the Advisory Council. Ms. Rescalvo noted that staff wants the members to be the voice and the leader in advocating and disseminating information to their jurisdictions or stakeholders, since they will be representing coalitions of interest. She cited, for example, that it will be the COG representative's responsibility to communicate to all the cities within the COG. If a member is representing the category of social justice, their responsibility will be to send out information to related interest groups and stakeholders, seek their input, and disseminate information.

Mr. Mostahkami asked if staff has reached out to the COGs yet? Ms. Rescalvo replied yes, and that most COGs have submitted their nominations. She noted that staff has not received responses from the Gateway Cities COG and the South Bay Cities COG. Ms. Rescalvo explained that at this time, staff is only requesting the COGs to provide a recommendation for a representative. This can be the Executive Director or a staff member such as the City Engineer, Director of Transportation, or Director of Public Works.

Mr. Mostahkami asked if there are specific criteria for a representative? Ms. Rescalvo replied that the criteria are outlined in the letter sent out to the COGs and cities. She noted that the only thing a representative cannot be is an elected official. Ms. Rescalvo noted that the letters were sent two weeks ago to all the Chairs, Executive Directors, Mayors, and City Managers of the cities in the region.

Mr. Mostahkami asked for more detail on what the Council will be discussing? Ms. Rescalvo replied that the Council members will be advising on the development of the Measure M
Guidelines, the development of the Long Range Transportation Plan, and providing input on policy decisions.

Mr. Mostahkami asked if the Council will have a Chair and to whom will they report? Ms. Rescalvo replied that the Council will consist of 27 members, and they will elect a chair. Ms. Pan added that the Council will report directly to the Metro Board.

Ellen Blackman (ADA) asked what the timeframe is for having members established, specifically for members of the Transportation Consumers group? Ms. Rescalvo replied that staff has sent a letter to various organizations, including organizations representing the elderly and disabled, and offered to send Ms. Blackman a list of organizations that staff sent a letter to in the disabled and elderly community. Nominations were due on February 14, 2017. Ms. Rescalvo added that staff would like to have members selected before the first council meeting on April 5, 2017.

7. ATP Update (Shelly Quan, Metro)

A handout of Board Report – Item 14 and a Board Box concerning the ATP Regional Planning and Non-Infrastructure Project List for Los Angeles County was distributed to TAC members.

Ms. Quan reported that the Board approved the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2017 Active Transportation Program (ATP) Regional Program Implementation Project List for Los Angeles County at the January 2017 Board Meeting. This action was required by the SCAG ATP guidelines to secure Los Angeles County’s population share of SCAG’s ATP implementation funds. This action secures $28.8 million for Los Angeles County projects.

The ATP Regional Program implementation list is one of three components of SCAG’s ATP, with the other two being Regional Planning and Non-Infrastructure projects. Selection for planning and non-infrastructure projects was done through SCAG’s Sustainability Planning Grants program. Ms. Quan reported that Los Angeles County projects are receiving approximately $1.4 million for those two components.

Ms. Quan reported that the projects approved on these lists are eligible to apply for early programming of construction funds through the Greenhouse Gas Reduction funds available in the ATP. She noted that these funds are available for construction only projects that will be implemented in by FY 2020. The deadline for submitting materials to the state for the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund is May 12, 2017.

Mr. Mostahkami asked if Metro is allowed to submit projects for the ATP? He cited that Metro is listed as an applicant on the ATP Regional Program Implementation Project List. Ms. Quan replied that Metro is an eligible applicant, as well as other non-city groups.

Mr. Mostahkami asked who comprises the selection panel? Ms. Quan replied that for the statewide program, there is a third party evaluation group comprised of individuals from around the state. During this round, there were teams of two who each scored a set of 10 applications. Projects that did not get selected for the statewide program fall down to the regions, and the regions each have their own selection process. In Los Angeles County’s case,
the projects fall under the SCAG regional process. Ms. Quan noted that for the SCAG process, staff worked with SCAG to augment the statewide scores with an additional 10 points for Los Angeles County projects, which was also approved in the Board Report.

Mr. Mostahkami asked if Metro is involved in the scoring? Ms. Quan replied that staff applies the 10 point assignment based on consistency with local and regional plans. Mr. Mostahkami asked if Metro was involved in the decision-making process? He explained that he was concerned about a conflict of interest. Ms. Quan replied that Metro was involved in assigning the 10 additional points, and was required to provide additional justification for any Metro sponsored projects receiving the 10 additional points.

Ms. Caldwell asked for clarification that Metro was involved in the selection process, but in order to avoid a conflict of interest, Metro had to provide additional justification for its own project on the list? Ms. Quan confirmed.

Ms. Caldwell asked if Metro was the only entity in the selection process? Ms. Pan explained that each project received a score from round one as part of the statewide program. The ATP then funded projects based on the statewide program scores. All remaining projects that did not meet the ATP funding threshold were then assigned 10 additional points from Metro for being consistent with local and regional plans.

Ms. Watson asked if SCAG is the decision maker in this process? Ms. Quan replied yes, elaborating that they assign each county a population share of the ATP funds.

John Walker (County of Los Angeles) asked if the early programming of construction funds applies to both the regional and statewide programs? Ms. Quan confirmed, and noted that the deadline to submit materials for this was May 12, 2017.

Mr. Mostahkami asked for clarification that the 10 points were added to all projects, and if Metro had anything to do with awarding the eight projects on the award list of the ATP Regional Program Implementation Project List for Los Angeles County? Ms. Quan clarified that those eight projects were first scored at the state level but did not make the funding cut-off. These projects then went to SCAG for selection, and because these projects are in Los Angeles County, Metro was responsible for determining whether they would receive an additional 10 points for consistency with local and regional plans. Metro then determined that all these projects were consistent and thus assigned an additional 10 points to their statewide score. SCAG then determined a new funding cut-off based on available funding.

Ms. Caldwell asked for more details on the additional projects that landed in the contingency list after the first eight. Ms. Quan replied that Metro awarded those projects an additional 10 points as well, but they were under the funding cut-off. She noted that if any additional funding becomes available then they will be selected.

Ms. Caldwell asked how the top eight projects were ranked if each project received an additional 10 points? Ms. Quan replied that the projects are ordered from highest score to lowest, and elaborated that the 10 additional points were added to the state score.
Justine Garcia (LTSS) asked if there is a way for a project not being funded could apply for advanced construction funding if additional Greenhouse Gas Reduction funds become available? Ms. Quan replied that if there are no projects deemed eligible to receive Greenhouse Gas Reduction funds, then the state intends to do another Call for Projects.

Mark Hunter (TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee) asked if the contingency list applies to just the SCAG level? Ms. Quan confirmed.

8. CTC Update (Zoe Unruh, Metro)
Ms. Unruh reported that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) held their Northern California workshop for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) guidelines at their January 2017 meeting. The CTC is required to hold a workshop in both Southern California and Northern California before the guidelines are adopted. Ms. Unruh reported that the 2017 RTP Guidelines are now adopted and posted on the Caltrans website for the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs).

Ms. Unruh reported that CTC staff and Caltrans provided an update on the fund estimate overview and timeline for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) adoption. They are required to adopt the fund estimate by August 15, 2017. The CTC requested to extend the deadline so they could adopt the fund estimate at the August 16-17, 2017 CTC meeting. Ms. Unruh noted that they were reluctant to provide an assumption for the amount of funding and are waiting for the State Board of Equalization to revise their estimates for the price-based excise tax.

Ms. Unruh reported that the CTC gave a report on the 2016 Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment, which is now available on the Save California Streets website. Highlights from the report include the 2016 average Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of 65 falls in the At-Risk category, and is a decline from the 2008 average PCI of 68.

Ms. Unruh reported that the state’s total pavement needs category is estimated to be approximately $70 billion over the next 10 years. The essential components needs category, which includes signals, storm drains, and signs, are estimated to be $32.1 billion for the next 10 years. The bridge needs category is estimated to be $4.6 billion. There are 2,500 bridges in need of replacement and repair, and bridge sufficiency ratings are expected to decline due to funding levels. Ms. Unruh reported that this puts the funding need at approximately $106.7 billion, although the state is projecting only $33.7 billion in funding, including inflation.

Ms. Unruh reported that average PCI is expected to decline to 56 with existing funding. $3.5 billion per year would be required to maintain an average PCI of 65. Improving PCI with best management practices would require $7 billion over the next 19 years and $2.5 billion annually afterwards. Ms. Unruh noted that there are current transportation funding bills in the state that focus on the repair and maintenance of local streets and roads.

Ms. Unruh reported that the CTC approved $1.9 million in Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) funds for the Metro Red and Purple Line improvements. The awards covers preliminary engineering work and staff is expecting to return for allocation in summer 2017.
Ms. Caldwell asked what is the funding source for the current funding bills that are proposed from the State? Ms. Unruh replied that it is a combination of new revenues, an increase in the excise tax and the price-based excise tax. She noted that the Governor’s proposal also includes an increase in gas but is a bit more conservative that AB-1 and SB-1 includes. She noted that the Governor intends to restore the excise tax to 21.5 cents, and increase the diesel excise tax by 11 cents. They are proposing to make some adjustments and set that for inflation, which would begin in FY 19 and inflation adjustments would begin in FY 20.

David Kriske (League of California Cities – Arroyo Verdugo Cities) asked if these funds meet the funding need for the year or if it is still short? Ms. Unruh replied she is unsure if it is sufficient.

9. Countywide ExpressLanes Strategic Master Plan (Philbert Wong, Metro)

Mr. Wong reported that the Countywide ExpressLanes Strategic Plan was prepared in response to Board Motion Item 59 at the November 2014 Board meeting. Staff coordinated with SCAG to be consistent with their Regional ExpressLanes Study, as well as with Caltrans District 7. Staff only considered High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes that were either existing, in construction, or planned, for conversion into ExpressLanes. Staff did not consider General Purpose (GP) lanes for conversion.

Staff’s screening methodology comprised of three components: corridor screening, financial screening, and refinement.

The corridor screening involved a two-step process. Staff first started with the SCAG regional travel demand model used to forecast traffic volume in 2020 and 2035. Second, staff used RapidTOM (Toll Optimization Model), which takes the output from the SCAG model and calculates the number of vehicles and amount they are willing to pay to use the ExpressLanes. As a result of those two tools, staff developed evaluation metrics for the HOV lanes being considered: 1) value of travel time savings; 2) high-occupancy toll (HOT) lane person throughput; 3) average peak period vehicle speeds in the GP lanes.

The financial screening included a two-step process: 1) estimate gross revenue generation for each corridor; 2) estimate net revenue, calculated by subtracting projected gross revenue from construction and operations costs based on actual costs incurred on the I-10 and I-110 Expresslanes.

For the composite scores, each corridor was ranked into quintiles (top 20%, second 20%, third 20%, fourth 20%, and fifth 20%) for the three corridor screening metrics and one financial screening. The ranks were then averaged to get a composite score.

For the refinement screening, four qualitative criteria were used to refine the results of the corridor and financial screening: connectivity with other existing and potential ExpressLane corridors; transit benefits; funding availability; and the ability to provide two ExpressLanes in each direction.
After the corridor, financial, and refinement screenings were applied, the projects were placed into three tiers: Tier 1 – near-term (within 5-10 years); Tier 2 – mid-term (within 15 years); Tier 3 – longer-term (within 25 years).

Mr. Wong presented the recommended Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 projects from the screening. He noted that there has been wide acceptance of ExpressLanes throughout Los Angeles County, with heavy concentrations of transponder owners in the South Bay and San Gabriel Valley. He noted that many of the new ExpressLanes projects correlate with where these ExpressLanes account holders are concentrated.

Mr. Wong noted that while some of the projects have Measure M funding, many do not and staff will have to seek funding for those projects. Funding options that staff is considering include: Bonding, Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA), grants, or net toll revenue loans from other ExpressLanes.

Mr. Kriske asked if it is possible to bond against a future toll road revenue? Mr. Wong replied yes.

Marianne Kim (Automobile Club of Southern California) asked if the law allows for usage of net toll revenue loans from other ExpressLanes? She elaborated that the law currently only allows for ExpressLanes revenue to be used within the corridor it is generated from. Mr. Wong replied that this would not be a transfer of funds, but would be a loan that would be repaid from future toll revenues from the new ExpressLanes corridors.

Ms. Caldwell asked if loaning revenue from other ExpressLanes corridors could lead to no transportation improvements being made in the corridor generating the revenue? Mr. Wong replied that could potentially be the case. Ms. Caldwell asked if this would require a change in the law? Mr. Wong replied that staff believes this would not require a change in law because it is not a transfer of funds, but rather a loan that would eventually be repaid to the originating corridor. He noted that it will however ultimately require Board approval.

Ms. Kim noted that current ExpressLanes revenue is used towards the Silver Line, transit services, carpool, vanpool, other transit operators in the corridor, and the remaining funds go towards community projects along the corridor. She asked if loaning the net toll revenue from one corridor would affect funding to community projects along the corridor? Mr. Wong replied that this funding allocation will need to be a Board decision. Ms. Kim suggested that the idea of reducing the funding allocation for net toll revenue grants within the corridor in order to fund other ExpressLane corridors should be vetted.

Mr. Wong reported that staff’s recommendation to the Board was to initiate planning studies, including a comprehensive financial plan for Tier 1 projects, and submit those projects as a network to the CTC to request tolling authority.

Mr. Hernandez asked if the studies were already done or if it is part of the next steps? Mr. Wong replied that currently staff has only conducted the estimates at a very high-level, which involved using a regional average for income to estimate the willingness to pay for using ExpressLanes. He noted that a comprehensive financial plan would involve more detailed
studies to get a finer level of detail for actual incomes and a more accurate estimate of potential revenue.

Mr. Hernandez asked how the potential revenue estimates compare to existing ExpressLanes revenues? Mr. Wong replied that the SCAG model for single occupancy vehicles averages $20 per hour and two-person vehicles average $32 per hour. The revenues are higher in some corridors around the County, while others are close to the SCAG model.

Ms. Caldwell asked if the revenue estimates included the additional number of transponders that would be issued as a result of a new ExpressLanes corridor? She elaborated that many drivers who do not own transponders may purchase one after a new ExpressLanes opens in their area. Mr. Wong replied that staff used the SCAG model to forecast traffic volumes in 2020 and 2035, which only looked at the redistribution between GPs to HOVs. The estimate did not factor into whether a new ExpressLanes facility would attract new drivers. Ms. Caldwell encouraged staff to consider that factor in the model. Mr. Wong agreed and stated that staff was not able to look at the shifts between different freeways for this high-level estimate.

Mr. Kriske commented that this model assumes that trips that use the new HOT lanes would be taken out of the GP lanes, and that this shift would require people to buy transponders. He asked if this induced demand is accounted for in the SCAG model? Mr. Wong replied that they are not. Mr. Kriske asked if shifting from GP lane into new HOT lane would be considered new revenue? Mr. Wong confirmed.

Ms. Kim asked if staff has assessed which corridors will be adding a lane, which corridors will be requiring HOV to HOT conversion or GP to HOT conversion, and which corridors will be requiring a three-person occupancy to accommodate these changes? Mr. Wong replied that staff did not look at GP to HOT conversion. Staff only studied freeways with existing, in construction, or planned HOV lanes. He noted that there has been a project study report (PSR) done on the I-105, which indicated that restriping and adding a lane was possible along the entire length of the I-105. Staff will have to review the PSR to gain a better sense of whether a new HOT lane could be implemented. Ms. Kim asked if any corridors in the screening included only one HOT lane in each direction? Mr. Wong replied that for corridors where adding a second lane is not possible, staff would consider three-person occupancy, but this will be determined in more detailed studies.

Ms. Kim commented that there has been talk that the federal government may require Caltrans to change HOT lanes to minimum three-person occupancy, however the Automobile Club of Southern California has always cautioned against three-person occupancy for tolling. Their approach has always been introducing three-person occupancy before tolling. Mr. Wong agreed and replied that HOV lanes experience a lot of degradation regardless of whether there is an ExpressLanes. He noted that introducing three-person occupancy only during peak periods, like what currently exists on the I-10, could be a more acceptable interim solution.

Mr. Chan asked if there is a minimum speed limit where single occupancy users are no longer allowed to enter the ExpressLanes? Mr. Wong replied yes, an average of 45 miles per hour is the threshold. Mr. Chan asked if Metro has ever imposed that threshold? Mr. Wong replied that they impose it almost every day on the northbound I-110, and occasionally on the I-10.
10. Legislative Update (Raffi Hamparian/Michael Turner, Metro)
A handout of the State and Federal Legislative Update and the 2017 State and Federal Legislative Programs was emailed to TAC members on February 2, 2017, in lieu of an oral report.

11. Other Business
Mr. Chan asked if Metro has looked into the federal government’s proposition of withholding federal funding to sanctuary cities, which includes the City of Los Angeles. Ms. Pan replied that she will request for staff to give an update at the next TAC meeting.

Mr. Walker requested to have an update on Federal Earmark Repurposing. Ms. Pan replied she will include that in the next TAC meeting. Mr. Walker stated that an email update would also suffice.

12. Adjournment
Ms. Pan adjourned the meeting and reported that the next scheduled TAC meeting is March 1, 2017 in the William Mulholland Conference Room on the 15th floor at 9:30 am. If you have questions regarding the next meeting, please contact Brian Lam at (213)922-3077 or email lamb@metro.net.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Kim/Stephen Finnegan (A)</td>
<td>AUTO CLUB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Dillsio/Michelle Mowery (A)</td>
<td>ROYALTY COORDINATOR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Caldwell/Susan Lipman (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Leonard/Gloria Galler (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgt. Dave Nielms/Oc. Christian Cracroft (A)</td>
<td>CHP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Slater/Steve Novotny (A)</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Farn/Kelly Lamare (A)</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Blackman/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>CITIZEN REP ON ADA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Widstrand/Nathan Baird (A)</td>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant/Corinne Ralph (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Mitchell/Carlos Rico (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fardy Chani/Kevin Minke (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Marshalian/Ayala Ben-Yehuda (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Walker/Inez Yeung (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Proano/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kriske/Roubik Galobanian (A)</td>
<td>ARROYO VERDUGO CITIES</td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Warning!</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Mostahkami/Lisa Rapp (A)</td>
<td>GATEWAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Brager/Ramiro Adeva (A)</td>
<td>LAS VEGAS MALIBU COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Beilen/Allen Thompson (A)</td>
<td>NORTHLA COUNTY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Stevens/ Craig Bratshaw (A)</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL VALLEY COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Newman/Wayne Ko (A)</td>
<td>SAN FERNANDO VALLEY COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bestle/Ted Semaan (A)</td>
<td>SOUTH BAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Feinberg/Sharon Perlstein (A)</td>
<td>WESTSIDE CITIES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian Hernandez/Perr Goodman (A)</td>
<td>TSS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justine Garcia/Linda Evans (A)</td>
<td>TSS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanny Pan/Brian Lam (A)</td>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Corral-Lopez/Carolyn Kreslak (A)</td>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Watson/Dale Benson (A)</td>
<td>PED COORDINATOR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH COORDINATOR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Louise Roe/Karen Sakoda (A)</td>
<td>SCRRA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evyonne Drummond/Kathryn Higgins (A)</td>
<td>SCAGMD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Whitesaker/Annie Nam (A)</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupe Valez/LaDonna DCamato (A)</td>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Bagheri/Phil Aker (A)</td>
<td>TDM/SUST SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hunter/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>TDM/SUST SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 5

ATP Survey Results
ATP Survey Results

Presented to Metro Technical Advisory Committee on March 1, 2017

Overview

- **What:** a survey conducted by the Strategic Financial Planning and Programming staff at LA Metro to understand the challenges LA County agencies are facing in securing ATP funding and delivering ATP projects
- **When:** November 17 to December 16
- **Who:** reached out to 89 cities and the county and 10 nontraditional ATP applicants via email and presentation at TAC and Streets and Freeways
- Total of 47 agencies submitted responses. Number of responses to each question varies due to:
  - Question skip logic
  - Optional questions
- Survey sections covered in this presentation:
  - ATP Application Process
  - Grant Assistance
  - Project Delivery
  - Metro Successful Applicants Workshops
Has your agency ever applied to the ATP?
(47 responses)

- Yes: 40
- No: 7
The following slides show responses from both agencies that have applied and agencies that have not applied to the ATP.

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with providing additional points for the following application questions.

(40 responses)
Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with providing additional points for the following application questions.

(40 responses)

**Potential for Increased Biking/Walking**

- Strongly Agree: 42%
- Agree: 52%
- Disagree: 3%
- Strongly Disagree: 3%

**Safety**

- Strongly Agree: 42%
- Agree: 52%
- Disagree: 3%
- Strongly Disagree: 3%
Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with providing additional points for the following application questions.

(40 responses)

**Public Participation and Planning**

- Strongly Agree: 17%
- Agree: 42%
- Disagree: 33%
- Strongly Disagree: 8%

**Public Health**

- Strongly Agree: 20%
- Agree: 55%
- Disagree: 15%
- Strongly Disagree: 10%
Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with providing additional points for the following application questions.

(40 responses)

Cost Effectiveness

- Strongly Agree: 17%
- Agree: 70%
- Disagree: 8%
- Strongly Disagree: 5%

Leveraging

- Strongly Agree: 7%
- Agree: 55%
- Disagree: 33%
- Strongly Disagree: 5%
The following slides show responses from agencies that have not applied to the ATP.

### Why has your agency not applied to the ATP? (5 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough resources to complete application</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware of funding sources</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven't obtained community input on project</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't find out about ATP early enough to apply</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application too challenging</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't have a bike or ped plan to support project selection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No local matching funds available</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike and ped projects aren't a priority for my agency</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough resources to deliver projects if awarded</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community doesn't support agency-identified/feasible project</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other:
- Project delivery is not realistic
What changes to the ATP application process would make it easier for your agency to apply?
(5 responses)

Other:
• Don’t make the application so cumbersome and with so many points attributed to disadvantaged communities or make a subcategory with a small funding pool like the dedicated rural funds
• Revise delivery schedule

What resources would your agency need in order to apply for the ATP as it stands?
(5 responses)
The following slides show responses from agencies that have applied to the ATP.

Why did you apply for the ATP?
(34 responses)

Other:
• No match is required for ATP
How does your agency prepare its ATP applications?
(32 responses)

ATP Cycles 1 to 3

- Entirely in house: 38%
- Entirely agency-hired consultant: 14%
- In-house with partial agency-hired consultant: 22%
- Metro consultant: 27%

Have you changed your approach over time in applying to the ATP?
(31 responses)

- No: 18
- Yes: 13
In what way(s) have you changed your approach over time in applying to the ATP?
13 responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• We collaborate with other community partners to achieve regional and local goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We concentrate on our current projects knowing that CTC has very restricted rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for awarding and completion of the projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The City is now actively seeking and applying for available Grants whenever a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solid project is identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• We have transitioned the responsibilities from being shared evenly through an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agency-consultant collaboration to mostly consultant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing more data in the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Got Caltrans assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In what way(s) have you changed your approach over time in applying to the ATP? (continued)
13 responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size of Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Larger and to complete networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fewer applications submitted in one cycle. Started preparing much sooner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouped work into a program versus single stand alone projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Smaller projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The declining gas tax has resulted in applying for less projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• We used a SRTS Masterplan to apply for ATP Cycle 3 to make it a stronger application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More planning work completed beforehand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The only reason we applied the third, and successful time, was that we received a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grant for a private grant writer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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What changes to the ATP application would make it easier for your agency to apply?

(35 responses)

- Streamline application: 23
- Allow applicant to choose either hard copy or electronic submittal, don’t require both: 20
- Make communication with CCC/CALCC easier: 12
- Make application more favorable for planning projects: 11
- Other: 11

The next 2 slides show the responses provided for “Other”

Metro

What changes to the ATP application would make it easier for your agency to apply? (continued)

(34 responses)

Application
- Display all questions, no drop downs after clicking on an answer. Provide helpful hints ie. use drop down calendar instead of typing in date.
- Benefit/cost ratio should be more realistic
- Make application more favorable for cities that used a planning document/master plan
- To confirm with Caltrans on identifying “Eligible” elements to eliminate potential post award conflicts.

Submittal
- Require only electronic submittals
- On-line submittal and upload of files
- Remove requirement for submittal of hard copies. Make it an entirely digital submittal.

Metro
What changes to the ATP application would make it easier for your agency to apply? (continued)

34 responses

Schedule/Timing
• Allow agencies more time for awarding funded projects. It is very though to award the contract within six months!!!!!
• Allow for more time to prepare the application and lengthen the reversion date for the timely use of funds

Disadvantaged Communities
• Requirement of Disadvantaged Community is too limiting. 100% of ATP awardees at State level were in disadvantaged community. While a portion should go to disadvantaged communities, the purpose of the ATP program is lost as other projects that are really good projects are not selected only due to the fact that it is not in a disadvantaged community.
• Award it to DACs.

If you have any other comments that would help Metro develop resources to apply to the ATP, please write them.

10 responses

Project Delivery
• Flexibility when programming Funds. Sometimes Cities program moneys in advance and for valid budget reasons agencies need to use alternative funding (for local match for example). Flexibility to change in the future when project is to be implemented.
• Metro and Caltrans should work corporately to relax the implementation of the projects funded by ATP.
• More assistance and guidance in coordinating with the conservations corps

Project Identification/Development
• We believe that ATP projects should benefit a wide range of local interest and should be backed with studies and planning programs to demonstrate a need for the project. Partnering with local agencies, and community leaders/organizations should be key to delivering a multi-beneficial infrastructure project or planning study to later justify future ATP cycle applications.
• Early concept planning and public outreach help needed.
If you have any other comments that would help Metro develop resources to apply to the ATP, please write them. (continued)
(10 responses)

Application
• Streamline the process as much as possible and provide all forms and resources online.
• It would be great if Metro would favor infrastructure applications that were founded and created by using a SRTS/Bike or other masterplan. Our SRTS masterplan took a lot of time and effort from our school district, PTA, Sheriffs, city staff, residents, etc and it covered all the goals under ATP guidelines; yet it was not funded. Extremely disappointed since we felt we had submitted a strong project that met all the ATP requirements and it is much needed in our community. When you notify the community that their work into creating a masterplan will be used to apply for future grants, they put a lot of time and effort into the study/masterplan.
• Provide all past winning applications
• Provide a maximum grant amount per project
• Have more qualified consultants available. Not to overload those are known “better” grant writers...
• Award it to DACs

Grant Assistance

Metro
Has your agency prepared an ATP application(s) with Metro consultant assistance?
(32 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many hours did agency staff devote to... 
(16 responses)

- **Providing information to the consultants**
  - Average*: 32 hours

- **Reviewing the draft application**
  - Average*: 11 hours

*Excludes outlier response
What were the positives of Metro grant assistance?
(16 responses)

- Consultant was responsive to agency questions and requests: Cycle 1: 3, Cycle 2: 3, Cycle 3: 1
- Consultant suggested constructive changes to project scope: Cycle 1: 0, Cycle 2: 2, Cycle 3: 6
- Consultant provided strong graphics: Cycle 1: 3, Cycle 2: 3, Cycle 3: 5
- Consultant provided quality narrative responses: Cycle 1: 2, Cycle 2: 3, Cycle 3: 5
- Agency staff time was saved: Cycle 1: 3, Cycle 2: 5, Cycle 3: 6
- Agency printing/assembling/mailing was saved: Cycle 1: 3, Cycle 2: 3, Cycle 3: 8

What were the negatives of Metro grant assistance?
(16 responses)

- Consultant was not responsive to agency questions and requests: Cycle 1: 2, Cycle 2: 3, Cycle 3: 1
- Consultant suggested changes not in alignment with agency objectives: Cycle 1: 0, Cycle 2: 2, Cycle 3: 3
- Consultant did not understand the project: Cycle 1: 2, Cycle 2: 3, Cycle 3: 0
- Consultant asked for too much data: Cycle 1: 1, Cycle 2: 2, Cycle 3: 3
- Consultant did not provide quality graphics: Cycle 1: 2, Cycle 2: 3, Cycle 3: 1
- Consultant did not provide quality narrative responses: Cycle 1: 0, Cycle 2: 2, Cycle 3: 4
- Consultant did not have application draft ready to review on schedule: Cycle 1: 3, Cycle 2: 4, Cycle 3: 3
- Consultant did not incorporate agency comments into final draft: Cycle 1: 2, Cycle 2: 3, Cycle 3: 3
- Agency still had to devote a significant amount of staff time: Cycle 1: 3, Cycle 2: 3, Cycle 3: 5
- Agency still had to print/assemble/mail application(s): Cycle 1: 2, Cycle 2: 3, Cycle 3: 4
What changes would you like to see in Metro grant assistance?
(16 responses)

Other:
• The consultant need to be working directly with staff on one application - theirs.
• It would be helpful if the Letter of Interest process would occur prior to the Call For Projects period.
What level of in-house staff resources does your agency have to support ATP project delivery?

(31 responses)

- Medium: 17 responses
- Low: 10 responses
- High: 4 responses

Does your agency use consultant/contract staff?

(31 responses)

- Yes: 25 responses
- No: 6 responses
What issues are posing a challenge to you in delivering your ATP project? (30 responses)

The next slide shows the responses provided for “Other”

• Have not been directly awarded a grant as of yet.
• Coordination between CTC and Metro/Caltrans deadlines.
• Difficulty with the Metro provided grant writer understanding the project and doing a good job on the application.
• Numerous unsuccessful applications.
• Insufficient understanding of the sequential steps/processes to obligate funds/to get Metro/Caltrans approval to move forward. Further training and on-line documents regarding processing and approval would be helpful.
• Inconsistent guidelines
Please elaborate on any difficulty you had with Metro, Caltrans, CCC/CALCC.

(9 responses)

Metro
• For programming, projects are not adopted into the FTIP by the beginning of the first year of funding, resulting in funding authorization delays.

Caltrans
• We have experienced delays in the R/W Certification stage. Local agencies have roads that go over or under Caltrans freeways. Caltrans requires local agencies to certify the R/W following the State On-System R/W Certification process. This is a cumbersome process for a project that has no impact to Caltrans facilities. **Local agencies should be allowed to use the State Off-System R/W Certification** (LAPM Chapter 13).

• We have experienced delays with utility certifications as a part of the R/W Certification. We have been requested to provide email/written confirmation from utilities agreeing to the relocation which is unnecessary and not required per the LAPM. **Notice to Owner letters should be sufficient.** Local agencies should also be allowed to follow their own policies on plotting utilities on the plans and utility coordination as long as it follows State and Federal regulations. If Caltrans wants all local agencies to follow Caltrans procedures/documentations for utility delineation/coordination, then they should make that a requirement in the LAPM.

Caltrans continued
• ROW Clearance with Caltrans takes too long. Caltrans not sensitive to tight deadlines that City has to make to keep ATP project on schedule.

• Additionally, requests for certain technical studies are often unreasonable given the scope of the project, i.e. air quality studies are required for road diet projects.

• Caltrans’ interpretation of the need for Air Quality Report results in extensive review/study that is time-sensitive.

• It may also take a long time to secure an encroachment permit from Caltrans. On one occasion, it took several revisions before finally being issued a permit.

• Caltrans is a great organization that has purpose in the process; however, some of the submittal requirement are rigorous and time consuming and approval process is at times slow.

• Timely response from Caltrans.

• Special studies required by Caltrans during environmental review was most challenging.
Please elaborate on any difficulty you had with Metro, Caltrans, CCC/CALCC (continued).
(9 responses)

CTC
- Caltrans staff are doing very good job to help our agency, however, CTC deadlines to award and complete the projects is very challenging.
- They keep changing guidelines on applicants and application process!

CCC/CALCC
- Difficult communication and coordination with CA Conservation Corps
- We have dealt with the local Corps and found them to be hard working, but closing documentation requests on labor has been difficult to obtain.

Other
- Our ATP Planning Grant is being administrated by the Planning Division. We (as opposed to Public Works) have never worked with Caltrans before so the grant administration is all new to us and therefore challenging.
- The first application was submitted by a project partner and part of the application was not transmitted. The second application was not completed correctly.
- Difficulties are also encountered when Engineer’s Estimates are lower than the allocation amount for construction phase which can delay Caltrans funding authorization.

How would you change the ATP project delivery guidelines to increase your success?
(30 responses)

- Flexibility to reprogram later phases, if early phases take extra time: 20
- Allow work to proceed using local funds with reimbursement later: 19
- Ability to program over more than 2 or 3 years: 18
- Longer deadlines: 17
- Flexibility on deadlines for CEQA/NEPA clearance: 16
- Allow advanced allocation of early phases: 16
- Program 4 years at a time by reserving early phase funds from each...: 9
- Other: 5

Other:
- Deadline Flexibility for multi-agency projects
- No difficulty with these guidelines
- Keep them the same each cycle.
Does your agency have sufficient funds to conduct environmental clearance? (30 responses)

Has your agency ever proceeded with environmental clearance or design (whether funded by agency funds or other funds) prior to commitment of funds for construction? (30 responses)

What resources would assist your agency to make project delivery easier? (30 responses)

The next slide shows the responses provided for “Other”
What resources would assist your agency to make project delivery easier?
(30 responses)

Other

• Clarification on time need for review/approval by Caltrans/FHWA for environmental clearance, R/W certification, etc.

• ROW Certification process easier and faster

• Too many approvals for each phase CTC, Caltrans, too many deadlines to track

• Increase funding lapsing dates

• Workshops closer to North County.

• Actually getting awarded a grant would be nice for a start

What online resources would be helpful to your agency?
(30 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calendar of key milestones</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery process flow chart with timeline</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of completed forms</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to Caltrans forms and program resources</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual project delivery tracking spreadsheet</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro contact information</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Local Assistance contact information</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other:

• Previously funded applications achieved

• Nothing
Metro Successful Applicants Workshops

Has your agency ever attended a Metro Successful Applicants Workshop?
(30 responses)

- Yes: 21
- No: 9
Why did you not attend any Successful Applicants Workshops?
(9 responses)

- Was not aware of workshop(s): 7
- Did not want to attend: 2

What were the positives about the Successful Applicants Workshops?
(21 responses)

- Connecting with Caltrans/Metro staff: 15
- Learning about allocation request procedures: 11
- Learning about time extension requests: 10
- Learning about other resources: 8
- Learning about Requests for Authorization to Proceed: 8
- Clear and helpful answers to questions: 7
- Learning about the FTP: 6
- Other: 2

Other:
- Be aware of additional requirements/docs needed
- All of the above were positives, but because this information is not something we deal with on a regular basis, it was not initially apparent as to its meaningfulness for the process.
What were the negatives about the Successful Applicants Workshops?
(21 responses)

Other:
• Not enough info for deadlines to meet for Request for Allocation Packages for different phases (CTC Meetings, etc)
• Not conveniently located or programmed -- more than one location/one date would be great.

Additional thoughts about ATP from agencies that have never applied
(2 responses)

• Need to have pre and post data from other similar projects to ensure project is worthwhile

• There has to be a better way for small affluent communities to have a chance at these funds. With the disadvantaged community points and regional impacts and larger opportunity to change mode it leaves small above middle-class communities at a really disadvantage and the City's do not want to expend the necessary resources for such a massive grant application when we are pretty much behind the ball. The cities play a role in the linkage of the region just not on the same scale with some many of these communities supply the choice riders vs transit dependent – they need higher quality facilities get people to consider changing modes but they are the more costly treatments that cities can't fund out of the general funds budgets.
Additional thoughts about ATP from agencies that have applied
(10 responses)

Application
• If it could be considered favorable to ask/check off whether or not the proposed infrastructure project is requested based on a masterplan/study. Masterplans take a lot of time and effort from the community and city staff. They are the foundation/results of much needed infrastructure work that would increase safety, increase walking/biking, health, etc. It's unfortunate that projects are not rated stronger after so much effort from all involved.
• Application: Public Health question does not really add any value to the application in deciding if it should be funded or not. All bike/ped/active transportation projects have a positive effect on health so it's really a moot question.
• Application is cumbersome
• Having a dedicated grant writer working on our application made all the difference! The third application rated a score of 98!

Project Delivery
• The CCC & LA Cons. Corps are both limited in work that they can perform. Neither group is able to supply material and have limited construction capability. To date, we have only included bike rack installation & tree planting to be done by either.
• Provide information or warn agencies when projects are in risk to be in the INACTIVE list or redflag projects due to a missing action/document by Cities.

Program Administration
• We enjoyed working with Metro, they are very helpful; but, there are areas where CTC/Caltrans/Metro are not synching with each other that make project delivery challenging.
• Too many overseeing agencies.... FHWA, Caltrans, SCAG, and Metro....

Metro
Summary

Project Delivery Assistance
California Transportation Commission
• More flexibility in program years and deadlines

Caltrans
• Update LAPG and do not request documents it does not require
• Simplify ROW cert requirements for non-SHS improvements
• Provide samples of approved forms
• Provide information on expected processing times

Metro
• Successful Applicants Workshop in multiple locations
• Workshop should include more information regarding deadlines for various phases and types of requests
• Make sure information presented is consistent

Program Guidelines/Application
• Streamline application
• Online submittal only

Consultant/Grant Assistance
• Less applications per grant writer
• Start grant assistance process earlier so there's more time for all steps
• Consultant should continue handling printing/submittal of application
• Process should require less city staff time
LA Metro Staff Contact Information

Patricia Chen  
Senior Manager, Transportation Planning  
(213) 922-3041  
chenp@metro.net

Shelly Quan  
Transportation Planner  
(213) 922-3075  
quans@metro.net