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
   5 min
   Information (Fanny Pan)

4. Consent Calendar
   • Approval of Minutes
   Attachment 3: Draft March 1, 2017 Minutes
   Action

5. Measure M Guidelines Update
   15 min
   Information (Kalieh Honish)

6. TOD Planning Grant Round 5 Update
   10 min
   Information (Desiree Portillo Rabinov)

7. CTC Update
   5 min
   Information (Zoe Unruh)

8. ATP Update
   5 min
   Information (Shelly Quan)

9. California High Speed Rail Update
   20 min
   Information (Michelle Boehm, CHSRA)
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/

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 May 3, 2017 at 9:30 a.m. in the William Mulholland Conference Room. Please note that the 2017 Call for Projects Deobligation Appeals will be held at this meeting and may run longer than usual.
Attachment 1

Subcommittee Agendas
# Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

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

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Call to Order</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1 minute)</td>
<td>Jane Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Approval of February 21, 2017 Minutes</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1 minute)</td>
<td>BOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Chair’s Report</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5 minutes)</td>
<td>Jane Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Metro Report</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5 minutes)</td>
<td>Annelle Albarran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>FTA Update</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10 minutes)</td>
<td>Arianna Valle/Adam Stephenson/Stacy Alameida/Charlene Lee Lorenzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Southern California Regional Rail Transit Training Consortium</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15 minutes)</td>
<td>Dave Stumpo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>FY18 Budget Development and Update</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 1: FY18 Budget Overview</td>
<td>Conan Cheung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Regional Ridership Task Force Update</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10 minutes)</td>
<td>Conan Cheung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Update on FTA Section 5307 Principles/Guidelines &amp; Application Packet</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5 minutes)</td>
<td>Joyce Rooney</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. STA Efficiency Test
   Attachment 2: STA Efficiency Test Information
   (10 minutes)

11. BRT Update
   (10 minutes)

12. Access Update
   (10 minutes)

13. FAP Update
   (5 minutes)

14. Transit Industry Debriefing/Updates

15. New Business

16. 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
FY18 Budget Overview
STA Efficiency Test Information
FY17 FTA Section 5307 Fund Balances
FY16 FTA Section 5307 Fund Balances
Combined FY17 and FY16 FTA Section 5307 Fund Balances

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, April 18, 2017, at 9:30 am in the Mulholland Conference Room, 15th Floor of the Metro Headquarters Building.
NOTES TIME: 1:30 PM

Thursday, March 23, 2017, 1:30 P.M.

Agenda
Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE
Gateway Building – TAP Conference Room (4th floor)

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

1. Call to Order
   Action
   Sebastian Hernandez, Chair

2. Approval of Minutes
   Action
   Sebastian Hernandez, Chair

3. Annual Nominations for LTSS
   If you can’t attend, please have someone vote for you by proxy.
   Our current nominations are: Sebastian Hernandez, Pasadena (Chair),
   Justine Garcia, Glendora (Co-Chair), Luz Echavarria, LADOT
   (Secretary)

4. FY18 Budget Development
   Information
   Giovanna Gorgreve, Metro

5. Status of MOUs for FY17-21 (voluntary & non-voluntary) and
   Funding Marks for FY18 Sub-regional Paratransit 1st Draft
   Information
   Susan Richan, Metro

6. Measure M Local Return Update
   Information
   Susan Richan, Metro

7. New Business, Date of Next LTSS Meeting
   Sebastian Hernandez, Chair
Thursday, March 16, 2017  9:30 a.m.

Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

Willam Mulholland Conference Room – 15th Floor

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

2. Approval of Minutes
   Action (Subcommittee)
   Attachment 1: February 16, 2017 Minutes
   Attachment 2: Sign-in Sheet/Attendance Sheet
   Attachment 3: 90-Day Rolling Agenda

3. Chair Report
   5 min
   Information (Bahman Janka)

4. Metro Report
   5 min
   Information (Fulgene Asuncion)

5. Caltrans Update
   5 min
   Information (Steve Novotny)

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

7. FY 2018 Budget Development Status
   10 min
   Information (Conan Cheung)

8. Metro BRT Technical Studies Update
   10 min
   Information (Michael Richmai/Lauren Cencic)
9. Metro Bike Share  
   **10 min**  
   Information *(Avital Shavit)*

10. Open Streets  
    **10 min**  
    Information *(Brett Thomas)*

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

12. New Business  
    **5 min**

13. Adjournment  
    **1 min**

The next meeting for the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee will be held on April 20th at 9:30 a.m. on the 15th floor, Mulholland Conference Room. Please contact Fulgene Asuncion at (213) 922 – 3025 should you have any questions or comments regarding this or future agendas.

Agendas can be accessed online at: [http://www.metro.net/about/sfs/](http://www.metro.net/about/sfs/)
Attachment 2

Subcommittee Actions
Disposition of Subcommittee Actions

March 2017

Bus Operations Subcommittee:
  • Approved the February 21, 2017 meeting minutes

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:
  • Approved the January 2017 meeting minutes

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:
  • Approved the February 16, 2017 meeting minutes

TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee:
  • Did not meet in March
Attachment 3

Draft March 1, 2017 Minutes

March 1, 2017 Sign-In Sheets
Wednesday March 1, 2017 9:30 A.M.

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 February 21, 2017
   • Received updates on:
     o Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Asset Management Data Collection
     o Regional TAP Program and Service Center Operating Rules
     o Measure M Transit Operations 20% Working Group
     o Section 5307 Process Working Group
   • Next meeting is scheduled for March 21, 2017

   Local Transit Systems Subcommittee (LTSS)
   • Did not meet in February
   • Next meeting is scheduled for March 23, 2017

   Streets and Freeways Subcommittee
   • Last met on February 16, 2017
   • Received updates on:
     o California High-Speed Rail
     o Countywide ExpressLanes Strategic Master Plan
   • Eric Bruin (City of Culver City) was elected as the primary Bicycle Coordinator for Streets and Freeways, and will also serve as the alternate Bicycle Coordinator for TAC.
   • Next meeting is scheduled for March 16, 2017

   Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Sustainability Subcommittee
   • Did not meet in February
3. **Chairperson’s Report (Fanny Pan, Metro)**

A handout of the February 23, 2017 Metro Board meeting recap was distributed in lieu of an oral report.

Ms. Pan reported that the first Measure M Policy Advisory Council meeting will be held on April 5th. If the Board approves the release of the guidelines at the March 23rd Board meeting, then the item will be brought to TAC on the April 5th meeting for TAC member feedback.

Mohammad Mostahkami (League of California Cities – Gateway Cities COG) asked if there will be a representative from the TAC on the Policy Advisory Council? Ms. Pan replied that there is no TAC representation on the Policy Advisory Council, but there will be representation from each of the Council of Governments (COGs).

Ms. Pan reported that an email was sent to TAC members about the Envision training program and the Green Professional Building Skill Training Fundamentals.

Ms. Pan reported that TAC has one seat on the Metro Sustainability Council and nominations for this seat are due on March 31st. A copy of the nomination form is attached to the agenda packet. Mr. Lam reported that the Sustainability Council held their first informational meeting on February 15th. He noted that the Sustainability Council’s objectives are: to increase awareness of sustainability-related leading industry practices and best practices to be included 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 and work related training; and improve the understanding of our constituents and stakeholders of the sustainability-related efforts and opportunities at LA Metro. The Metro Sustainability Council is scheduled to meet quarterly, but the schedule has not been finalized yet. He explained that TAC’s seat on the Council includes one primary and one alternate representative. He noted that one TAC member has expressed interest, so one more is needed to serve as the alternate. Ms. Pan noted that a Metro staff member will still provide updates on the Sustainability Council at future TAC meetings.

Jane Leonard (BOS) commented that she hopes the Metro Sustainability Vision will thoroughly cover advanced technology, including not only electric buses but also Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) and other alternative fuels. Ms. Pan replied that staff will pass this information along to the Metro Environmental Compliance/Sustainability group.

Larry Stevens (League of California Cities – San Gabriel Valley COG) asked if the TAC representative on the Sustainability Council will be selected through a volunteer or a voting process? Ms. Pan replied that TAC can decide how they would like to choose the representative.

Michelle Caldwell (BOS) asked if the TAC representative for the Metro Sustainability Council needs to be a current TAC member? She noted that many TAC members have sustainability specialists in their agencies, but might not be as well versed in sustainability issues.
themselves. Ms. Pan acknowledged that and also suggested that it may make more sense for members of the TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee to serve as the TAC representative on the Sustainability Council, since they specialize in that field. She left this open for TAC members to decide how they would like to proceed. The TAC agreed that staff should reach out to the TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee for interest in serving on the Metro Sustainability Council.

Mr. Mostahkami asked for clarification that there will be one member and one alternate? Ms. Pan confirmed.

4. Consent Calendar
A motion to approve the February 1, 2017 TAC minutes was made by Sebastian Hernandez (LTSS) and seconded by John Walker (City of Los Angeles). Richard Dilluvio (Bicycle Coordinator), Jane Leonard (BOS), David Feinberg (League of California Cities – Westside Cities COG), and Dan Mitchell (City of Los Angeles) abstained. The minutes were approved.

5. FY 18 Budget Development Status (Conan Cheung, Metro)
Mr. Cheung presented a budget development overview for FY 2018 which involves a four-month process. In February 2017, the budget development process included outreach, and sales tax revenue and consumer price index (CPI) assumptions. In March, staff will compile a list of transit projects that Metro will be funding in FY 2018, Metro bus/rail service levels, and transit boardings and fare revenue projections. Staff plans to have a preliminary budget proposal in April 2017, along with a public hearing and final Board adoption.

Mr. Cheung reported that staff has been working significantly to increase its outreach efforts for the budget development process. Staff will be conducting a series of public and stakeholder meetings, and will also be utilizing social media to distribute information on budget development. Staff will be conducting a telephone town hall to accommodate members of the public who are unable to attend the public meetings in person.

Mr. Cheung noted that the budget starts with the goals set forth by the Metro CEO, while the Metro Office of Management and Budget's (OMB's) ultimate objective is to provide departments with the resources they need to be able to attain these goals. Each department is expected to develop an annual work program of objectives and activities, and OMB will supply those objectives and activities with funds and full-time equivalents (FTEs).

Mr. Cheung reported that the sales tax represent about 50% of Metro's revenues, with an average of 3.2% growth over the past 30 years. Revenue growth from sales tax has tended to follow a cyclical pattern, since factors such as retail prices, wages, and changes in legislation all impact the sales tax growth rate. He noted that Metro is projecting 2.6% growth this year. Staff also tracks the Consumer Price Index (CPI) as it relates to their expenses, and is expecting to have CPI growth 1.25% - 2%.

Mr. Cheung reported that average fare revenue has stabilized at 78 cents per boarding over the last two to three years, and staff is anticipating the same level of revenue per boarding for FY 2018. Staff is still looking at boarding rates and has been conducting studies on ridership, which will then be used to create an estimate for FY 2018.
Mr. Cheung reviewed the major Measure R and Measure M transit projects planned in FY 2018. He noted that planning phase constitutes up to 2% of the life cycle cost of a project. Mr. Cheung reported that the three current major transit construction projects include the Crenshaw/LAX Line, Regional Connector, and the Westside Extension. He noted that the Airport Metro Connector is set to enter construction and the Gold Line Foothill Extension 2B will be entering a construction engineering phase.

Mr. Cheung reported that Metro is largely planning to retain the current level of bus service, and Operations will be taking some unproductive services out, mostly those parallel to the Expo Line. They will also be increasing frequency in the Owl Network, which would include additional running time or increasing frequency along some key corridors.

Mr. Cheung reported that the amount of budgeted service hours will largely remain flat for rail. He noted that staff budgeted more rail hours in FY 2017 than they were able to provide, because they did not have enough cars to provide the level of service expected on the Gold Line and Expo Line extensions. With additional cars now being added to the system, staff will be able to meet the estimated service levels. He noted that the Expo Line and Gold Line will be running three car trains on weekdays, as well as increasing frequency on the Expo Line on weekends. Mr. Cheung reported that staff will be budgeting a 60% increase in special event service and a 16% overall increase in State of Good Repair, which is largely due to rail vehicle acquisitions.

As part of Metro’s budget outreach, staff also developed an online budget tool that allows the public to provide feedback on their individual transportation priorities.

Mr. Stevens noted that the Board recently adopted a policy to incorporate first/last mile improvements into the capital construction of the project. He questioned whether the Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase 2B has first/last mile funding included in the construction cost. Heather Hills (Metro) replied that the Program Guideline development process will link station development funding with first/last mile improvements. The Board is anticipated to adopt the Program Guidelines in June.

Robert Beste (League of California Cities – South Bay Cities COG) asked where Proposition A and C funds fit into the budget? Mr. Cheung replied that at this stage in the budget preparation process, the budget overview only shows high-level assumptions of revenue. OMB puts together an expense plan for FY 2018, which the appropriate funding sources will then be used to balance the budget. Mr. Cheung noted that the draft budget will include the specific funding sources.

Mr. Mostahkami asked when Measure M funding will start flowing? Tim Mengle (Metro) explained that the Measure M sales tax takes effect on July 1st, and funds will start to be distributed to Metro in October.

Sebastian Hernandez (LTSS) referenced an article in the press discussing a decrease in Metro ridership, but that the budget presentation showed an increase. Mr. Cheung clarified that the chart in the presentation showed budgeted boardings. Staff is currently reanalyzing budgeted ridership due to the ridership trends being seen throughout the system.
Mr. Hernandez asked why the North Hollywood to Pasadena Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project is not listed in the transit projects chart? Mr. Cheung replied that this was an error and that the chart would be corrected.

Richard Dilluvio (Bicycle Coordinator) commented that he is glad that the staff is increasing the Gold Line to three cars. He asked if there is a timeline for this effort? Mr. Cheung replied that staff is currently receiving approximately four new cars per month, split between Gold and Expo Line. He predicted that all the cars should be available within the next couple of months.

Ms. Caldwell asked if there is another phase for a fare change? Mr. Cheung replied that there are currently no plans for fare changes. Ms. Caldwell asked what is the fare box recovery ratio? Mr. Cheung replied it is about 21.5% - 22%, without supplemental funding.

6. Long Range Transportation Plan Update (Heather Hills/Mark Yamarone, Metro)

Mr. Yamarone reported that the passage of Measure M sets the stage for a new, innovative Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), because of the new capital projects being added and the new opportunities for local programs through the multi-year subregional programs. In January 2017, the Board approved to amend the 2009 LRTP to include the Measure M projects in the Expenditure Plan. Staff is currently working with SCAG to include Measure M projects in the 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS).

Mr. Yamarone reported that Metro’s Office of Extraordinary Innovation (OEI) is currently developing a Strategic Plan, which will help Metro create a seamless world-class transportation system throughout Los Angeles County. The Strategic Plan will help set the agency’s goals and missions for implementing mobility, which will then directly inform the LRTP planning process.

The LRTP will have a modular approach, which allows maximum flexibility to actively engage departments within the agency. It will help ensure that all existing plans and programs within the agency will remain consistent. Staff will inventory all relevant current efforts and strengths, and fill in any “gaps” among Metro’s planning needs. The LRTP will also provide Los Angeles County with the elements to regional planning required by federal and state mandates.

The LRTP includes seven modules, broken into two sections. Section 1 consists of three modules and answers: who we serve, what they need, and where do they go? Module A is A Plan for Communities, which analyzes demographics and socio-economic analysis, and includes an equity element to address the real “opportunity gap” in Los Angeles County, and how transportation can assist in breaching that gap. Module B is A Plan for Partners, which defines the roles of Metro and its local, regional, state, and federal partners to catalyze change and/or sustain critical activities. Module C is A Plan for Outcomes, which identifies missions, goals, and objectives, in order to provide the foundation for relevant system performance metrics, and how to measure and monitor them.

Section 2 consists of four modules and answers: how we achieve system outcomes, today and in the future. Module A is A Plan to Manage, which addresses the transportation core:
operations, maintenance, safety, and security. Module B is A Plan to Serve, which identifies and coordinates Metro’s multiple planning and programming activities impacting equity, economy, and the environment. Module C is A Plan to Build, which will develop the Capital Investment Program for a 30-40 year period and look at priorities, project delivery, and adjusting for innovation and new technologies. Module D is A Plan to Fund, which will determine and prioritize the investments needed for the entire plan, such as resources and costs, priorities where funding gaps are anticipated, and scenarios to test assumptions and position for uncertainty.

Ms. Hills reported that in this modular approach, staff will establish a baseline and timeline for all the modules. Section 1 baselines will include identifying partners, goals, and projects, in order to set the stage for Section 2. She noted that staff is trying out “sensitivity testing,” which tests scenarios and variation—such as loss of federal funding, so that Metro can be quick with how to respond to such scenarios. Ms. Hills reported that a public outreach program will be developed to support all activities in 2017 and 2018.

Ms. Leonard asked how the LRTP update effort relates to Call for Projects? Ms. Hills replied that the Call for Projects is part of Section 2, Module D: A Plan to Fund, involving scenario testing.

Mr. Beste asked how staff is analyzing the effect that new technologies such as ride sharing will have on current transportation programs? Ms. Hills replied that the scenario testing effort takes these new services and technologies into account.

Mr. Stevens asked if this plan requires any California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) clearance? Ms. Hills replied that Metro is not required do an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), but SCAG is required to do a programmatic EIR every four years, prior to adoption of their RTP.

Mr. Stevens asked if other agencies have taken this type of approach for an LRTP before? Ms. Hills replied yes, and it is similar to how the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) conducts their planning.

7. Federal Earmarks Repurposing Update (Wil Ridder, Metro)
Mr. Ridder reported that final federal approval for federal earmarks repurposing is expected in early March. Staff hosted a workshop on February 23rd for participating agencies and walked them through the process. After final federal approval, staff will be able to execute funding agreements with the local agencies.

Mr. Mostahkami commended the partnership between Metro and the COGs during the Federal Earmarks repurposing process. He asked if Metro can issue a Letter of No Prejudice (LONP) once they received final federal approval? Mr. Ridder replied that staff is currently looking into the possibilities. He noted that there is a level of uncertainty to issue LONPs with local agencies before Metro receives the E-76. Any LONP would need to acknowledge that uncertainty and share the risk between the local agency and Metro.
8. ATP Update (Shelly Quan, Metro)

A copy of the ATP Survey results was attached to the agenda packet.

Ms. Quan noted that there is a small technical correction expected for the statewide Active Transportation Program (ATP), because a project from Los Angeles County submitted a revised funding request that was not reflected in the program that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) adopted in December 2016. This has the effect of reducing the amount of Los Angeles County’s ATP award by $293,000.

Ms. Quan summarized the results of the ATP Survey, which was administered to local agencies in Los Angeles County to understand the challenges they are facing in securing ATP funding and delivering ATP projects. The survey was distributed from November 17 – December 16, 2016. Staff reached out to 88 cities, Los Angeles County, and 10 non-traditional ATP applicants, and received responses from 47 agencies.

The four sections of the survey include: the ATP application process, grant assistance, project delivery, and Metro successful applicants workshop. 40 out of the 47 agencies who submitted responses to the survey have previously applied to the ATP.

For responders who have never applied to the ATP, the most common reason for not applying was not having enough resources to complete the application. The two most common responses for changes to the ATP application process that would make it easier for cities to apply would be to streamline the application, and allowing the applicant to choose either hard copy or electronic submittal. The top resource that responders stated they needed in order to apply for the ATP was consultant support to write the application, as well as funding for that consultant support. Ms. Quan noted that staff is currently working to offer grant assistance to cities for consultant support in the next year.

For responders who have applied to the ATP, the most common response for applying was that active transportation infrastructure is a critical need in their community. The majority of applicants prepared their application entirely in-house, and the majority of applicants have not changed their approach between ATP application cycles. For those who have changed their approach, those changes include: collaborating with other community partners to achieve regional and local goals, concentrating on current projects due to CTC restricted rules for awarding and completion of projects, actively seeking and applying for available grants whenever a solid project is identified, transferring the responsibility of the application to mostly the consultant, providing more data in the application, receiving Caltrans assistance on the application, submitting fewer applications in one cycle, starting preparation sooner, applying for smaller projects, using the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Masterplan to make a stronger application, completing more planning work beforehand, and receiving a grant for a private grant writer. The most common response for changes to the application process that would make it easier for agencies to apply was to streamline the application.

Concerning grant assistance, 17 responders indicated that they prepared an ATP application with Metro consultant assistance. Agency staff devoted an average of 32 hours to providing information to the consultants, and an average of 11 hours reviewing the draft application. The most common positive of Metro grant assistance from these responders was the agency
staff time that was saved. The most common negative response was that the agency still had to devote a significant amount of staff time. The four changes that responders most wanted to see in Metro grant assistance were: having Metro provide more notice of availability of grant assistance, having more time to meet and discuss with consultants before starting the application, having the consultant coordinate communication with California Conservation Corps (CCC)/California Local Conservation Corps (CALCC), and having more time to review application drafts.

Concerning project delivery, the majority of responders rated their in-house staff resources as medium. 25 responders indicated that they use consultant or contract staff for project delivery. The most common challenge in ATP project delivery was tight deadlines. The most common response for changing the ATP project delivery guidelines was to allow flexibility to reprogram later phases, if early phases take extra time. Most responders indicated that their agency had sufficient funds to conduct environmental clearance, but that they would not proceed with the process prior to commitment of funds for construction. Ms. Quan noted that this could be a concern because the CTC likes to fund shovel-ready projects. Grant funds management by Metro or SCAG were the most common response for resources that would assist agencies in making project delivery easier. A calendar of key milestones was the most common response for online resources that would help the agencies.

Concerning Metro Successful Applicants Workshops, 21 out of 30 responses stated that they have attended the workshops. Of the nine who have not attended, seven stated not being aware of the workshops as their reason for not attending. For those who did attend, the most common response on the positives of the workshops was being able to connect with Caltrans and Metro staff. The most common responses for negatives about the workshops include: not having enough information of deadlines to meet for Request for Allocation Packages for different phases (CTC Meetings, etc.), and the workshops not being conveniently located or programmed.

The main takeaways from the survey results for project delivery assistance from the CTC includes: more flexibility in program years and deadlines from the CTC. For Caltrans, it includes: updating the Local Assistance Program Guidelines (LAPG) and not requesting documents it does not require, simplifying right-of-way (ROW) certification requirements for non-State Highway System (SHS) improvements, providing samples of approved forms, and providing information on expected processing times. For Metro, it includes: hosting Successful Applicants Workshops in multiple locations, having the workshops include more information regarding deadlines for various phases and types of requests, and ensuring that information is presented consistently.

The main takeaways concerning program guidelines and the application include: streamlining the application, and requiring only an online submittal.

The main takeaways for consultant and grant assistance include: having fewer applications per grant writer, starting the grant assistance process earlier so that there is more time for other steps, having the consultant handle printing and submittal of the application, and using less city staff time for the application process.
John Walker (County of Los Angeles) asked if these survey results are reflective of only Los Angeles County or if they resonate across other areas of the state? Ms. Quan replied that while staff does not have survey results to confirm, they have heard the same concerns at events they have attended. She noted that Metro will offer to distribute the survey to other transit agencies in the state at the March ATP TAC meeting, which will focus on first/last mile solutions.

Full results of the survey can be found here: [https://media.metro.net/about_us/committees/images/presentation_TAC_ATPSurveyResults.pdf](https://media.metro.net/about_us/committees/images/presentation_TAC_ATPSurveyResults.pdf)

9. **Metro BRT Technical Studies Update (Michael Richmai/Lauren Cencic, Metro)**

Mr. Richmai reported that staff completed the Los Angeles County Bus Rapid Transit (CBRT) Study in December 2013, which recommended nine potential corridors for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) implementation, including North Hollywood to Pasadena and Vermont Avenue. The Board directed staff to begin advanced technical studies on the North Hollywood to Pasadena and Vermont Avenue corridors, in July and October 2014, respectively. Mr. Richmai noted that staff is expecting to complete both studies in March 2017.

Mr. Richmai reported that the North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT study is a 16-mile corridor, stretching from the Metro Red and Orange Lines at the North Hollywood Station to the Gold Line in Pasadena, and runs parallel to the SR-134. The corridor traverses the cities of Los Angeles, Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena. Key activities centers along the corridor include Burbank Airport, Downtown Burbank, Downtown Glendale, and Downtown Pasadena.

The analysis within the study showed two types of trips generated in the study area: 1) trips passing through the study area and trips beginning or ending in the study area. He noted that the study area has 700,000 daily trips, with the majority of trips by automobile. He noted that transit usage in the corridor is very low, so the key objective for this study is to create a BRT service that can make transit more attractive to current automobile users in the study area.

Mr. Richmai reported that the study created 10 initial alignment concepts, which were then refined to create two preferred BRT alignment concepts: Primary Street Alignment and Primary Freeway Alignment.

The Primary Street Alignment concept is approximately 18 miles long, and will connect the Metro Red and Orange Lines to the Gold Line. The majority of the street alignments will have dedicated bus lanes, and will connect to the many activity centers along the way. There are six street alignment options for the Primary Street Alignment concept: Green/Union Couplet (Pasadena), Central (Glendale), Chandler (Burbank), Magnolia (Burbank), and Alameda (Burbank).

The Primary Freeway Alignment concept is approximately 16 miles, and will connect the Metro Red and Orange Lines to the Gold Line primarily via the SR-134. The Primary Freeway Alignment concept has one option that would include access to Burbank Airport via the SR-134 and the I-5 freeways.
The Primary Street Alignment concept will have a travel time of 77 minutes, with daily boardings of 18,000 in model year 2035; while the Primary Freeway Alignment concept will have a travel time of 52 minutes, with daily boardings of 10,300 in model year 2035. Mr. Richmai noted that the Primary Street Alignment concept has the potential to attract more riders because it will connect to more key activity centers. The Primary Street Alignment concept also has a higher capital investment and higher operations/maintenance cost, because it will have more stations. Mr. Richmai noted that the project includes $267 million in Measure M funding.

Key findings of the study for the North Hollywood to Pasadena corridor include: the potential for a substantial untapped transit market in the study area; a premium bus service has the potential to capture more choice riders; the Street and Freeway concepts serve different market segments; and that both concepts are feasible BRT options to improve transit service and increase ridership in the study area.

Ms. Cencic reported the Vermont BRT study area stretches along Vermont Ave., from Hollywood Blvd. down to 120th St. It is a 12.4-mile corridor and is the second busiest bus corridor in Metro’s network with 45,000 daily boardings. The current bus service along the corridor suffers from heavy traffic congestion, which results in slow bus speeds, poor on-time performance, uneven headways, and overcrowding. The corridor has many key activity centers and connects to the Metro Red, Purple, Expo, and Green Lines.

Ms. Cencic reported that the technical study has identified four preliminary BRT concepts:

Concept 1: End-to-End Side Running BRT involves an all-day bus lane for the entire corridor. It would convert the traffic lane next to parked vehicle into a dedicated bus lane. This concept would create 12.4 miles of bus lane, but remove 446 all-day parking spaces, which is 22% of all on-street parking along the corridor.

Concept 2: Combo Side / Center Running BRT converts the traffic lane next to the parking lane north of Gage Ave. into a dedicated bus lane. South of Gage Ave., it would create a center running bus lanes by converting two center traffic lanes, in order to speed up travel times and reduce friction with other vehicles. This concept would result in a parking loss of 464 all-day spaces, which is 23% of all on-street parking.

Concept 3: Curbside Running BRT would run adjacent to the curb, and would convert existing on-street parking, where wide enough, to dedicated bus lanes. Due to ROW constraints, only 7.3 miles of curbside dedicated bus lanes would be feasible, and the remaining 5.1 miles would be in mixed traffic flow. This concept would have the largest impact on parking, with a total parking loss of 1,100 all-day spaces, which is 55% of all on-street parking. Ms. Cencic noted that parking spaces along the corridor are only occupied on-average 55% of the time. This concept may also result in slight delays from right-turning vehicles.

Concept 4: Peak Period Curbside Running BRT would involve a curbside bus lane only during peak hours (7-9 am and 4-7 pm), and the BRT would operate in mixed-flow all other times. Because of existing restricted peak period parking and ROW constraints, this concept would only have 2.7 miles of curbside peak hour dedicated bus lanes, with the remaining 9.7 miles
being mixed-flow. This concept would have a parking loss of 83 all-day spaces, which is 4% of capacity.

In a No Build scenario, expected ridership along the corridor is expected to increase to 54,600 daily boardings in model year 2035. Ms. Cencic reported that Concepts 1 and 2 would improve travel time the most by approximately 20 minutes. Concept 1 is estimated to have 74,050 daily boardings; Concept 2: 74,380; Concept 3: 66,480; and Concept 4: 63,850. Ms. Cencic noted that overall, Concepts 1 and 2 offer the greatest improvements in travel time, bus speed, and ridership.

Ms. Cencic noted that while Concepts 1 and 2 would be converting a travel lane into a dedicated bus lane, person throughput would increase with the dedicated bus lane. Concept 3 has the largest impact to parking, whereas Concept 4 has the lowest impact, but will operate primarily in mixed flow.

Ms. Cencic reported that Concepts 1 and 2 have the highest project costs, at $322 million and $332 million, respectively. Both Concepts have an annual operations and maintenance (O&M) cost increase of $3.4 million. Concept 3 has a capital cost of $235 million, with an O&M cost of $3.8 million. Concept 4 has a capital cost of $145 million, with an O&M cost of $4.1 million.

Ms. Cencic reported that the study found Concepts 1 and 2 to be the most promising options for improving passenger experience and Metro’s operational service, as well as having a minimal impact on parking.

Ms. Cencic noted that both the North Hollywood to Pasadena and the Vermont BRT projects are funded by Measure M. North Hollywood to Pasadena has a groundbreaking date of 2020, and opening date of 2022. Staff is currently waiting for Board approval to initiate the environmental process. The Vermont BRT project has a groundbreaking date of 2024, and opening date of 2028. Measure M also identified the potential for light rail transit (LRT) conversion after FY 2067, and Phase 2 of the study will look at how BRT could be converted to LRT in the future.

Eric Widstrand (City of Long Beach) asked if staff looked into all-door boarding and pre-boarding fare payments? Ms. Cencic replied that these studies cover a 5% technical level, so those aspects have not yet been determined, but staff is keeping them in mind.

Dan Mitchell (City of Los Angeles) asked if travel time assumed that those features were implemented? Ms. Cencic replied that travel times only assumed a high level BRT model. She noted that all-door boarding is a strong possibility, but pre-boarding payment would be more complicated to consider. Mr. Richmai noted that these BRT features do help increase travel speeds, and that staff will look at these in future phases.

Ferdy Chan (City of Los Angeles) noted that the North Hollywood to Pasadena project was proposed in Measure M with the Primary Freeway Alignment. He asked how switching to the Primary Street Alignment may affect existing funded municipal projects on Colorado Blvd? Mr. Richmai replied that staff has been working closely with the City of Pasadena, and will
take adjacent city projects into consideration. Mr. Chan added that the City of Los Angeles has an ATP project on Colorado Blvd. that has already started the design phase. Mr. Richmai replied that staff will work with City of Los Angeles staff to ensure that the projects do not conflict with one another. Mr. Chan requested to meet with the project team to discuss these details. Mr. Richmai confirmed.

Ms. Leonard asked if there is existing bus service on Vermont Ave? Ms. Cencic replied that the corridor is served by the Metro Local 204 and Rapid 754 and is heavily used. Ms. Leonard asked how staff would handle bus stops for Concepts 1 and 2 if they are not at curbside? Ms. Cencic replied that in the portions where it is side-running, they would consider bulb-out stations. For the segment south of Gage Ave. in Concept 2 where the bus runs in the center lane, there would be stations in the median area.

Mr. Beste asked why the Primary Street Alignment for the North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT project is higher performing when it has longer travel time than the Freeway Running Alignment? He noted that it does not make sense for commuters. Mr. Richmai replied that staff identified different types of trips in the study area: those that want to travel faster, and those who would like to connect to more activity centers. He noted that the street option offers more connections to activity centers, whereas the freeway option is for faster travel. Mr. Beste stated that the freeway option does not seem to be fast enough to attract commuters out of their automobiles. Mr. Richmai replied that travel time is increased in this option because the bus would still have to exit the freeway to stop at stations.

Mr. Mitchell asked what were the major costs of doing the side-running concept for the Vermont BRT project? Ms. Cencic replied that the costs for the side-running and median-running concepts are very similar. She noted that the initial cost estimate involve looking at re-paving the dedicated bus lane for the entire 12.4 miles. Mr. Mitchell asked for confirmation that the $250 million estimate is mostly for rebuilding the street? Ms. Cencic replied that the concrete deck is a large part of the cost estimate, but there are still other features as well, such as integrating stations, technologies, passenger amenities, and ensuring that riders can walk to the station safely.

David Kriske (League of California Cities – Arroyo Verdugo Cities) commented that the cost estimate for the Primary Street Alignment for the North Hollywood to Pasadena project assumes building a 17-mile stretch of concrete. Mr. Kriske stated he does not believe this is necessary and that the cost estimate is too high. Additionally, he believes the cost estimate for the Primary Freeway Alignment is too low, because it is not capturing the cost of the infrastructure required in building stations in the middle of the freeway. Mr. Richmai replied that study assumes stations will be located off the freeway. He noted that the buses would have to exit the freeway to reach a station, and then get back on. Mr. Kriske commented that this method would increase travel time, and it would be hard to convince an automobile commuter to leave their car for a bus commute that would take three times as long. Ms. Cencic noted that both BRT studies are still high level technical projects and all the capital cost estimates are subject to change. She noted that these technical studies are primarily meant to show feasibility of BRT in these corridors.
Mr. Beste asked if the Vermont BRT cost estimate included the offset cost to reducing service on the existing lines? Ms. Cencic confirmed and stated that the cost estimate is the net difference of the increase. She noted that the new BRT would most likely replace the current Rapid line, with adjustment to the Local line, which will still operate alongside the BRT.

10. Legislative Update (Raffi Hamparian/Michael Turner, Metro)
No Legislative Update was provided.

11. Other Business
Ms. Pan announced that this TAC meeting would be Sergeant Dave Nelms’s (California Highway Patrol) last meeting. She thanked him for serving on TAC for the past 3.5 years. Sergeant Steve Branconier will serve as the new Primary California Highway Patrol representative.

Ms. Pan announced that the 626 Golden Streets event will take place on Sunday, March 5, 2017, from 9:00 am – 3:00 pm in the San Gabriel Valley, which also coincides with the one year anniversary of the Gold Line Foothill Extension opening.

Mr. Chan asked for a status update from a previous request to look into potential impacts of the new federal administration on transportation funding. Mr. Lam replied that Steven Mateer (Metro) was looking into the matter, but since there has been no official announcement from the federal administration, there is nothing concrete to report at the moment.

12. Adjournment
Ms. Pan adjourned the meeting and reported that the next scheduled TAC meeting is April 5, 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.
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**Sign in Sheet**  
**March 1, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>Marianne Kim/Stephen Finnegan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICYCLE COORDINATOR</td>
<td>Rich Dilluvio/Michelle Mowery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (BOS)</td>
<td>Michelle Caldwell/Robert Portillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jene Leonard/Dana Pynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL</td>
<td>Sgt. Dave Nelms/Ofc. Christian Cracroft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>Gary Slater/Steve Novotny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greg Par/Kelly Lamare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVE ON ADA</td>
<td>Ellen Blackman/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>Eric Widstrand/Nathan Baird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CITY OF LOS ANGELES                  | 1. Kari Perderian  
Vacant/Corinne Ralph  
2. Dan Mitchell/Carlos Rios  
3. Ferdy Chan/Kevin Minne |
| COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES                | 1. Richard Marshalian/Ayala Ben-Yehuda  
2. John Walker/Inez Yeung  
3. Pat Proano/Vacant  
Mary Raver |
| LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES          | 1. David Kriske/Roubik Golanian  
2. Mohammad Mostahkami/Lisa Rapp  
3. Robert Brager/Elizabeth Shavelson  
4. Troy Niebla/Mike Behen  
5. Larry Stevens/Craig Bradshaw  
6. Jason Smisco/Wayne Ko  
7. Robert Beste/Ted Semaan  
8. David Feinberg/Sharon Perlstein |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE (LTSS)</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 (SCAGRA - Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Anne Louise Rice/Karen Sakoda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SCAQMD -- Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Eyvonne Drummonds/Kathryn Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG -- Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Warren Whiteaker/Annie Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Lupe Valdez/LaDonna DiCamillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/</td>
<td>1. Mike Bagheri/Phil Aker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>2. Mark Hunter/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JIMMY Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Connor Chung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Amanda Meza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jessica McHenry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jennifer Martinez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES

<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 Dilluvio/Michelle Morey (A)</td>
<td>BICYCLE 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/Robert Porillo (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/Dana Pyrit (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. Steve Bransconier/Ofc. Christian Cracraft (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>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>Greg Fair/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 Widstedt/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 Rios (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>Ferdy Chan/Kevin Minne (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 Marshall/Aysha Bien-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>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>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 Pecora/Mary Reyes (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 Keske/Roubik Gotskan (A)</td>
<td>ARROYO VERDUGO CITIES</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>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 VIRGENES MALBUC 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 Behen/Alien Thompson (A)</td>
<td>NORTH LA. 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 Bradshaw (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 Beste/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 Fernberg/Sharon Pfeilstein (A)</td>
<td>WEST SIDE 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/Farn Goodman (A)</td>
<td>LTSS</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>LTSS</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 Contreras/Caroline Kreitke (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>Annette Lauer/Rae Korkhoda (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>Elyonnie Drummonds/Kathryn Higgins (A)</td>
<td>SCAQMD</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 Whiteaker/Amiee Nair (A)</td>
<td>SCAQ</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 Valdez/LaFinnia Beckmiller (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>

**Warning:**