Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

William Mulholland Conference Room

FY 2018 Budget Workshop (STARTS AT 9:00 AM) Information
30 min (Metro OMB Staff)

1. Call to Order/Roll Call Action (Fanny Pan, Brian Lam)

2. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees Information
   Bus Operations (Jane Leonard)
   Local Transit Systems (Sebastian Hernandez)
   Streets and Freeways (Fulgene Asuncion)
   TDM/Sustainability (Mike Bagheri)
   Attachment 1: Subcommittee Agendas
   Attachment 2: Subcommittee Actions

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

4. Consent Calendar Action
   • Approval of Minutes
     Attachment 3: Draft April 5, 2017 Minutes

5. TIMED AGENDA 9:45 AM
   Call for Projects Deobligation Appeals Action
   Attachment 4: TAC Call for Projects
   Appeals Protocol (Fanny Pan)
   Attachment 5: Recommended Project
   Deobligation List
   Attachment 6: TAC Appeals Fact Sheets

6. Draft Measure M Guidelines Discussion/Action

7. Other Business
8. 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 June 7, 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 March 21, 2017 Minutes
   (1 minute)  
   Action  
   BOS

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

4. Metro Report
   (5 minutes)  
   Information  
   Scott Hartwell

5. STA Efficiency Test
   Approval of Final Draft
   (10 minutes)  
   Action  
   Susan Richan

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

7. FAP Updates
   (5 minutes)  
   Information  
   Manijeh Ahmadi

8. Measure M Draft Guidelines
   (10 minutes)  
   Information  
   Anelli-Michelle Navarro

9. Access Update
   (10 minutes)  
   Information  
   Matthew Avancena

10. Transit Industry Debriefing/Updates
    (5 minutes)  
    Information  
    All
11. FTA Section 5307 15% Discretionary Capital and 1% ATI Funds Allocation (2 hours)
   Action
   Jane Leonard

12. New Business
   Information
   All

13. Adjournment

Information Items:

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

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

Please call SCOTT HARTWELL at 213-922-2836 or ANNELLE ALBARRAN at 213-922-4025 if you have questions regarding the agenda or meeting. The next BOS meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 16, 2017, at 9:30 am in the Mulholland Conference Room, 15th Floor of the Metro Headquarters Building.
NOTE TIME: 1:30 PM
Thursday, March 20, 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) 922-4940
In house call ext. 24940

1. Call to Order
   Action
   Sebastian Hernandez, Chair

2. Approval of Minutes
   Action
   Sebastian Hernandez, Chair

5. Status of MOUs for FY17-21 (voluntary & non-voluntary) and Funding Marks for FY18 Sub-regional Paratransit 2nd Draft
   Information
   Susan Richan, Metro

6. Measure M Local Return Guidelines Feedback
   Discussion
   Sebastian Hernandez, Chair

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

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

William Mulholland Conference Room – 15th Floor

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

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

3. Chair Report
   5 min  
   Information (Bahman Janka)

4. Metro Report
   5 min  
   Information (Fulgene Asuncion)

5. Caltrans Update
   5 min  
   Information (Steve Novotny)

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

7. Local Streets and Roads Awards Program
   5 min  
   Information (Charles Herbertson)

8. Airport Metro Connector Update
   15 min  
   Information (Meghna Khanna)
9. Measure M Guidelines Update  
   Possible Action (Mark Linsenmeyer)
   10 min

10. TOD Planning Grant Round 5 Update  
    Information (Desiree Portillo-Rabinov/Elizabeth Carvajal)
    10 in

11. State and Federal Legislative Update  
    Information (Raffi Hamparian/ 
    Marisa Yeager/ 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 May 18th at 9:30 a.m. on the 15th floor, Mulholland Conference Room. Please contact Fulgene Asuncion at (213) 922 – 3025 should you have any questions or comments regarding this or future agendas.

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

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority
(Metro)

TDM/ SUSTAINABILITY
SUBCOMMITTEE

Metro HQ
18th floor, Tarzana Conference Rm.

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

2. Introductions
   All

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

4. Metro Complete Streets and First/Last Mile Trainings
   (Katie Lemmon, Metro)
   All

5. Future Agenda Items
   All

6. Adjournment

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

Subcommittee Actions
Disposition of Subcommittee Actions

April 2017

Bus Operations Subcommittee:

• Approved the March 21, 2017 meeting minutes
• Approved the following items:
  o Final draft of the State Transit Assistance (STA) Fund Efficiency Standards;
  o FTA Section 5307 15% Discretionary Capital Funds Allocation
  o FTA Section 5307 1% ATI Funds Allocation

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:

• Approved the March 2017 meeting minutes

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:

• Approved the March 16, 2017 meeting minutes

TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee:

• No Actions were taken
Attachment 3

April 5, 2017 TAC Minutes

April 5, 2017 Sign-In Sheets
Meeting Minutes

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. Call to Order/Roll Call
Brian Lam (Alternate Chair) called the meeting to order at 9:34 A.M., took roll and declared a quorum was present.

2. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees

Bus Operations Subcommittee (BOS)
- Last met on March 21, 2017
- Received updates on:
  - Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Triennial Audit
  - Southern California Regional Rail Transit Training Consortium
  - FTA Section 5307 Principles/Guidelines & Application Packet
  - Access Services
- Next meeting is scheduled for April 18, 2017

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee (LTSS)
- Last met on March 23, 2017
- Held nominations for LTSS positions:
  - Sebastian Hernandez (Chair)
  - Justine Garcia (Co-Chair)
  - Luz Echavarria (Secretary)
- Received updates on:
  - FY 2018 Budget Development
  - Measure M Local Return Guidelines
- Next meeting is scheduled for April 20, 2017

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee
- Last met on March 16, 2017
- Received updates on:
  - FY 2018 Budget Development
  - Metro Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Technical Studies
Metro Bike Share Expansion
- Open Streets Cycle 3
- Next meeting is scheduled for April 20, 2017

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Sustainability Subcommittee
- Did not meet in March

3. Chairperson’s Report (Fanny Pan, Metro)
A handout of the March 23, 2017 Metro Board meeting recap was distributed in lieu of an oral report.

Ms. Pan reported that nomination forms for TAC representation on the Metro Sustainability Council have been submitted. Mike Bagheri (TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee) will be the primary TAC representative on the Sustainability Council, and Mark Hunter (TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee) will be the alternate.

Ms. Pan welcomed Sergeant Steve Branconier as the newest primary TAC member representing the California Highway Patrol.

Ms. Pan announced that there will be a Complete Streets Training Workshop on Monday, April 17th and Tuesday, April 18th in Culver City. An email announcement for the meeting was sent to TAC members on March 29, 2017.

Ms. Pan reported that the application for FTA Sections 5310, 5316, and 5317 are due on April 28th.

Ms. Pan reported that the annual TAC Call for Projects Deobligation Appeals will be held on May 3, 2017. Staff is currently reviewing projects that may need to appeal to TAC. Due to the adopted Revised Lapsing Policy, there may be less than 20 projects that need to appeal. Staff will also be holding an FY 18 Budget Workshop on May 3rd at 9:00 AM before the Appeals.

4. Consent Calendar
A motion to approve the March 1, 2017 TAC minutes was made by Mohammad Mostahkami (League of California Cities – Gateway Cities COG) and seconded by Robert Brager (League of California Cities – Las Virgenes Malibu COG). Richard Dilluvio (Bicycle Coordinator), Kevin Minne (City of Los Angeles), and Mark Hunter (TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee) abstained. The minutes were approved.

5. Measure M Guidelines Update (Kalieh Honish, Metro)
Ms. Honish explained that the Measure M Guidelines reinforce Metro’s fiduciary responsibility and address any concerns that Measure R did not address. Ms. Honish emphasized that Measure M will allow Metro to deliver projects and programs, not to escrow funds. The Draft Guidelines encompass three core principles: Timely Use of Funds; Cash flow; and Multi-Year Funds Partnering and Related Toolbox.
Ms. Honish reported that the Timely Use of Funds principle consists of two elements: Project Readiness and the Lapsing Policy. Project Readiness involves demonstrating that projects are “ready to go” before securing funds. Ms. Honish reported that the TAC will be more involved in developing technical specifications for Project Readiness and the Guidelines. The Lapsing Policy will ensure that money not being used will be reprogrammed to maximize delivery.

Ms. Honish reported that responsible cash flow management means Metro will move projects based on funding availability. Many projects, including Multi-Year Subregional Projects (MSP), are spread out over long periods of time. It is important to ensure that projects are “shovel ready,” that they stay within the scope of the costs set forth in the Expenditure Plan, and that there is discipline in undertaking comprehensive assessments and amendments of projects when changes are needed. Under the Measure M Ordinance, project assessments may occur every five years while amendments may occur every ten years. The Ordinance also sets forth a Debt Policy and Contingency Funds Policy for cost escalations. The Contingency Funds Policy only applies after the first ten years of Measure M.

Ms. Honish reported that there will be a 3% Local Contribution by jurisdictions within one-half mile of transit stations.

Ms. Honish reported that the MSP’s were developed from the Mobility Matrices. These projects are consistent with Guideline definitions, and it will be up to the subregions to deliver these projects. MSPs will still have to meet the Timely Use of Funds and Project Readiness requirements. If an MSP exceeds its scope and needs additional financial assistance from Metro, it will have to comply with other Metro policies.

Ms. Honish reported that eligibility, technical criteria, and a competitive process will be developed for the following capital areas: 2% Active Transportation Program; 2% Highway; 2% Transit; Countywide Bus Rapid Transit; and Visionary Seed Fund.

Ms. Honish reported that approximately half (44%) of Measure M funds will go to Los Angeles County Transit Operators, cities, Access Services, and Metro to improve mobility throughout Los Angeles County. A motion at the March Board Meeting regarding Local Return allocation and additional staff analysis is being undertaken to respond to the motion. 2% of Measure M funds will go toward ADA Paratransit and Metro discounts for seniors and students. The Draft Guidelines address how this 2% will be split. Regarding Local Return, the staff proposal is to move forward with a minimum allocation of $100,000 per jurisdiction.

Ms. Honish reported that anyone wishing to make an official comment on the Draft Guidelines must be made in writing through the Metro website at http://theplan.metro.net or by email to theplan@metro.net.

Ellen Blackman (ADA) asked if there is further information in the Draft Guidelines on the 2% that goes to the ADA/Paratransit category? Ms. Honish replied that of the 2%, 75% would go to ADA and 25% to paratransit. This percentage split may change as further discussion on the Draft Guidelines occurs.
Mr. Mostahkami asked if the Draft Guidelines will be sent to all the cities for review? Ms. Honish replied that the representatives at the Policy Advisory Council (PAC) are responsible for distributing information to their constituencies. The Draft Guidelines are now public and posted on Metro’s website for review and comment by all. Mr. Mostahkami requested the Guidelines be sent to the COGs as a minimum outreach effort. Ms. Honish replied that staff will raise the issue at the PAC meeting.

Larry Stevens (League of Cities – San Gabriel Valley COG) asked when there will be an opportunity for the TAC to make comments on the Guidelines? Ms. Honish replied that the public comment period ends on May 26, 2017. Mr. Stevens asked if the TAC has to set up a special meeting to make formal recommendations on the Draft Guidelines? Heather Hills (Metro) commented that this would be a good idea. Ms. Pan replied that today’s agenda item was only informational because the Draft Guidelines were just released.

Mr. Stevens asked TAC members if they would like to make formal comments on the Draft Guidelines as a group? He noted that he is concerned that future, more specific guidelines to be developed will be constrained by what is adopted by the current Guidelines. Mr. Mostahkami agreed and asked what is the TAC’s role in the formal comment process? Ms. Pan replied that the TAC can make formal recommendations, which will be forwarded to staff. She noted that TAC’s role is more technical, which is separate from the PAC. Ms. Honish elaborated that the PAC is an Advisory Council that directly advises the Board. The PAC members represent their constituency, take in information, make policy recommendations, and their recommendations then go to the Board. Staff is responsible for taking public comments, then providing recommendations to the Board in June 2017.

Mr. Stevens noted that the current procedure for adopting the Guidelines does not include any requirement for formal comments from the TAC. The only way for the TAC to provide input is to hold a meeting, organizing members’ comments in writing, and submitting it formally. Ms. Hills agreed.

Mr. Mostahkami asked what is the timeline for adoption of the Guidelines? Ms. Honish replied that the Board will consider adoption of the Guidelines at the June 2017 meeting.

Mr. Stevens recommended a special TAC meeting to discuss the Measure M Guidelines, noting that the May 2017 TAC meeting is already being used for the TAC Appeals.

Robert Beste (League of California Cities – South Bay Cities COG) asked why the TAC Deobligation Appeals need to happen in May? Ms. Pan replied it is because project funding typically lapse in June. Ms. Hills elaborated that it holding the Appeals in May is also to meet the Southern California Association of Governments’ (SCAG) deadline as well as federal requirements.

David Kriske (League of California Cities – Arroyo Verdugo Cities) asked for clarification that the Appeals will be shorter than past years because of the Revised Lapsing Policy? Ms. Pan elaborated that there are fewer projects that will need to appeal because of the Revised Lapsing Policy which was adopted in 2016.
Mr. Beste asked if time can be set aside at the May meeting to discuss the Draft Measure M Guidelines? Ms. Pan replied yes, if TAC members do not mind having the meeting last until the afternoon. The Appeals could be done in the first half of the meeting, while discussion of the Draft Measure M Guidelines could be done in the second half.

Sebastian Hernandez (LTSS) asked if an extended meeting would be enough to cover all the discussion needed for the Draft Guidelines? Mr. Stevens suggested that if TAC members do not finish the discussion by the end of the May meeting, a special meeting can be scheduled. He noted it would be easier to start with having a discussion at the May meeting, since TAC members will already be together.

**Motion**

Mr. Stevens made a motion to extend the May TAC meeting to discuss the Draft Measure M Guidelines. Michelle Caldwell (Bus Operations Subcommittee) seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Mostahkami asked if there is a way to reduce the amount of time the presentations take? Ms. Pan replied that each project sponsor’s appeal is limited to five minutes, followed by a discussion.

Mr. Mostahkami asked if there is a way to limit the number of projects that need to appeal? Ms. Pan replied that staff is still working with the modal leads on the appeals list.

Mr. Kriske asked for clarification on the 2% funding categories for system connectivity in the Draft Guidelines. Ms. Honish replied that there will 2% system connectivity for highways and 2% connectivity for transit. She noted that there are some earmarked projects in this category, and staff will develop a competitive process for allocating the remaining funds.

Mr. Stevens commented that the pages and appendices in the Draft Measure M Guidelines are inconsistent and mislabeled. Ms. Honish replied that this is because the Draft is anticipated to change. Ms. Pan suggested to Ms. Honish to provide TAC members a hardcopy of the Guidelines at the next meeting.

Mr. Stevens asked for more information regarding the Local Return, specifically regarding the minimum allocation of $100,000 per jurisdiction. Ms. Honish replied that the topic is related to a recent Board motion that was not covered in her presentation. Ms. Pan replied that staff will circulate the motion to TAC members. (The motion was emailed to TAC on April 10, 2017). Mr. Stevens asked for a breakdown of the different minimums for the cities. Ms. Honish replied that the Local Return group is currently working on that analysis. Mr. Stevens requested that analysis be presented at the next meeting. Ms. Honish replied that she is unsure whether the analysis will be completed by the next meeting. She elaborated that staff is currently anticipated to respond at the May Board meeting.

Mr. Mostahkami noted that the Local Return allocation was a big topic of discussion at the Local Return Working Group meetings. He commented that smaller cities deserve more than $100,000. Mr. Stevens asked if the Working Group members voted on anything regarding the
Local Return allocation? Mr. Mostahkami replied that they did not because there was no consensus.

Mr. Hernandez asked what is the best way to hear what is discussed during the Policy Advisory Council meeting? Ms. Pan replied that it is a public meeting and all are welcome to attend. Mr. Hernandez asked if there will be minutes from the meeting? Ms. Pan confirmed.

Mr. Stevens commented that the Policy Advisory Council’s agenda and minutes were not easy to find online. Ms. Pan replied that staff will communicate that to the Council, and noted that the format for their minutes will resemble that of TAC.

Ms. Pan reiterated that the May TAC meeting will be a day-long meeting, with the TAC Appeals first, followed by discussion on the Draft Measure M Guidelines.

6. CTC Update (Zoe Unruh, Metro)
Ms. Unruh reported that a draft State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) fund estimate assumption was brought forward at the California Transportation Commission (CTC) meeting. The draft assumptions include a forecast of four funding scenarios for the five-year 2018 STIP. The recommended alternative assumes a modest increase in the price-based excise tax, which would grow to 18 cents per gallons in 2021-2022. Caltrans indicated that their recommended assumption would result in a positive fund estimate, absent any new funding legislation. Ms. Unruh noted that this outlook is an improvement, compared to the 2016 STIP, which had a program deletion of $754 million. Mr. Unruh reported that the assumptions are set to be adopted in May 2017.

Ms. Unruh reported that CTC staff brought forward draft Guidelines for the California Freight Investment Program. These Guidelines will direct the $556 million of federal freight formula funds for California. The draft Guidelines have a share of 40% set aside for the State, with the remaining 60% divided by corridors. The Los Angeles-Inland Empire Corridor has a target of $164-190 million, which is roughly 49-56% of what is available for regional shares. The Guidelines include project evaluation criteria and a schedule for application submittal and program adoption. At the CTC meeting there was a request to adopt the program later, and Ms. Unruh reported that the CTC is prepared to delay program adoption to allow for more application development and review time. In this scenario, the first allocation of funds would be distributed in March 2018. The draft Guidelines have a deadline date of December 21, 2022. Ms. Unruh reported that some commissioners requested consideration of a 2020 deadline, but the CTC staff is supportive of maintaining the 2022 deadline. Ms. Unruh reported that there are ongoing discussions on who will be the lead for Regions and Corridors, and nominating and submitting projects to the CTC.

7. TOD Planning Grant Round 5 Update (Desiree Portillo Rabinov, Metro)
Ms. Rabinov reported that staff is planning to release Round 5 of the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Planning Grant Program after Board approval in April 2017. $3.1 million will be available for Round 5, which will be initiated in May 2017 pending Board approval. Eligible applicants include local municipalities, the County of Los Angeles, and entities that have land use control to establish regulatory documents.
The TOD Planning Grant Program was created in 2011, to advance transit-supportive planning, increase transit ridership, increase access to transit, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Ms. Rabinov reported that Round 5 of the program will have two new features. The first feature is the transit-supportive planning toolkit, which offers best practices and over 100 case studies and tools to help agencies build a successful TOD. Staff is requesting that grantees utilize the toolkit as part of the application process. The second feature is the Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Tax Increment Pilot Program, which staff is incorporating in partnership with SCAG. This program will be offered as a separate application to fund the initial feasibility analysis for the formation of tax increment financing districts around transit. To qualify, applicants must have an adopted transit regulatory document in place. SCAG has developed a screening tool that all applicants will be required to use before submitting their application to Metro. This tool assesses a city district’s viability through a parcel-level database that gauges data such as unemployment rates, crime statistics, and household income. If a district meets the threshold of that criterion, then applicants may proceed in submitting their application to Metro.

Ms. Rabinov reported that the application will be uploaded onto the Metro website. Staff will be holding workshops in June, which will describe the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), TOD program, and toolkit. Staff hopes to begin evaluating applications in July 2017 and go for Board approval in October 2017.

Mr. Stevens asked if the screening tool is different from the CalEnviroScreen from the California Office of Environmental Health and Hazard Assessment? Ms. Rabinov replied that it is different, and the TOD screening tool focuses primarily on the STIP. It is designed for two state programs: Community Revitalization Investment Authority (CRIA) and the Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD).

Jenna Hornstock (Metro) reported that the SCAG screening tool looks at both the CRIA and EIFD’s minimum thresholds, and runs the district through these thresholds to see if they qualify. She noted that the EIFD criteria’s focus is on how much of property tax is collected. The workshops that will be hosted by Metro will include training on using this screening tool.

Mr. Stevens asked if staff will be sending a notice to all cities and the COGs once they receive Board approval of Round 5 of the grant program? Ms. Pan noted she will also share the information to TAC members as well.

Mr. Mostahkami asked when Round 5 will begin? Ms. Rabinov replied early May 2017. Mr. Mostahkami asked if the TOD Grant Program requires a Local Match? Ms. Rabinov replied no.

8. ATP Update (Shelly Quan, Metro)
Ms. Quan reported that the ATP TAC met on March 2nd where Metro staff presented the ATP Survey Results.
Ms. Quan reported that CTC staff stated a mechanism may be implemented in the Cycle 4 Guidelines which would allow project schedules to be adjusted after the environmental phase is completed.

Ms. Quan reported that the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPA) meeting took place on March 15. The agenda included ATP Cycle 3 updates and a preview of Cycle 4. For Cycle 3, CTC staff shared that Caltrans is still conducting eligibility and deliverability reviews, and staff anticipates doing a program amendment for the statewide component in May and for the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) component in June, in lieu of the technical adjustments and corrections that they have done for the past two cycles.

For Cycle 4, CTC staff expressed that they intend to spend more time on the development of the application and scoring rubric. They also suggested having separate applications with different criteria that would depend on the project type or size. Ms. Quan reported that the Cycle 4 schedule would be advanced to allow agencies more time to complete the application and to allow evaluators more time to score the applications. The CTC staff is hoping to adopt the Cycle 4 Guidelines in January 2018 and release the Call for Projects in late winter.

Ms. Quan reported that the CTC meeting took place on March 15. The CTC adopted the SCAG MPO component of the ATP, which included a total of 15 projects from Los Angeles County. Ms. Quan noted that the total award for Los Angeles County for the MPO component totaled $30.2 million. All Cycle 3 projects are now approved, and project sponsors should be receiving notification letters from SCAG or Caltrans.

Ms. Quan reported that Metro has also sent emails to successful applicants about funding availability beginning in FY 210. Metro is also hosting a project delivery workshop on April 27, 2017. Topics covered will include: state allocation processes, federal authorization processes, Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), non-infrastructure and planning-specific processes, and Conservation Corps coordination. There will be presentations from District 7 Local Assistance, Active Transportation Resource Center, Conservation Corps, and Metro staff. A handout for the ATP Project Delivery Workshop was provided to TAC members, and was sent via email by Mr. Lam.

Ms. Quan reported that Metro intends to provide grant assistance for ATP Cycle 4. As in previous cycles, Metro will solicit letters of interest for grant assistance in September 2017. The timeline may be revised if the CTC advances their Cycle 4 schedule.

Ms. Quan noted that any projects with funds programmed in FY 17 are required to allocate or submit an extension request, since the current fiscal year is coming to an end.

Mr. Minne asked if the CTC staff discussed the $100 million in greenhouse gas funds that is in the Governor’s budget? Ms. Quan replied that they did not have a specific discussion on that topic, but there are still $10 million in greenhouse gas reduction funds on the table for Cycle 3 projects that are for construction-only projects and are ready to allocate by FY 18 and expend by FY 20. She noted that supplemental materials are due to CTC by May 12th. Mr. Minne asked for clarification if there was an additional $100 million budgeted for Cycle 4? Ms. Quan replied that there has not been discussion on that topic.
9. California High-Speed Rail Update (Michelle Boehm, CHSRA)
Ms. Boehm gave background information on high-speed rail technology. High-speed rail was first introduced in Japan in the 1960’s and ran at about 150 mph. The top high-speed systems in the world now operate at over 200 mph, which is the level at which the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) plans for California.

Ms. Boehm noted that California's current transportation systems will not accommodate the state's projected population growth of an additional 12 million people by 2050, as well as the 2 million people that visit California every year. The state proposed the high-speed rail project to complement the existing transportation infrastructure and support the projected population growth. The system is meant to move people from county to county and region to region.

Ms. Boehm presented the map of proposed stations across the state, and noted that they will be located in the center of urban areas in order to connect people to points of interest. She reported that transportation analyses have shown that high-speed rail is the most cost-effective mode for moving a rider between 100-600 miles.

Ms. Boehm reported that sections of the California high-speed rail project are currently under construction, with approximately 119 miles of the structure component being built from Madera to north of Bakersfield. This portion will become the test track so that the CHSRA can certify the technology with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA).

Ms. Boehm reported that the Southern California portion of the high-speed rail project is being worked on in separate project segments. The first segment begins in Bakersfield and runs south to Palmdale; the second segment is from Palmdale to Burbank, with tunnels going under the San Gabriel Mountains; the third segment is Burbank to Los Angeles Union Station, which will join the existing network of Amtrak, Metrolink, and freight, and will include improvements such as complete grade separation and fencing. CHRSA will be upgrading these corridors to allow for speeds up to 125 mph from Burbank to Los Angeles, and 110 mph from Los Angeles to Anaheim. She noted that actual operating speeds will not reach these limits, but the infrastructure quality will support these speeds.

The goals for the Southern California portion are to create multi-modal hubs and to improve air-rail connectivity. Ms. Boehm noted that Phase 2 of the Southern California portion will be from Los Angeles to San Diego. The Bakersfield to Palmdale section is currently in the environmental phase, and draft environmental documents are expected to be released in 2017. The CHRSA has been hosting a number of public meetings about the project.

Ms. Boehm reported that the high-speed rail project includes a 30% goal for small business participation, with a 10% requirement for Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) and a 3% requirement for Disabled Veteran Business Enterprises (DVBE). Statewide, there are 327 Certified Small Businesses working on the high-speed rail project, with 127 Certified Small Businesses from Southern California.
Ms. Boehm reported that there is a Community Benefit Agreement for high-speed rail construction, which allows CHRSA to employ workers from the surrounding area. The agreement governs all of CHRSA’s approaches to construction, and is consistent with all state and federal laws.

Ms. Caldwell asked if Public Private Partnerships (P3s) have been considered for a connection between Los Angeles and Las Vegas? She noted specifically a partnership with the Las Vegas casino owners, who would have a vested economic interest. Ms. Boehm replied that there are several efforts being conducted for a Los Angeles to Las Vegas segment. XpressWest has completed an environmental document that cleared right-of-way from Victorville to Las Vegas. Metro also environmentally cleared rail in the High Desert Corridor through CEQA. The High Desert Corridor Joint Powers Authority (JPA) led an initiative to complete investment grade ridership analysis. Ms. Boehm noted that CHRSA is currently trying to environmentally clear Phase 1 of the Southern California section so that they can have a project-ready piece that attracts investors and public support for future phases.

David Feinberg (League of California Cities – Westside Cities) asked why the alignment alternatives to San Diego cross from Downtown Los Angeles through the Inland Empire, instead of going from Anaheim to San Diego? Ms. Boehm replied that demographic data has showed high growth and economic activity in the Inland Empire which warrants providing high speed rail, as well as right-of-way constraints through Orange County which limit where high speed rail could be placed. She noted that there is currently no rail service between the Inland Empire and San Diego, which presents a mobility gap to be addressed. This alignment toward the Inland Empire could also set up the possibility for a future high-speed rail connection to Phoenix, Arizona.

Mr. Bagheri asked what Ms. Boehm’s opinion was on the Hyperloop concept? Ms. Boehm replied that the Hyperloop is untested technology that will likely not be a viable transportation technology until late in the 21st century. The transportation industry cannot wait for the technology to be solidified.

10. Legislative Update (Michael Turner, Metro)
Mr. Turner reported that Senate Bill 1 (SB-1) for transportation funding will go up for vote on April 6th, and he encouraged all TAC members to call their Assembly members. He noted that a two-thirds majority vote from both Houses is required for the bill to pass. He noted that SB-1 would double the subventions that get allocated to the cities.

Mr. Turner reported that SB-1 has a total of $5.2 billion transportation funds. $3 billion will go to highway and local street repair, $1.5 billion will go into the Office of State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP), and another $1.5 billion will go to subventions. Los Angeles County receives 30% of those subventions for highway and local street repair. He noted that because of the nature of the subventions, the municipalities will receive most of those funds, not Metro.

Pat Proano (County of Los Angeles) commented that while Metro will not directly be receiving much of the subventions, all transportation agencies will benefit, since Metro buses use municipal roads. Mr. Turner agreed, but noted that only $750 million will be going to transit.
Mr. Mostahkami asked for confirmation that the bill has no sunset date? Mr. Turner confirmed that there is no sunset date.

An audience member asked if the support for the bill among the state legislature was partisan? Mr. Turner replied that it is.

John Walker (County of Los Angeles) commented that there is a provision in the bill that allocates an additional $200 million statewide for self-helping counties. He noted that Los Angeles County’s share of this fund is approximately $63 million. Mr. Turner elaborated that the bill provides $1.5 billion will go to the SHOPP, $1.5 billion to the subventions, $750 million for transit, and also includes a new vehicle fee that will go to the cap-and-trade program.

Mr. Turner noted that he has been in Sacramento working with the Governor’s office and Speaker’s office in support of the bill. The Senate can vote at 2:39pm on Thursday April 6th. The votes will then be cast by the Assembly Transportation Committee, Senate Appropriations Committee, and a Floor vote.

Mr. Proano asked who is the Assembly Member for Inglewood? Mr. Turner replied that it is Autumn Burke. He noted that Assembly Members need to hear that this bill is important to the cities and urged the TAC members to call their Assembly members.

Mr. Turner noted that the environmental opposition has some people concerned, because of a provision in SB-1 that allows some truckers to run current engines for a longer period of time. Mr. Turner noted that the agricultural industry has also come out in opposition of the bill.

Mr. Hernandez asked how much the gas tax will be? Mr. Turner replied that the excise tax will be 12 cents and the diesel tax will be 20 cents, with a sales tax increase on diesel and vehicle fees.

Mr. Turner noted that if SB-1 passes, there will likely be implementation bills introduced for categories such as the state and local partnerships.

11. Adjournment
Ms. Pan adjourned the meeting and reported that the next scheduled TAC meeting is May 3, 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.
# TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Sign in Sheet**

**April 5, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>1. <strong>Marianne</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kim/Stephen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Finnegan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICYCLE COORDINATOR</td>
<td>1. <strong>Rich</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dilluvio/Michelle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mowery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (BOS)</td>
<td>1. <strong>Michelle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Caldwell/Robert</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Portillo</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>Jane</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Leonard/Dana</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL</td>
<td>1. <strong>Sgt. Steve</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Branconier/Ofc. Christian</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cracraft</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>1. <strong>Gary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Slater/Steve</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Novotny</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>Greg</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Farr/Kelly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Lamare</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVE ON ADA</td>
<td>1. <strong>Ellen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Blackman/Vacant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1. <strong>Eric</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Widstrand/Nathan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Baird</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Vacant/Corinne Ralph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Dan Mitchell/Carlos Rios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Ferdy Chan/Kevin Minne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Richard Marshalian/Ayala Ben-Yehuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. John Walker/Inga Yeung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Pat Proano/Mary Reyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td>1. David Kriske/Roubik Golanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities COG</td>
<td>2. Mohammad Mostahkami/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes Malibu COG</td>
<td>3. Robert Brager/Elizabeth Shavelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td>4. Trolis Niebla/Mike Behen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
<td>5. Larry Stevens/Craig Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley COG</td>
<td>6. Jason Smisko/Wayne Ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td>7. Robert Beste/Ted Semaan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Cities COG</td>
<td>8. David Feinberg/Sharon Perlstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE (LTSS)</td>
<td>1. Sebastian Hernandez/Perri Goodman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Justina 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 (SCRRRA - Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Anne Louise Rice/Karen Sakoda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SCAQMD -- Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Eyvonne Drummonds/Kathryn Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG -- Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Warren Whiteaker/Annie Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Lupe Valdez/LaDonna DiCamillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/ SUSTAINABILITY SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>1. Mike Bagheri/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Mark Hunter/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda J.</td>
<td>NCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>InvestingPlace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>As Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 4

TAC Call for Projects
Appeals Protocol
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TAC Roles and Responsibilities: TAC is an Advisory Committee and serves as the appeal body for Metro Grant Programs including the Call for Projects, Transit Oriented Development (TOD), FTA Section 5310, to name a few. TAC’s primary role and responsibility is to provide an objective, technical, and countywide perspective in the appeals process. TAC’s role is also to objectively listen to project sponsors’ appeal for funding. Based on the merits of the appeal, it is TAC’s role to recommend whether the project is justified to receive funding from the Board approved TAC Appeal Reserve fund. Projects are not to be reevaluated or rescored. Metro staff can concur, reject or recommend alternatives to the TAC recommendations. To ensure TAC’s countywide role, these protocols shall govern:

- The Alternate TAC member shall only participate in the meeting when the primary TAC member is not present.
- Ex-officio members are not allowed to vote.
- For projects for which their respective agency has submitted an application(s) or appeal(s), TAC members and/or Alternates are prohibited from providing oral testimony.
- TAC members and/or Alternates should not participate in TAC discussion concerning project(s) their agency sponsored so as not to be perceived as taking an advocacy role.
- Motion seconds should be made from an agency/jurisdiction/League of Cities/TAC Subcommittee representative other than the agency/jurisdiction/League of Cities/TAC Subcommittee representative that originated the motion.
- Any discussion involving the public will be allowed when acknowledged and determined appropriate by the TAC Chairperson.
- TAC discussion and motion development is intended for TAC members’ participation only.
Attachment 5

Recommended Project Deobligation List
# 2017 Call for Projects Deobligation TAC Appeal

May 3, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPEAL TIME</th>
<th>PROJ #</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECT COSTS $ (000')</th>
<th>TOTAL METRO PROG $ (000')</th>
<th>METRO PROG YR(S)</th>
<th>LAPSED PROG YR(S)</th>
<th>LAPSED FUND TYPE</th>
<th>METRO AMOUNT SUBJECT TO LAPSE $ (000')</th>
<th>TOTAL EXT'S YEARS</th>
<th>REASON(S) FOR APPEAL</th>
<th>PREVIOUS TAC RECOMMENDATION FROM LAST APPEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 9:45</td>
<td>F3175</td>
<td>Culver City</td>
<td>Culver Boulevard Realignment Project</td>
<td>6,965 2,856</td>
<td>2014 2015</td>
<td>2014 2015</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>2,856</td>
<td>1 Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 9:50</td>
<td>F9518</td>
<td>Port of Long Beach</td>
<td>Coastal Bike Trail Connector - Ocean Boulevard, Long Beach</td>
<td>10,379 3,113</td>
<td>2017 2018</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>Need to execute Letter of Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 9:55</td>
<td>F3139</td>
<td>Manhattan Beach</td>
<td>Sepulveda Boulevard Bridge Widening Project</td>
<td>10,730 6,813</td>
<td>2012 2014</td>
<td>2012 2014</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>5,373</td>
<td>2 Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 10:00</td>
<td>F1168</td>
<td>Santa Clarita</td>
<td>Via Princesa Extension-Golden Valley Road to Rainbow Glen</td>
<td>44,738 11,577</td>
<td>2015 2015</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>11,577</td>
<td>0 Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 10:05</td>
<td>F3507</td>
<td>Baldwin Park</td>
<td>South Baldwin Park Commuter Bikeway Project</td>
<td>820 484</td>
<td>2014 2015</td>
<td>LTF</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>1 Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 10:20</td>
<td>F3632</td>
<td>LA City</td>
<td>Western Ave Bus Stop &amp; Pedestrian Improvement Project</td>
<td>1,472 1,178</td>
<td>2012 2014</td>
<td>2013 2014</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>2 Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 10:25</td>
<td>F9502</td>
<td>Monterey Park</td>
<td>Monterey Pass Road Complete Streets Bike Project</td>
<td>3,987 1,994</td>
<td>2017 2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>Need to execute Funding Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 10:30</td>
<td>F3146</td>
<td>LA City</td>
<td>Highland Avenue Widening-Odin Street to Franklin Avenue</td>
<td>5,804 3,773</td>
<td>2014 2015</td>
<td>2014 2015</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>3,773</td>
<td>1 Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 10:35</td>
<td>F3112</td>
<td>Lawndale</td>
<td>Inglewood Ave Corridor Widening Project</td>
<td>3,615 2,172</td>
<td>2014 2015</td>
<td>2014 2015</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>1 Did not meet Lapsing Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97,436 40,058</td>
<td>40,058</td>
<td>35,443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
May 3, 2017 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: F3175  
Project Sponsor: Culver City  
Project Title: Culver Bl. Realignment Project  
Call Awarded Year: FY 2013  
Time Extension Request: 3 year(s)  
Date of last TAC appeal: n/a

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

This project will widen the main arterial roadway of Culver Boulevard between Sepulveda Boulevard and Elenda Street in order to separate the eastbound and westbound traffic with a new raised landscaped median, in order to mitigate the increase level of traffic due to the 405 HOV and ramp relocation project. The proposed widening will cause the existing 58 foot wide bicycle/pedestrian raised pathway, located to the north of Culver Boulevard, to be reconstructed by shifting it to the north. Also the arterial roadway widening will increase the capacity of Culver Boulevard and allow for the construction of left turn lanes, traffic signal modifications, countdown pedestrian heads, and a striped buffer of local residential parking from through traffic. In order to improve vehicular and pedestrian safety, additional elements of this project will include the replacement of existing antiquated street lights, installation of new street lights, and sidewalk/parkway rehabilitation. A "green" element will be added to this project that will capture storm water and irrigation water from the raised bike/pedestrian median and adjacent roadways in order to provide percolation and filtration.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

The original scope of work will remain as approved.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

The conceptual design is 90% completed.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

There were no ROW acquisitions required for this project.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

Yes, the Culver Boulevard Widening Project is viable and fully funded.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

On March 22, 2016, the Culver City staff emailed Metro staff the reason for the project delay was due to project funding. The City was waiting on grant funding of a regional multi-beneficial stormwater project to be built below the relocated median of Culver Boulevard. This joint regional stormwater project with the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation (LASAN) proposes to capture, treat, infiltrate, and re-use stormwater/urban runoff from an 85th percentile storm event.

In order to comply with the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit, Culver City has elected to implement the Enhanced Watershed Management Program (EWMP). The Environment Programs and Operations (EPO) Division of the City’s Public Works Department has studied the drainage area of the entire City and determined that the Culver Boulevard median was the most promising site and listed it in the EWMP as a signature multi-beneficial Regional Project. Preliminary geotechnical reports show excellent soil conditions that are favorable for infiltration and a deep groundwater table.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map  
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
This project has the potential to capture stormwater/urban runoff from a total drainage area of approximately 800 acres from both City of Los Angeles and Culver City. The proposed project cost is estimated at $16.9 million.

For the past year, the City has been working actively in search for funding. Staff applied for two grants, State of California - Proposition 1 Grant Funds and Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission (SMBRC) Proposition 84 Grant Funds. The City did not receive funding from the Prop.1 grant; however, staff was able to secure the SMBRC Proposition 84 Grant for the amount of $3.3 million (requested $6 million).

In November 2016, the City obtained support from its residents and passed a local parcel tax, Measure CW (Clean Water), to fund projects that allow the City to comply with its stormwater regulations. Measure CW is expected to generate approximately $2 million per year.

Culver City staff is currently working with LASAN staff to confirm their financial commitment with the project.

| Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay: |

Due to the extensive excavation required to install the underground infiltration gallery and storage vaults for the irrigation re-use beneath the bike/pedestrian path raised median of Culver Boulevard, the proposed stormwater project must precede the Culver Boulevard Widening Project.

Through Measure CW, Culver City will be able to secure its fair share of the stormwater project of $5,440,000. In addition, the City was awarded $3,300,000 of Prop 84 Grant from SMBRC. Culver City staff respectfully request additional time to negotiate and secure the additional funds needed from LASAN. Meanwhile, the City will continue to apply for more grants.

| Revised/Proposed schedule: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td>March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design RFP &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>January 2018</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>August 2019</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
PROJECT LOCATION MAP

Project Limits
Culver Boulevard
Between Sepulveda Boulevard and Elenda Street
This Project connects the new bicycle path planned on the Gerald Desmond Bridge (in construction) and the City of Long Beach’s bicycle network east of the Los Angeles River. The Project spans the Ocean Boulevard Bridge and provides an additional connection to the LA River Bicycle Path below. The half-mile long Class I path will close a gap in the California Coastal Trail and in the regional and local bicycle network.

Since the Metro Board approved the project, the scope of work has changed. Port staff and our consultants have continued to identify alignment and design options to improve the project, given the significant challenges of retrofitting a bicycle facility within an operating Port. Since the Metro Board’s approval of grant funding, we have identified a new alignment on the south side of the Ocean Boulevard Bridge that will provide coastal views that were not possible on the north side of the bridge. In addition, this new alignment will provide a more direct link between the Port and downtown Long Beach while also minimizing the bicycle facilities’ dramatic elevation changes when connecting between the Gerald Desmond Bridge and the Ocean Boulevard Bridge. Changing the alignment from the north to the south side of the Ocean Boulevard Bridge was possible due to the City of Long Beach Department of Public Works’ willingness to revise its position to allow the Port to remove a lane of traffic on the south side (eastbound direction) of the Ocean Boulevard Bridge. Despite the resultant delay in the execution of an LOA for this project, the additional time necessary to conduct an alternative analysis has yielded a significantly improved project.

The changes to the project do not diminish or eliminate any of its original objectives as proposed to (and approved by) the Metro Board. The new alignment still closes a critical gap in the California Coastal Trail by linking the new Gerald Desmond Bridge Bixby Bike Path to the Long Beach bicycle network east of the Los Angeles River. The new project design still includes a 14-foot wide Multi-Use Class I bicycle path for full physical separation from vehicular traffic. The new alignment retains the bicycle and pedestrian connection from the Ocean Boulevard Bridge down to the Los Angeles River Bicycle Path. In addition to these originally proposed objectives, the new alignment provides the added benefits of (1) a bicycle path on the south side of Ocean Boulevard Bridge, consistent with the Bixby Bicycle Path on the south side of the Gerald Desmond Bridge, thus enhancing coastal access and (2) minimized elevation changes between the two bridges, thus allowing bicyclists to connect from one bridge to another without descending and ascending.

This new project alignment is included on the agenda for the next meeting of the Harbor Board of Commissioners, scheduled for May 16, 2017. Port staff also has provided an information update to our commissioners in advance of this meeting, when we will recommend and expect adoption of the project and receive Board authorization to execute the Letter of Agreement. In the meantime, the Port has transmitted all other required documents to Metro, including scope, schedule, programming plan, and TIP sheet.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

The project is financially viable but will not be fully funded at the time of the TAC Appeal Hearing; however, we anticipate budget approval and authorization to continue design work, two weeks after the TAC Appeal Hearing. The City and the Port continue to work together to identify our respective shares for the local match commitments. This is a joint project between the Port of Long Beach and the City of Long Beach; specifically, the Ocean Boulevard Bridge is owned by the Port but the bicycle path will form a critical connection to the new Gerald Desmond Bridge (currently under design and construction by the Port) thus extending the City’s bicycle network across the Los Angeles River.

Port staff will recommend to the Harbor Board of Commissioners at their next scheduled meeting on May 16, 2017, that the Ocean Boulevard Bicycle Project be included in the Port’s Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and that Port staff receive authorization to execute a Letter of Agreement (LOA) with Metro, certifying project readiness in terms of (1) a commitment to local match, (2) approved project budget, and (3) dedicated staffing for the project.

The Port will continue to work with the City of Long Beach to ensure the financial viability of the project and timely delivery. Given (a) the Port’s critical location along the coastline, (b) our commitment to the California Coastal Commission to close the gap in the California Coastal Trail, and (c) the City of Long Beach’s demonstrated standing as a national leader in active transportation planning, we have both regulatory and planning incentives to complete the project within the requirements of ATP policy. Additionally, we have worked extensively with the Port’s Bicycle Stakeholder Group (formed three years ago, and including advocacy groups) to develop this project with full support from the bicycling community.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

Port staff is in close communication with Metro programming and project delivery staff to request a scope change to reflect the preferred (south) alternative. The delay in executing the LOA is due to our interest in identifying a more user-friendly, south side alignment across Ocean Boulevard Bridge (as described above) and also due to a two-year schedule delay with the Gerald Desmond Bridge (GDB) Replacement Project. The GDB project is a $1.47 billion project of national and regional significance, using a design-build project delivery method. Upon completion of the bridge, its ownership will be transferred to the State of California and the new bridge will be incorporated into the state highway system. The project includes a Class-I bicycle and pedestrian facility, to which the Ocean Boulevard Bike Path will connect. The GDB Project’s engineering complexities, sheer scale, construction challenges in an operating port (and in the nation’s second largest active oil field), project delivery method, and institutional coordination requirements have delayed the overall GDB Project by about two years. This, in turn, has affected the schedule of the Ocean Boulevard Bicycle Project, which is designed to connect to the new bicycle path on the GDB.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

We are requesting an extension in executing the LOA based on the unforeseen delays in the GDB project and the City’s agreement to a new, south side alignment that will allow the Port to remove a traffic lane on the eastbound side of the Ocean Boulevard Bridge to accommodate a new Class I bicycle path. To overcome delay, Port staff has met collectively with Metro staff (programming, project delivery and modal groups) to coordinate our project schedule with grant funding requirements. We are in the process of requesting a scope change to reflect the new alignment. The Port also has institutionalized a partnering effort with Caltrans and our GDB contractors and developed a robust risk model to minimize additional delays to the GDB project. We have completed a review of the Ocean Boulevard Bike Project with our engineering teams through the Port’s internal Governing Committee to transition the project from planning to engineering design, and we anticipate Harbor Board of Commissioners’ authorization to proceed in mid-May. In the meantime, the Port has transmitted all other required documents to Metro, including scope, schedule, programming plan, and updated TIP sheet.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>February 2017</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>January 2018</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>January 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>January 2021</td>
<td>January 2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
### Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
**May 3, 2017 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet**

**Call for Project #:** F3139  
**Project Sponsor:** City of Manhattan Beach  
**Project Title:** Sepulveda Boulevard Bridge Widening  
**Call Awarded Year:** 2009  
**Time Extension Request:** 15 year(s)  
**Date of last TAC appeal:** May 4, 2016

### Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

Widen existing bridge structure to accommodate an additional northbound through lane on Sepulveda Boulevard (State Highway 1) from 33rd Street to 640' north of 33rd Street consistent with the existing street cross-section north and south of the project.

**Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:**

Yes, there were changes to the overall project scope-of-work since the Metro Board first approved the project. However, the costs of the scope changes were absorbed by other funding sources (Safetea-LU and Measure R Highway Program). The CFP funding was not affected. Only the schedule was affected. As background, these changes primarily included:

1. Caltrans required New Advanced Planning Study (APS)  
2. Caltrans required design changes to sidewalk and roadway geometrics based on changes to Caltrans policy, procedures, and direction (required Caltrans Fact Sheets).  
3. Additional Traffic Analysis was required.  
4. Additional drainage design due to poor condition of existing storm drain to remain.  
5. Additional design for a non-standard retaining wall.  
6. Caltrans required to seismic retrofit the existing bridge.  
8. Additional detailing of bridge aesthetics.  

The funding term was extended by 1 year by the Metro Board on August 25, 2016. The new lapsing date was set to June 30, 2017. Project extension was granted via the attached Letter of Agreement (Amendment 2).

### Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

Project is in final design and right-of-way acquisition phases. Plans are 100% completed and in final review and negotiations with one remaining adjacent property owner and the owner’s two tenants in the building continues. It is a likely possibility that negotiation with one of the tenants of the building may require initiating the Eminent Domain process.

**If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):**

The right-of-way requires acquisition of 7 Caltrans Highway Easements, 7 Temporary Construction Easements, and 1 Caltrans Maintenance Easement.

To date, the City:

- Adjacent Manhattan Village Mall development entitlement required property owner to dedicate 6 Temporary Construction Easements and 5 Caltrans Highway Easements. All 11 easements have been executed.
- Mall Access Agreement has been executed providing access to the project site.
- Donation from Chevron USA for 1 Caltrans Highway Easement has been executed.
- Has received Irrevocable Offer to Dedicate (IOD) for 1 Caltrans Highway Easement – 3500 Sepulveda Blvd.
- Negotiated 1 Temporary Construction Easement, 1 Caltrans Highway Easements, and 1 Caltrans Maintenance Easement – 3500 Sepulveda Blvd.
- Actively negotiating noise mitigation for one building – 3500 Sepulveda Blvd.
- Actively negotiating the Personal Property Relocation for one building tenant – 3500 Sepulveda Blvd.
- Actively negotiating Non-residential Relocation for one building tenant – 3500 Sepulveda Blvd.

**Note:**

1. Please attach a Project Map  
2. Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

The project is fully funded.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

Delay was caused primarily by additional work required by Caltrans and also by delays in obtaining right-of-way acquisition documents from adjacent property owners.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

The project is in the final stages of PS&E and ROW Acquisition. The extension will allow additional time to complete the right-of-way acquisition, obtain right-of-way certification from Caltrans, obtain E76 from Caltrans for construction, and construct. The City’s project team has stepped-up negotiation efforts to accelerate execution of the remaining acquisition documents.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
<td>April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>March 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
May 3, 2017 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: F1168
Project Sponsor: City of Santa Clarita
Project Title: Via Princesa Extension from Golden Valley Road to Rainbow Glen
Call Awarded Year: 2007

Time Extension Request: 20-months
Date of last TAC appeal: Not applicable

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

The Via Princesa Extension is a regional roadway and will construct a new 1.2 mile multi-modal, complete streets extension of Via Princesa from Golden Valley Road to Rainbow Glen. The project will construct six-lanes with a raised median, sidewalks on each side, and a Class I bike path along the south side. The new roadway will provide a link between four regional highways, Interstate 5, State Route 126, State Route 14, and Sierra Highway. Via Princesa will become one of the primary east-west arterials through the City of Santa Clarita.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

There have been no changes to the scope of work.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

Not applicable, this is the first TAC appeal.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

Project is not in the ROW acquisition phase. In the next 12-months, required right-of-way is mutually agreed to be dedicated by three (3) property owners/developers. The City held a joint meeting with all property owners to coordinate nearby development, right-of-way dedication, and construction of the roadway. These property owners currently have plans under review with the City’s Planning Department, and right-of-way dedication will be a condition of approval for each parcel.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

The project is financially viable. The City has shown commitment towards completing this project by allocating 100% local dollars to the environmental and design phases. Construction will be fully funded through a combination of this Metro Call for Projects grant and local Bridge and Thoroughfare District fees.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

The delay was a direct result of the economic downturn. Metro approved this 2007 Call for Project at the onset of the recession, and with adjacent development being an integral part of the project, including dedicating right-of-way, the schedule was delayed. With the upturn of the economy, development moving forward including plans currently under review, and the positive outcome of the joint meeting with property owners, the City does not anticipate future delays to complete design, right-of-way dedication, or construction.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

The City is requesting Metro TAC execute the Revised Lapsing Policy towards this project and grant a 20-month extension to complete design. Design is currently underway for the mass-grading portion of the work, and full design is estimated to be complete in February 2019. The City would return to the Metro TAC in 2019 with a Recovery Plan to complete construction and fully expend the Call for Projects grant funds, which are allocated only in the construction phase. The City will continue to provide Quarterly Reports updating Metro Staff on the progress of design and construction on a quarterly basis.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>August 2009</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
<td>February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
<td>February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>October 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
May 3, 2017 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: F3507  Time Extension Request: ___1___ year(s)
Project Sponsor: City of Baldwin Park  Date of last TAC appeal: ___August 25, 2016___
Project Title: South Baldwin Park Commuter Bikeway  Time Extension Request: __1__ year(s)
Call Awarded Year: 2009

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

The proposed project will connect the employment centers of Kaiser Permanente, UPS, In and Out Hamburger Sub-region Headquarters and other major employment centers located on Baldwin Park Blvd. (just north of the Walnut Creek Wash) with the regional North-South bike path (Class I) along the San Gabriel River by constructing a 2.5 miles of bike path along Walnut Creek and San Gabriel River (entry at Ramona Blvd.) and adding a bike route (class II) along Baldwin Park Blvd. Future plans will extend this bike path east to West Covina Mall and the Eastland Shopping Center. Entry to Walnut Creek Nature Park will be provided as a bike-friendly way-station with amenities such as restrooms, observation structure, other rest areas and drinking fountains.

Improvements included in this class I bike path are way finding and directional signage, safety railing, striping, park entry improvements, enhanced bike path entries, and bicycle parking amenities at or near destination locations.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

As the bikeway design has progressed detail to certain elements can now be better identified such as safety enhancements (i.e. graded slopes, railing, warning signage…etc.) enhancements for stormwater are also included to improve water quality while beautifying the bike path, by creating bio-swales, mulched slopes and other features that create a sense of place along the bike path. Additional [STPL] funds were also identified to construct a bicycle ramp and a grand security barrier and entry gate at the way-station (Walnut Creek Nature Park). These changes will be taken for our City Council approval consideration of plans and specification in October or September 2017’s city council meeting.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

The design of the project is over 80% complete and is slightly behind schedule due to the complexity of the project and the challenges having to do with multi-agency collaborative efforts, including permitting, which are about 10% complete.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

There has not been a need to acquire additional property or ROW to complete this project. Therefore, a schedule to acquire properties has not been established.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

With additionally identified City STPL funding this project has become further feasible. Additionally, working with County departments like Flood Control and Public Works, City Staff has gained partners in moving the project forward to meet regional bike objectives. Caltrans is another partner agency with whom we’ll need to work with very closely in the near further since there are two freeway undercrossing planned under the I-10 freeway and the I-605 Freeways. If all goes well this project will create future bike access through the region by connecting bike access across West Covina, La Puente, El Monte, Covina and other cities through Walnut Creek Wash.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

Design challenges added to the delay of schedule. To remedy this delay Staff has hired a professional engineering firm to help expedite design work. At this time, the bid advertisement should take place around October 2017 and construction work may start soon thereafter.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

This project has been identified as having regional benefit and it’s been recognized as a highly desired high priority community project. The completion of the project will open further bike path expansion opportunities for the regional bicycle network to other employment hubs at West Covina Mall to the Eastland Shopping Center and the communities’ in-between.

To overcome the challenges identified by City Staff, partnerships have been solidified. First by contracting for professional design services with a private firm. Identifying additional project funding sources. Lastly by identifying and fostering partnerships with the County, Caltrans, Community based organizations, Metro Staff and other agencies.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>July 19, 2016</td>
<td>August 16, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>April 4, 2016</td>
<td>August 16, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>September 6, 2017</td>
<td>October 4, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>October 16, 2017</td>
<td>April 30, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Baldwin Park

Proposed San Gabriel River-Walnut Creek Commuter Bikeway-Class I

Location Map

San Gabriel River Commuter Bikeway Project Limits

Existing Bikeway

Employment Hubs
**Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)**  
**May 3, 2017 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet**

**Call for Project #:** F1708  
**Project Sponsor:** LADOT  
**Project Title:** Hollywood Integrated Modal Information System  
**Call Awarded Year:** 2007  
**Time Extension Request:** __1__ year(s)  
**Date of last TAC appeal:** __May 4, 2016__

### Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

The project includes the installation of electronic direction and parking availability signs to address vehicle traffic congestion in the Hollywood area. Pedestrian wayfinding signs will be installed at key destinations in Hollywood to encourage park and ride and pedestrian travel.

**Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:**

Yes, LADOT reduced the number of parking availability directory signs from eight to four. The intent is to redirect the resources saved from those signs to upgrade parking technology. All other aspects of the original scope of work remain unchanged. The Metro Board approved these changes to the scope of work on August 25, 2016.

### Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

The project is progressing in line with Amendment No. 3 to the Letter of Agreement between LADOT and Metro, signed March 14, 2016.

1. **Hire consultant to help with preliminary engineering phase.** Change Order No. 9 to City Contract C-119654, dated and filed with the City Clerk June 24, 2016, authorized Conduent to proceed with preliminary engineering. (Conduent State & Local Solutions, Inc. was formerly Xerox).

2. **Initiate public outreach.** Public outreach began February 18, 2015, with a PowerPoint presentation to the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce. LADOT is currently working with the Council Office and the BIDs to develop the design of the pedestrian way finding signs. Hunt Design of Pasadena is the subcontractor to Conduent for this effort. The next step will be to take the designs to the Neighborhood Councils.

3. **Initiate work on the design of the wayfinding signs and parking guidance signs.** Hunt Design began work on this task in October 2016. We anticipate completion of the design in May 2017. The design work is well underway and we anticipate consensus from the community on the final design theme. Hunt Design is also working with the BID south of the project area to create a common theme for the entire Hollywood area.

### If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

There is no ROW acquisition required.

### Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

Yes.

### Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

The Preliminary Environmental Study was submitted to Caltrans in May 2016. The Caltrans Senior Environmental Planner stated that it looked good, but requested some additional information. LADOT supplied the requested information within two days. LADOT’s staff member who was handling this task accepted a promotion to another division at the end of May and has not been replaced.

On June 15, 2016, Caltrans informed LADOT of an additional requirement. **After careful review by our Cultural Resources Unit, they have made the following request with regard to the subject project: Because there are historic properties located along both Sunset Boulevard and Hollywood Boulevard, we will need more information regarding the installation of the proposed signs. Please describe the proposed signs to be installed and let us know where they will be installed. Without further detailed information, a determination cannot be made on how to proceed with the Section 106 documentation (Screened Undertaking vs. request for further studies).**

---

**Note:** 1) Please attach a Project Map  
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
LADOT responded on October 18, 2016. On February 27, 2017, not having heard back from the Caltrans environmental group, LADOT told Caltrans they assumed everything was in order. On February 28, 2017, Caltrans informed LADOT of an earlier PES that was submitted by CRA in July 2010. Caltrans had responded to the CRA on September 13, 2010, informing them, “…further study is required and an Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR) and a Finding of Effect (FOE) must be completed by an architectural historian who meets the Secretary of Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards…If it is determined that the project will cause an adverse effect to the District, a Memorandum of Agreement that will detail measures to mitigate the effect must be signed by Caltrans, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the City of Los Angeles.”

After a search for a qualified firm, Conduent contracted with the Historic Resources Group in March 2017 to complete the required study. They anticipate completing the study by June 30, 2017.

**Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:**
LADOT has work underway to answer all of the concerns raised by Metro and Caltrans. However, it will not be possible to complete all of the requirements by June 30, 2017. Barring any further obstacles, LADOT anticipates satisfying all requirements by December 30, 2017. As a hedge against the unknown, LADOT requests a new completion date of June 30, 2018.

**Revised/Proposed schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>5/2016</td>
<td>12/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>6/2016</td>
<td>6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>11/2016</td>
<td>9/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction – Installation Complete (All PE)</td>
<td>1/2018</td>
<td>6/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Construction costs will be below 10% of the total project cost. Therefore, as an ITS project, the entire project may be funded through the PE phase.
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
May 3, 2017 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: F3514
Project Sponsor: City of LA
Project Title: Exposition-West Bikeway-Northvale Segment (LRTP Program)
Call Awarded Year: 2009 Call

Time Extension Request: FY18/19
Date of last TAC appeal: N/A

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

The Expo II Bike Path Northvale Segment project proposes to construct approximately 0.25 mile of Class I Bike Path north of the I-10 Freeway, from Motor Avenue to Putney Dr., within Caltrans right-of-way and City of Los Angeles sewer easement within existing private properties. After construction, the project will complete a continuous bike facility of approximately 3.45 miles of Class I Bike Path, with an adjacent pedestrian pathway between the Culver City, City of Los Angeles and the city of Santa Monica. All but this segment of this project has been completed as of March of 2016.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

None.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

Project is In Design Phase, where this phase is anticipated to be completed by October 2018.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

The project will be acquiring necessary ROW, where the process of acquisition is anticipated to start at September 2017, after the 30 percent completion of the Design Phase. It is anticipated that at least 7 properties will be affected, though additional ROW purchase may be needed dependent upon the design configuration. Project anticipates that the cost of ROW acquisition to be substantially beyond the current grant allocation. The City is actively securing funding to meet the shortfall and is confident to meet this goal by August 2019.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

The Design Phase is on track to meet the completion date of October 2018. The revised project's construction costs resulted in significant funding shortfall. However, all the stakeholders (LADOT, BOE, City Council, the Mayor's Office and the Metro) involved are confident and in the process of securing necessary funding for the shortfall before the anticipated start of construction phase, currently set at August 2019.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

The unforeseen need for additional ROW, resulted in lengthy legal litigation, which severely delayed the funding's originally scheduled time lines. Litigation has been settled with the 7 properties affected by the alignment, allowing City of LA to proceed with design phase.
Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

Project has been faced with ROW legal litigations, which substantially delayed the start of the Design Phase, resulting in delay of the originally scheduled Construction Phase. Furthermore, the litigation has resulted in substantially unforeseeable additional acquisition costs. However, the City is actively pursuing funding sources to remedy the funding shortfall and litigation has been settled with the 7 property owners.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>4/17</td>
<td>9/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>4/17</td>
<td>9/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>9/17</td>
<td>12/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>12/18</td>
<td>8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>8/19</td>
<td>4/21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Call for Project #: F3632

Project Sponsor: City of Los Angeles

Project Title: Western Avenue Bus Stop & Pedestrian Improvement Project (Expo to I-10 Fwy)

Call Awarded Year: 2011

Time Extension Request: 1 year(s)

Date of last TAC appeal: None

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

This project will install pedestrian and transit amenities to enhance the pedestrian environment along Western Avenue between Exposition Boulevard and Interstate 10 Freeway.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

No.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

Funds were originally programmed for FY 11, FY 12 and FY 13. Project received two administrative extensions back in November 2014 and May 2016, which extended the lapse date or all years to June 30, 2017.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

Not applicable. No ROW acquisition necessary for this project.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

Yes. Project continues to be financially viable.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

As the project was completing the initial preliminary engineering phase in March 2014, DOT submitted the Preliminary Environmental Studies (PES) form to Caltrans with a recommended determination of Categorical Exclusion without required technical studies. Caltrans did not agree with this finding, and as such in January 2015, required DOT to prepare additional cultural studies. The City subsequently tapped into its consultant bench list to perform these technical studies. A kick-off meeting with Caltrans and AECOM (the selected consultant) was conducted in September 2015. After the initial consultation with the environmental team from Caltrans, the City submitted the first draft of the cultural studies for review. In February 2016, Caltrans provided initial comments that required additional information that was not accounted for in the initial meeting. At this time, the City acknowledged that they would not meet the June 30, 2016 Metro lapse date, and as such was granted an administrative 1-year extension. The additional information requested from Caltrans was submitted in November 2016. Upon review of this additional information, Caltrans responded and required yet additional maps and made the determination that the reports would need to go to SHPO for concurrence. Based on previous experience on projects that require SHPO concurrence, we have developed a revised project schedule with a new NEPA approval target date of January 2018. Meeting the revised NEPA clearance target date would allow just enough time to certify the ROW, finalize the plans and submit the Request for Authority to Proceed with Construction (E-76) by the recommended lapse date of June 30, 2018.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

As indicated above DOT had not anticipated the need for cultural studies to satisfy the environmental approval process. DOT and AECOM have been diligently working with Caltrans’ environmental staff to provide the required cultural studies in a timely manner. DOT feels that the one year extension being requested will allow the sufficient time needed to finalize the environmental phase, complete the design, and certify the ROW, such that an E-76 for construction can be obtained by June 2018.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
### Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>3/2014</td>
<td>1/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>7/2012</td>
<td>4/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-76 for Construction</td>
<td>5/2018</td>
<td>6/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>07/2018</td>
<td>12/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1/2019</td>
<td>3/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Vicinity Map
Western Ave Bus Stop and Pedestrian Improvement
City of Los Angeles
NOT TO SCALE
PROJECT LOCATION
Call for Project #: F9502  
Project Sponsor: City of Monterey Park  
Project Title: Monterey Pass Road Complete Streets Bike Project  
Call Awarded Year: 2015  
Time Extension Request: N/A year(s)  
Date of last TAC appeal: 7/28/2015

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):

The project consists of the installation of a Class II Cycle Track (At-grade, protected bike lane with parking & planter buffer) between the sidewalk & the parking lane along Monterey Pass Road, a 1.6 mile corridor on both sides for continuous bike lanes between Floral Drive & Fremont Avenue/Garvey Avenue. The bike way will dedicate & protect space for bicyclists to improve perceived comfort & safety while eliminating risk & fear of collisions with vehicles.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

There have not been any changes in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved the project.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

Project commencement is on hold until the execution of the funding agreement with Metro. Staff is currently in the process of developing and finalizing an agreement and anticipates it will be executed by June 2017. The last TAC appeal the City made for this project was in July 2015 for the 2015 Call for Projects funding recommendations and rankings. After the City’s appeal, the TAC recommended that the project be included in Metro’s Call for Projects funding recommendations. The TAC recommendation was met and since then Metro has been working with the City to establish the funding agreement.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

Project is not in ROW acquisition phase.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

The project is financially viable and fully funded.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

Development and execution of the funding agreement is ongoing and is anticipated to be complete by June 2017. An updated Scope of Work Attachment was submitted to Metro staff April 25, 2017. Upon receipt of the final draft of the agreement, it will be routed for City signature.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

Development and execution of the funding agreement is underway with anticipated completion by June 2017. An updated Scope of Work Attachment was submitted to Metro staff April 25, 2017. Upon receipt of the final draft of the agreement, it will be routed for City signature. The project’s lapping date is not until June 2022 and the project is scheduled to be complete before then.
Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way certification</td>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>August 2018</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Close Out</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>October 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map  
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Call for Project #: F3146  
Time Extension Request: 2 year(s)
Project Sponsor: City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Engineering  
Date of last TAC appeal: None
Project Title: Highland Avenue Widening-Odin Street to Franklin Avenue  
Call Awarded Year: 2009

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum):
The project will improve Highland Avenue between Odin Street and Franklin Avenue to City designated Class 2 Major Highway Standards having an 80 feet roadway within a 102 feet right of way. This street widening will provides two right turn lanes for southbound traffic in Highland Avenue to merge onto westbound Franklin Avenue (south intersection). In addition, the west leg of the Franklin Avenue (north intersection) will require right of way acquisition to provide a cul-de-sac for access to private properties (Alternative church parking lots and residential ingress/egress).

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:
No changes are introduced; however, the parameter of the project features has been well defined with exact dimensions/limits.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):
This is the first TAC appeal to be submitted.

If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):
1. The project is in the design phase. We have accomplished 45% of the design plans. E76 for R/W has not been submitted yet, because one of the requirements to be determined is the CEQA/NEPA documents that would require special studies (Environmental and Traffic Impacts Studies). This task would be accomplished within the next 4-6 months.

2. Properties that need to be acquired are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTY OWNER</th>
<th>APPROXIMATE AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County of Los Angeles</td>
<td>5230 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE, Hitoshi and Mariko</td>
<td>40 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley, Lawrence</td>
<td>500 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood Hills Beauty Center And Spa</td>
<td>370 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>6030 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willey, Alexis W. ET Al(TRS)</td>
<td>2730 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNT Lodging, Inc</td>
<td>4660 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Methodist Church of Hollywood</td>
<td>4100 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loews Hollywood Hotel LLC</td>
<td>1530 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H and H Retail Owner LLC</td>
<td>410 sq ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. These properties will be acquired starting Dec. 2017 after the E76 R/W approval by Caltrans is granted and will be accomplished within one year.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:
The project is fully funded (Local funds have been appropriated for this project) and can be accomplished in timely manner should we get the sought time extension.

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:
The project was delayed due to the uncertainty if this project would conflict with the City Planning new policy programs.

Reasons for delay:
1. The City adopted Mobility Plan 2035 in August 2015 which is an update to the City’s General Plan Transportation Element last adopted in 1999. The Mobility 2035 Plan established new complete street standards that were not in place when this project was conceived and then awarded through the Metro Call for Projects Process. The City needed time to determine how this project would fit into the new plan without changing the scope.
2. The project was envisioned by a Councilmember which is no longer in office. The new Councilmember transition into office and required time to review and support this project.
3. Time was required from Caltrans for environmental special studies and Traffic Impact Analysis.

The remedies has been addressed as follow:
1. The project is not in conflict with the policies of Mobility 2035.
2. The project has full support from the Council Office.
3. We have selected a consultant via issued Task Order Solicitation (TOS) to perform these special studies and traffic impact analysis. A consultant is well on their way to accomplish these specialized studies as requested by Caltrans.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:
The Project Manager will lead an aggressive schedule that will require: 6 months to accomplish the Environmental Studies; 12 months for R/W acquisition; Bid and award 6 months which is a total of 2 years’ time extension before we can start construction which will be done in 8 months.

We have selected a consultant that will do the Required Special Studies, and our Real Estate Group with the help of the City attorney will start property acquisitions in timely manner. Bid and award can be accelerated/overlapped after we get the E76 R/W approval. Construction will be done in timely manner since we have expertise in construction management for Street Widening Projects.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance (6 months)</td>
<td>04/28/2017</td>
<td>10/26/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (12 months)</td>
<td>04/13/2017</td>
<td>04/13/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition (12 months)</td>
<td>10/26/2017</td>
<td>10/26/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (6 months)</td>
<td>10/26/2018</td>
<td>04/26/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (8 months)</td>
<td>04/26/2019</td>
<td>12/31/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
May 3, 2017 Deobligation Appeal Project Fact Sheet

Call for Project #: F3112
Project Sponsor: CITY OF LAWNDALE
Project Title: INGLEWOOD AVENUE CORRIDOR WIDENING
Call Awarded Year: 

Time Extension Request: One year
Date of last TAC appeal: May 2017

Scope of Work (350 characters maximum): 

This project is for traffic improvements along the Inglewood Avenue Corridor aimed at improving traffic flow and capacity in the city of Lawndale, including:

- Inglewood Avenue between Rosecrans and Marine Avenues for the roadway widening along the west side of Inglewood Avenue to accommodate a dedicated third lane.

The roadway capacity addition, as well as modification to the signal systems, will improve traffic operations and flow on this busy corridor.

Were there any change(s) in the scope of work since the Metro Board approved of the project? If yes, please explain the change(s) and when these changes were approved:

No changes in the scope of work since Metro Board approved the scope change in August 2016 during the Countywide Call For Projects Recertification and Deobligation process.

Project status and whether last TAC recommendation was met (if applicable):

- A Funding Agreement amendment to reflect the Metro Board approved scoped change has been executed between Metro and the City of Lawndale.
- City has approved and awarded a professional services agreement with a consultant to revise the project plans to reflect Metro approved change in scope. Design is at approximately 65% complete.
- The City has awarded agreements with a couple of consultants to update a previously completed assessment and appraisal reports for the ROW take and Goodwill Losses for the one property located at the Northwest corner of Inglewood and Marine per CFP #F1198.
- The City continues working with the Centinela Valley Union High School District to acquire the needed easements for the construction of the right-turn pocket and relocation of overhead utilities.
- The City continues meeting with SCE regarding project updates. SCE will begin design of the relocation of facilities upon receipt of the City’s base maps showing final design along the Inglewood Avenue corridor and grant of easement by the School District.
- The City has acquired the services of a transportation planner/traffic engineer to evaluate current intersection LOS and to develop a traffic model to review the proposed scope alternatives for justification, feasibility, and effectiveness.
- The City is coordinating the work with Caltrans to meet federal funding requirements since the project is also federally funded.
- City Staff requested SBCCOG/Metro to suspend the Southbound I-405 On-Ramp Project (MR312.15) because elements of MR312.15 are included in Phase I of the Call For Projects LAE-2906 (CFP F1198).

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal
If project is in ROW acquisition phase, how many properties are needed and how many have been acquired since last TAC appeal. Schedule to acquire remaining properties (if applicable):

The City has awarded agreements with two consultants to update a previously completed assessment and appraisal report for the Right of Way acquisition and Goodwill Losses for the one property located at the Northwest corner of Inglewood and Marine per CFP F1198. The City continues working with the Centinela Valley Union High School District to acquire the needed easements for the construction of the right-turn pocket and relocation of overhead utilities.

Is the project financially viable and fully funded? If no, explain how the project will be delivered in a timely manner should extension be granted:

Yes, the project is still financially viable.

Reason(s) for delay, if any and how remedy:

The Metro Board approved the scope changes in August 2016, however the City did not receive the funding agreement until January 2017 and the funding agreement executed by Metro until April 7, 2017. Therefore the project is experiencing a corresponding delay in schedule. The City is working diligently (as noted above in the project update) to minimize future delays. Note that the City anticipates delays in coordinating the project with

- Caltrans in acquiring 1) Right-of-Way Certification thus affecting the City completing “Right-of-Way Acquisition”, 2) PES review, and 3) “Authorization to Proceed with Construction”, which may impact the Construction start date.
- Additionally, the City is working with Metro to amend the 2017-08 FTIP, which will require an amendment to include this project. As of 04/26/2017, delays may result as it is unclear to Metro Programming/SCAG if the scope of work will need to be modeled for air quality conformity.
- Finally, it is unknown at this time how the project schedule may be affected as it goes through Southern California Edison design for the relocation of poles.

Basis for extension and explanation of how the sponsor has or will overcome the delay:

At this time, Staff believes it has determined and identified all project milestones for the Project and expects to complete construction within 8 to 10 months after Construction Bid and Award as shown in Proposed Schedule below.

Revised/Proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>01/2012</td>
<td>05/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>01/2011</td>
<td>06/2017 02/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>03/2017</td>
<td>06/2017 02/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award (if applicable)</td>
<td>07/2017 03/2018</td>
<td>08/2017 06/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>09/2017</td>
<td>07/2018 03/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Please attach a Project Map  
2) Previous TAC recommendation (if any) will be provided to TAC at the Appeal