Agenda

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

William Mullholland Conference Room

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

2. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees
   - 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
   5 min

3. Chairperson's Report
   5 min

4. Consent Calendar
   - Approval of Minutes
     Attachment 3: Draft October 4, 2017 Minutes

5. LRTP Update
   5 min

6. LAUS Industry Forum/Master Commercial Developer RFQ
   10 min

7. Supportive Transit Parking Program Update
   30 min

8. Draft Project Acceleration/Deceleration Policy
   10 min

Action (Fanny Pan, Brian Lam)

Information

Attachment 3: Draft October 4, 2017 Minutes

Information

(Fanny Pan)

Action

Information

(Kalieh Honish/Mark Yamarone)

Information

(Jenna Hornstock)

Information/Action

(Frank Ching)

Information

(Manjeet Ranu)
9. Metro Orange Line Improvements
   Attachment 4: Orange Line BRT Board Report
   15 min
   Information
   (Fulgene Asuncion)

10. Metro Transfers Design Study
    Attachment 5: Transfer Design Study Presentation
    15 min
    Information
    (Georgia Sheridan)

11. Division 20 Portal Widening and Turnback Facility
    15 min
    Information
    (Cris Liban)

12. Regional Advance Mitigation Program (RAMP)/Regional Conservation Investment Strategy (RCIS)
    5 min
    Information
    (Cris Liban)

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

14. ATP Update
    Attachment 6: State ATP Cycle 4 Priorities Framework Board Report
    Handout in lieu of oral report

15. CTC Update
    Handout in lieu of oral report

16. Other Business

17. Adjournment

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

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

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

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

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

2. Approval of September 19, 2017 Minutes  Action  BOS
(1 minute)

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

4. Metro Report  Information  Scott Hartwell
(5 minutes)

5. Metro Transfers Design Study  Information  Georgia Sheridan
(15 minutes)

6. Metro’s New Fare Subsidy Program - LIFE  Information  Armineh Saint
(10 minutes)

7. LA County Regional ITS Architecture Update  Information  Edward Alegre
(15 minutes)

8. Legislative Update  Information  Michael Turner/Raffi Hamparian
(10 minutes)

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

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

12. New Business Information
    All

13. Adjournment

Information Items:

  90-day Rolling Agenda
  Summary of Invoices FY 2017 & 2018
  Summary of EZ Pass Invoices FY 2017 & 2018
  Subsidy Matrix FY 2017 & 2018
  TDA-STA Capital Claims FY 2017 & 2018
  TDA-STA Claims FY 2017 & 2018
  Metro Transfers Design Study
  LA County Regional ITS Architecture Update

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, December 5, 2017, at 9:30 am in the Gateway Conference Room, 3rd
Floor of the Metro Headquarters Building.
Agenda
Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE
Gateway Building – Gateway Plaza Conference – room on (3rd floor)

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

1. Call to Order
Action
Sebastian Hernandez, Chair

2. Approval of Minutes
Action
Sebastian Hernandez, Chair

3. Metro’s New Fare Subsidy Program - LIFE
Information
Armineh Saint, Metro

4. Group TAM Plan Kick-Off
Information
Avital Shavit, Metro
Randy Lam, Metro

5. LA County ITS Architecture Update
Information
Eva Pan (for Ed Alegre), Metro

6. LTSS recommended nominations for January elections
Sebastian Hernandez, Chair

7. New Business, Date of Next LTSS Meeting
   (next month – Ann Meiners will present on their service)
Sebastian Hernandez, Chair
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

University Conference Room – 4th Floor

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

2. Approval of Minutes
   Attachment 1: September 21, 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. Metro Transfer Design Study
   15 min
   Information (Georgia Sheridan)

7. Arterial Performance Measurements
   15 min
   Information (Eva Pan)

8. Metro Orange Line Improvements
   20 min
   Information (Fulgene Asuncion)
9. ATP Update  
   Information (Shelly Quan)  
   5 min

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

11. New Business  
    5 min

12. Adjournment  
    1 min

The next meeting for the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee will be held on November 16th at 9:30 a.m. on the 4th floor, University Conference Room. Please contact Fulgene Asuncion at (213) 922 – 3025 should you have any questions or comments regarding this or future agendas.

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

Subcommittee Actions
Disposition of Subcommittee Actions

October 2017

Bus Operations Subcommittee:
- Approved the September 2017 meeting minutes

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:
- Approved the September 2017 meeting minutes

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:
- Approved the September 2017 meeting minutes

TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee:
- Did not meet in October
Attachment 3

October 4, 2017 TAC Minutes

October 4, 2017 Sign-In Sheets
1. Call to Order/Roll Call
Brian Lam (Alternate Chair) called the meeting to order at 9:35 A.M., took roll and declared a quorum was present.

2. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees
   
   **Bus Operations Subcommittee (BOS)**
   - Last met on September 19, 2017
   - Elected BOS Officers:
     - Chair: Jane Leonard (Culver City)
     - Vice Chair: James Lee (Torrance Transit)
     - Secretary: Judy Fry (Antelope Valley Transit Authority)
   - Received updates on:
     - Bike/Bus Interface Study
     - Federal Transit Authority (FTA)
     - Access Services
   - Next meeting is scheduled for October 17, 2017

   **Local Transit Systems Subcommittee (LTSS)**
   - Last met on September 21, 2017
   - Received updates on:
     - Bike/Bus Interface Study
     - Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Architecture
     - Whittier Transit Service
   - Next meeting is scheduled for October 26, 2017

   **Streets and Freeways Subcommittee**
   - Last met on September 21, 2017
   - Received updates on:
     - Union Station Forecourt and Esplanade Project
     - Caltrans
Bus/Bike Interface Study
- East San Fernando Valley (ESFV) Transit Corridor
- Next meeting is scheduled for October 19, 2017

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Sustainability Subcommittee
- Did not meet in September
- Next meeting is scheduled for October 18, 2017

3. Chairperson’s Report (Fanny Pan, Metro)
A handout of the September 28, 2017 Metro Board meeting recap was distributed in lieu of an oral report.

Ms. Pan reported that there are two upcoming Scoping Meetings for the Division 20 Portal Widening and Turnback Facility Project on October 25, 2017 at Art Share L.A. from 6-8 pm and on November 8, 2017 at the Japanese American Cultural and Community Center from 3-5 pm.

Larry Stevens (League of California Cities – San Gabriel Valley COG) asked for clarification on Item 21 – Metrolink San Bernardino Line Strategic Study from the September 28, 2017 Metro Board Meeting. Jeanet Owens (Metro) replied that the Metro Board Motion adjusted the scope of the Metrolink San Bernardino Line Strategic Study to evaluate elimination of the Metrolink Claremont Station and to report back to the Board within 60 days.

Mr. Stevens asked if there is an estimated cost for the study? Ms. Owens replied not at this time. Mr. Stevens then asked if there would be a consultant procured for the study? Ms. Owens replied that there will be no consultants and that the evaluation would be done in-house.

4. Consent Calendar
A motion to approve the September 6, 2017 TAC minutes was made by Jane Leonard (BOS) and seconded by Eric Widstrand (City of Long Beach). Kevin Minne (City of Los Angeles) abstained. The minutes were approved.

5. Link US (Jeanet Owens, Metro)
Ms. Owens provided an overview of the Link Union Station (Link US) project. She explained that currently all commuter rail/intercity rail (Metrolink and Amtrak) enter from the north end of the station where there is a bottleneck forcing trains to idle anywhere from 30-40 minutes at any time. Link US will add run-through tracks to the south so that trains can enter and exit from both the north and south ends of Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS). With this capability, Metrolink and Amtrak trains could dwell for as little as 5 minutes. In addition, Link US will implement an expanded passenger concourse with passenger amenities such as passenger waiting areas, retail, restaurants, vertical circulation, restrooms, baggage handling, security, and any back of house operations for Metro, Metrolink and Amtrak. Link US will also include accommodation of California High Speed Rail (CA HSR) and a platform for the West Santa Ana Branch (WSAB) Light Rail that may be located adjacent to the existing Gold Line.
platform. In March 2017, the Metro Board approved the 6+2 alternative, which includes six regional rail run through tracks and two CA HSR run through tracks.

LAUS is the epicenter of the Southern California transportation system and is currently approaching operational capacity. Ridership at LAUS is projected to grow from 110,000 to 200,000 daily passenger trips by 2040. It is critical that capacity at LAUS is increased to accommodate the forecasted ridership. Benefits of the Link US project will provide increased rail service capacity and improved local, regional, and interstate connectivity.

Ms. Owens explained that there are two design alternatives for the passenger concourse, an at-grade and aerial. There is less development potential in the aerial design alternative as the above-grade passenger concourse will occupy potential development space.

The current cost estimate for the Link US project is $1.7-2.5 billion and will also accommodate active transportation and urban design opportunities.

Staff is currently in the Alternatives Analysis phase and hopes to release the draft EIR in spring 2018. The project is currently only funded through Preliminary Engineering (PE) and staff is actively seeking Public-Private Partnership (P3) opportunities. An Industry Review will be hosted on October 13th.

Ms. Leonard commended the project renderings. She asked if Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) have been notified of the Industry Review on October 13th? Ms. Owens replied that the invitation was sent to developers and posted on the Metro website. Staff will look into further coordinating with Metro procurement to make sure that the invitation is more widely distributed.

Mr. Stevens asked where the remainder of the project funding will come from? Ms. Owens replied that staff is actively searching for potential funding.

Dan Mitchell (City of Los Angeles) asked what the cost differences are between the aerial and at-grade concourse. Ms. Owens replied that the cost savings for the aerial concourse is approximately $500 million. The at-grade option is more expensive since it has the concourse underneath the rail yard and requires the rail yard to be raised 15 feet to clear the El Monte Busway and US-101 freeway. LAUS must remain fully operational throughout construction of Link US, requiring a large portion of funding for construction staging. The aerial design option minimizes the impacts to train operations.

Mr. Mitchell noted that in the previous presentations he saw Patsaouras Bus Plaza was being relocated to the west side of LAUS. Ms. Owens replied that the relocation of Patsaouras Bus Plaza was part of the Union Station Master Plan and has since been changed to remain at its current location.

Eric Widstrand (City of Long Beach) asked if the current configuration of Patsaouras Bus Plaza has the capacity for future growth? Ms. Owens replied that the bus plaza does not have additional capacity allowed. But as part of the redevelopment, there could be potential to add additional bus bays.
Mr. Stevens asked if historic preservation is being considered between the two alternatives? He noted that the aerial design option seems to have a larger impact on the existing historic LAUS. Ms. Owens replied yes. Staff is working with the Los Angeles Conservancy, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) as well as the City Office of Resource.

6. Highways Program Update (Abdollah Ansari, Metro)
Mr. Ansari provided a comprehensive view of the Metro Highway Program. He noted that Los Angeles County’s traffic congestion has been the subject of nationwide discussions. In 2015, six of the top 10 most congested corridors in the nation were in Los Angeles County. In 2016, an average driver in Los Angeles spent more than 81 hours/year stuck in traffic. Compared to global congestion, Los Angeles is ranked number one in top congested freeways. Mr. Ansari noted that one contributing factor to the congestion is the type of economy that we have in Southern California. Unlike most areas in the nation, Los Angeles County has multiple “downtown” areas spread throughout the county that draws traffic movement, making it difficult to implement traditional directional traffic congestion reduction strategies. Approximately 76% of Los Angeles County residents drive alone to work. The disparity between car demand and other modes is huge and is persistently rising.

Mr. Ansari explained that Metro is involved with Highway projects due to the shift in financial capacity of Caltrans to do the necessary work. Legislative changes have reduced funding Caltrans funding and has shifted part of the responsibility for highway projects to other agencies, including Metro in Los Angeles County.

When Measure R was approved in 2008, approximately $8 billion was committed to highway projects. Metro is currently managing around 300 projects. Staff is also in the process of finalizing the Administrative Guidelines for the Measure M Highway Program. In the Measure M Expenditure Plan, approximately $9 billion funding is provided to major highway projects that Metro or Caltrans will lead, and approximately $6 billion to subregional highway projects or categories. However, the highways needs assessment for Los Angeles County shows $70 billion of need.

Mr. Ansari provided brief project overviews of current on-going highway projects: I-5 North HOV and Truck Lanes; I-605 Hot Spots; I-710 (South); I-710 Early Action Projects; SR-57/SR-60 Interchange Improvements; High Desert Corridor; SR-14/138 Projects in Palmdale and Lancaster; SR-138, SR-14 to LA/SB County Line; SR-138 Northwest; SR-710 (North); I-5 North: SR-118 to SR-134; I-5 South: Orange County Line to I-605.

In addition to major projects, Metro is also focusing on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and other elements to help ease congestion, such as carpool lanes, High Occupancy Toll lanes, lower emission trucks, and truck platooning (which was test piloted in the Gateway Cities area).

With subregional funds given to local cities, Metro staff offers assistance to the local cities to accelerate the project through pre-construction phases. Metro is currently developing projects for the Gateway Cities COG and will be helping with pre-construction phases of highway projects in the San Gabriel Valley COG starting in 2018.
Mr. Stevens noted that he does not believe that it is possible to build Los Angeles County out of the congestion problem. He noted that it seems that more money should be focused on strategies reducing single occupancy drivers rather than highway construction projects. Mr. Ansari replied that ultimately, land use changes must be made to have the largest impact on congestion. Past land use decisions have led to outward sprawl resulting in long travel times and distances. More recent land use decisions have shifted towards in-fill, creating a reverse traffic pattern. Mr. Ansari noted that decision has its benefits and costs; however, understanding the travel demand and the unwillingness or inability of a driver to shift modes is necessary to approaching the highway congestion issues in Los Angeles County. He noted that a combination of strategies will be needed to solve the problem.

Mike Bagheri (TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee) agreed that land use changes need to be made at the local level. He commented that Metro’s strategy should be to tie grant funding to cities that have adopted land use plans that encourage development around transit, mixed use and amenities at the local level. Mr. Ansari agreed and commented that a combination of strategies is needed, not just limited to freeway improvements.

Ms. Leonard asked if there are DBE/SBE opportunities for highway construction projects? Mr. Ansari replied yes. Metro has created DBE/SBE set asides for projects.

7. **LRTP Update (Mark Yamarone, Metro)**

Mr. Yamarone reported that staff presented an introduction to the LRTP update to the Metro Board on September 28, 2017 and will present a Public Participation Plan to the Board in November 2017. The Public Participation Plan will detail the outreach efforts for each of the seven modules. A possible Board Workshop Visioning Session may also take place in winter 2018. The Board Workshop would further hone the vision for Metro and Los Angeles County, and how the LRTP can address that. The final LRTP is scheduled for Board adoption in the winter of 2020.

Mr. Stevens noted that the LRTP has typically been essentially a long range budget plan, rather than looking at project changes or additional projects. Mr. Yamarone replied that historically the LRTP has been somewhat of a Capital Improvement Program. The current LRTP update is a new concept with a much broader perspective. There are four major groups that contain the core content of the LRTP: Baseline Understanding, Values Framework, Transportation Network and Management Plan, and Implementing and Evaluating the Plan. The Transportation Network and Management Plan is the traditional programming of the projects against future funding. The other core aspects of the LRTP update are much broader planning concepts such as the Baseline Understanding and Values Framework.

Mr. Stevens asked if the LRTP has the potential to shift or redefine projects based on how the vision evaluates them in a longer term perspective. Mr. Yamarone replied yes.

Mr. Stevens asked what TAC’s role is in the development of the LRTP? Mr. Yamarone replied that the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) was formed by the Board specifically to report directly to the Board on policy issues associated with Measure M implementation and the LRTP update. Whereas TAC reviews projects and programs at the staff level to provide
technical advice. Ms. Pan stated as with prior LRTP updates, staff will be providing LRTP updates to TAC on a monthly basis as a standing item.

8. East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Update (Ivan Gonzalez, Metro)
Mr. Gonzalez reported that the East San Fernando Valley (ESFV) Transit Corridor Project was initiated in 2011 and was originally conceived as an extension of the Metro Orange Line (MOL) on Van Nuys Boulevard. During the Alternatives Analysis and Scoping process, the community expressed interest in a more significant mass transit investment along the corridor. Staff found that the corridor has the second-highest bus boardings in the SFV after the MOL.

Mr. Gonzalez reported that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) was released on September 1, 2017. Staff has held five public meetings and the public comment period closes on October 30, 2017. Staff anticipates going to the Metro Board in early 2018 for the selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA).

Mr. Gonzalez reported that bus ridership is highest and bus speeds are lowest between the MOL and Panorama City, with the Van Nuys Civic Center serving as a key activity center. Approximately 460,000 people reside in the Study Area, many of whom are transit dependent. The total route is 9.2 miles long, of which 6.7 miles would be along Van Nuys Boulevard and 2.5 miles would be along San Fernando Road.

Mr. Gonzalez reported on the existing conditions of the corridor. The Van Nuys Boulevard roadway consists of two to three travel lanes in each direction, with a curb-to-curb distance between 72 and 94 feet. Left turns are currently permitted throughout Van Nuys Boulevard. Some of the Project Alternatives would create left-turn restrictions, which would require drivers to make U-turns at major intersections to access some businesses. San Fernando Road is narrower, with a curb-to-curb distance between 55 and 66 feet.

Mr. Gonzalez reported on the Project Alternatives. There are four build alternatives, the Transportation Systems Management (TSM) alternative, and the No Build alternative. Two of the build alternatives are BRT, and two are LRT.

Mr. Gonzalez reported that the difference between the BRT alternatives is that one would be curb-running BRT (similar to the Wilshire BRT) and the other would be median-running BRT. A curb-running BRT would have operational inefficiencies as a result of cars pulling into and out of driveways and making right turns at intersections from the bus-only lane. The median-running BRT would reduce conflicts to bus service but would have impacts on automobile traffic such as restricting mid-block left turns.

Mr. Gonzalez reported that one of the LRT alternatives would have 28 stations while the other would have 14 stations. The 28 stations alternative mimics existing local bus service with stops every ¼ mile. Under the 14 stations alternative, there would be stops approximately every ¾ mile. For this alternative, local bus service would remain in place to serve shorter trips.
Mr. Gonzalez reported that both LRT alternatives would require a new Maintenance and Storage Facility (MSF). The BRT alternatives would utilize existing Metro divisions in Sun Valley or Chatsworth. The MSF for the LRT would require a 25 to 30 acre site within ¼ mile of the alignment.

Mr. Gonzalez reported that Metro’s 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) identified $170 million for the ESFV Transit Corridor. Neither of the BRT options would have had sufficient funding through the LRTP, with the curb-running BRT costing $294 million and the median-running BRT costing $402 million. After Measure M passed in 2016, the Metro Board earmarked $1.3 billion for the Project, which could fund either of the BRT alternatives or an at-grade LRT. Mr. Gonzalez reported that the subway option for LRT would add $1.4 billion to the Project cost while saving transit users only two minutes compared to at-grade LRT. Under the Measure M Expenditure Plan, the Project would break ground in Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 and would be completed between FY 2027 and FY 2029.

Mr. Gonzalez noted that there is not enough ROW to include a bike lane on Van Nuys Boulevard. Staff is pursuing mitigations and working with the community and local jurisdictions to address the issue. Mr. Gonzalez also noted that the option to run low-floor light rail trams has been removed from consideration, and both light rail alternatives will use the same high floor train design as the other Metro Light Rail Lines.

Mr. Gonzalez reported that the biggest difference between BRT and LRT is capacity, since LRT could carry approximately 200 passengers per two-car train-set and BRT could carry approximately 72 people per bus. BRT and LRT would both have significant traffic impacts, with the removal of one travel lane in each direction, the loss of on-street parking, and traffic flow changes, though Mr. Gonzalez reported that LRT would have somewhat more severe impacts. Mr. Gonzalez reported that the Project would impact existing Community Plans, as there would not be enough room for existing and planned Class II Bike Lanes on Van Nuys Boulevard. Construction impacts for BRT and LRT would differ, with an 18- to 30-month construction period for BRT versus a four- to six-year construction period for LRT. Only the LRT alternatives would require real estate acquisitions, most of which to construct an MSF.

Mr. Gonzalez reported that projected boardings for 2040 are higher for the LRT alternatives than for the BRT alternatives. The LRT with 14 stations is projected to have 47,400 boardings, the LRT with 28 stations is projected to have 35,800 boardings, and each of the BRT alternatives is projected to have approximately 31,000 boardings.

Mr. Gonzalez reported that the loss of two travel lanes would impact automobiles but that the Project would move people more efficiently through the corridor. Van Nuys Boulevard has a carrying capacity of 783 people per lane per hour for automobiles. Curb-running BRT with five-minute headways could accommodate 1224 people per lane per hour, and median-running LRT five-minute headways could accommodate 4800 people per lane per hour.

Mr. Gonzalez reported on First/Last Mile (FLM) improvements as part of the Project. Approximately 85% of Metro passengers arrive at stations by non-automotive modes. Staff will develop focus groups to determine origins and destinations within ¼ mile to ½ mile of stations and to increase the ease and attractiveness of traveling in station areas. Potential
improvements include curb ramps, sidewalk and crosswalk improvements, and landscaping. Mr. Gonzalez reported that 3% of the Project cost will fund FLM improvements.

Mr. Gonzalez reported that the public comment period closes on October 30, 2017. Staff has identified 2021 as the groundbreaking year of the Project, though ROW and utility relocation could begin as soon as 2019. Staff anticipates the determination of the LPA in early 2018, after which time staff will release a Request for Proposals for Preliminary Engineering (PE).

Greg Farr (Caltrans) asked for clarification on the statistic that 85% of Metro riders walk, bike, or roll to stations. Lia Yim (Metro) clarified that for bus trips, 83% of passengers access the system by walking and 5% access by bike. For rail trips, 68% of passengers access the system by walking and 4% access by bike.

Mr. Stevens asked if this project was initially a BRT project? Walt Davis (Metro) replied that the project was originally a City of Los Angeles project envisioned as a BRT. Metro conducted the Alternatives Analysis (AA) which considered all viable options, including LRT. During the Public Scoping period, the public voiced a preference for LRT. The Technical Analysis also showed a projected ridership that warranted LRT as well.

Mr. Stevens asked why the 14 station LRT option would retain the local Metro Bus service along Van Nuys Boulevard? Mr. Gonzalez replied that the 14 station LRT option would not serve the local uses that traditional local bus service would serve. Analysis has shown that many transit dependent residents in the area rely on the local service. Mr. Stevens commented that it seems that running two relatively similar services parallel to one another may not be cost effective in the long run. Mr. Stevens also noted that the 28 station LRT option seems like it would be stopping more than a bus would stop. Mr. Gonzalez replied that the 28 station LRT option would essentially serve as a local transit option as well. In this alternative the local bus service would be replaced by the LRT.

Mr. Bagheri asked why low-floor tram was eliminated? Mr. Gonzalez replied that the project purpose and need is to provide a high capacity, higher speed option through the East San Fernando Valley. In addition to the operational issues of not being able to interchange trains between lines, typically low-floor trams operate slower than high-floor LRT.

Mr. Stevens asked if the project is providing any parking facilities? Mr. Gonzalez replied that parking decisions will evolve as the project moves forward. Staff has conducted a parking survey and found that parking is heavily underutilized at sites; however, no specific parking needs have been identified at this point.

Mr. Stevens asked if the total cost of the LRT options includes the purchase of train cars? Mr. Davis replied yes, the total project cost includes the construction of the track, purchase of additional train cars, and construction of the MSF.

Mr. Widstrand asked if this project be phased to implement BRT first, and convert to LRT at a later date? Mr. Gonzalez replied that staff does not have that direction from the Metro Board at this time; however the project does not preclude that possibility.
Valerie Watson (Pedestrian Coordinator) asked if there are any updates on the Community Engagement Focus Groups that would be convened as part of the FLM component of the project? Mr. Gonzalez replied that FLM Guidelines for Transit Corridor Projects are currently in development and are anticipated to be finalized in early to mid-2018. Those Guidelines will have more detail on the aspects of community engagement.

9. Bike/Bus Interface (Lia Yim, Metro/Jeremiah LaRose, Fehr & Peers)
Ms. Yim reported that Metro has a service area covering approximately 1500 square miles, with 170 bus routes, a fleet of 2248 buses, and nearly 16,000 bus stops. There are 22 additional municipal operators in Los Angeles County.

Ms. Yim reported that 5% of Metro’s patrons access Metro Bus by bike and that 80% of Los Angeles County residents live within three miles of high frequency bus or rail. Three miles is the distance that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) defines as the bike shed, or the distance that the average person is willing to substitute a bike trip for a vehicle trip. Between 2006 and 2014, bike commuting has increased by 81%. Ms. Yim reported that between 2007 and 2014, there was a 127% increase in bike infrastructure, or an additional 930 miles of bikeways. There are now 836 miles of bike lanes in Los Angeles County.

Ms. Yim reported that the high level of bus activity and increase in biking has led to more bike and bus interactions, as both modes share the same space on the roadway. Travel patterns for bikes and buses are slightly different, as bikes travel slowly and steadily and buses tend to have a stop-and-go pattern. This leads to more crossovers between the two modes. Ms. Yim reported that there is existing guidance for bike facilities and street design but that there is room for improvement.

Ms. Yim reported that the Study was broken down into four components:
- Best Practices and Literature Review
- Before/After Analysis
- Training Guidance for Operators and People on Bicycles
- Bike/Bus Roadway Design Guidebook

Ms. Yim reported that the Study was led by a working group that consisted of roadway designers (planning and engineering staff at Metro, Caltrans, and municipalities), roadway users (transit operators from Metro and municipal operators), and bicyclists (agencies that specialize in bike education and outreach). Additionally, there was a peer review team that consisted of staff from the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority (SEPTA), King County Metro/Seattle Department of Transportation (DOT), and San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA). This allowed Metro staff to gain perspectives from agencies that have experience with bike and bus interactions.

Ms. Yim reported that the Study also included outreach in order to understand the qualitative aspects of bike and bus interactions. Outreach consisted of interviews with municipal staff, operator and bicyclist focus groups, and surveys of bicyclists. The survey was distributed online in English and Spanish, and Metro received 4000 responses.
Mr. LaRose reported that the Study examined different bicycle infrastructure types (i.e. standard bike lanes, buffered bike lanes, separated bikeways, and shared bus/bike or bus-only lanes) over 15 corridors throughout Los Angeles County that changed within the last three to five years.

Mr. LaRose reported that the Study Metrics included data on corridor volumes (average daily traffic, bus frequency, bikes), ridership, behavior (e.g. bicyclists riding the wrong way or on the sidewalk), and bus operations (i.e. speed and reliability).

Mr. LaRose reported on the findings of the Study:
- Bicycling increased on all study corridors after bike infrastructure was installed: The magnitude of increase was related less to the type of infrastructure installed and more to where the infrastructure was installed and connectivity to the existing network.
- Addition of bike facilities improved safety and standardized riding behavior: Bus operators highlighted concerns over predictability of bicyclist behavior. After new infrastructure was put in place, there were fewer reported instances of wrong-way and sidewalk bicycling.
- No apparent correlation between bus frequency and bicycling activity: When deciding where to ride, people are less concerned about the presence of buses than they are with private automobile drivers.
- Bus performance largely unchanged on study corridors
- All users prefer green “skip-stripe” markings: This marking shows a conflict area where buses pull into and out of bus stops. This indicates to bikes where they can expect a bus to be operating and indicates to bus operators where they can expect bikes to be riding.
- Buses and bicycles can share streets safely: There were few collisions between buses and bikes on the Study Corridors. There were expressed concerns regarding near misses and the stress of driving in the same space as someone riding a bicycle.

Mr. LaRose reported that there are two sets of training recommendations: one for bus operators and one for bicyclists. For bus operators, it is important to understand why people on bikes make the decisions that they make while riding. Critical elements for initial and ongoing bus operator training include minimum passing distances, knowing the “door zone,” and unpredictable riding behaviors. Additionally, staff found that bus operators who have experience biking are more sympathetic and understanding of bicycling behavior. Therefore, recommendations include providing on-bicycle experience and bicycle safety training to operators. The third major recommendation involves creating a forum for bus operators to share information about new and proposed street conditions.

Mr. LaRose reported that, for people biking, a better understanding of the differences between buses and private vehicles is essential. Many bicyclists are also drivers and understand how to interact with automobiles, but bicycle safety training programs tend to lack information on riding alongside buses. Staff found that only 30% survey respondents have taken a bicycle safety training course. The Study therefore recommends providing more opportunities for training, including informal educational opportunities at pop-up events and public awareness campaigns.
Mr. LaRose reported that the Design Guidelines include eight recommendations that provide high-level strategies and point to existing guidebooks for more detailed information. The design guidelines focus on bike-bus interaction at stops, intersections and corridors; responsiveness to gaps in existing guidelines; and are supported by corridor analysis, particularly outreach and stakeholder engagement.

Mr. LaRose reported that there are three steps to successfully implementing the Design Guidelines. The first is to create a collaborative process by including the roadway designers and roadway users. The second is to engage stakeholders early on in the process to determine what effects the design reconfigurations may have on bus operations, bike volumes, and interactions between the two modes. The third is to continue dialogue during and after implementation to identify further improvements that could be made, particularly if improvements can benefit bus operations.

Mr. Bagheri asked why is it not encouraged to share the sidewalk with bikes and pedestrians? Ms. Yim replied that bikes and pedestrians have very different travel patterns. Sidewalks are designed for slower movement. In addition, driveways pose significant safety issues for bikes as a driver may have a more limited view and may not expect something moving as quickly as a bike on the sidewalk. Ellen Blackman (Citizen Representative on ADA) noted that people with mobility disabilities do not want bikes on the sidewalk as it is perceived as a danger to them. She added that it makes more sense for both modes if they are kept separated due to safety and travel patterns.

Ms. Watson asked if a Metro contact list could be included in the Design Guidebook? Ms. Lim replied that the Design Guidebook will not list specific staff members, but will list which departments can be contacted for specific information.

Ms. Leonard asked how do you propose to provide training for bicyclists in Los Angeles County? Mr. LaRose replied that there needs to be a very proactive outreach approach. Currently the training offered is mostly elected, but being out in the community and engaging people will offer the best way to reach more bicyclists. Ms. Yim added that the current elected bicycle safety course is a free eight hour course, but more innovative techniques will be introduced. The Metro Bike Program is developing a bicycle education curriculum that can reduce the eight hour course to smaller segments to make it easier for people.

Ms. Leonard commented that the bicycle safety course should be brought to schools to teach safe bike riding to children at a younger age. Mr. Stevens agreed and noted that cities used to license bicycles which could be a way to facilitate bicycle safety education.

Mr. Bagheri commented that if you protect bicyclists with safe and protected bike lanes, people will use them and not feel the need to ride on the sidewalk. Ms. Yim agreed and noted that the study showed that providing a dedicated, protected space for bikes led to increased bike ridership and a reduction in sidewalk riding.

Justine Garcia (LTSS) commented that there is a huge risk for bicyclists riding on sidewalks. Most incidences occur when a bike on the sidewalk is approaching a driveway. Ms. Garcia
also suggested that local jurisdiction’s Parks and Recreation departments are a great resource to provide proactive bicycle education out to the communities.

10. Other Business

11. Adjournment
Ms. Pan adjourned the meeting and reported that the next scheduled TAC meeting is November 1, 2017 in the William Mullholland Conference Room on the 15th floor at 9:30 am. If you have questions regarding the next meeting, please contact Brian Lam at (213)922-3077 or email lamb@metro.net.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>1. Marianne Kim/Stephen Finnegan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICYCLE COORDINATOR</td>
<td>1. Rich Dilluvio/Michelle Mowery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (BOS)</td>
<td>1. Michelle Caldwell/Robert Portillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Jane Leonard/Dana Pynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>1. Gary Slater/Steve Novotny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Greg Farr/Kelly Lamarre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVE ON ADA</td>
<td>Ellen Blackman/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1. Eric Widstrand/Nathan Baird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</strong></td>
<td>1. Corinne Ralph/Kari Derderian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Dan Mitchell/Carlos Rios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Ferdy Chan/Kevin Minne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</strong></td>
<td>1. Richard Marshallian/Ayala Ben-Yehuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. John Walker/Mario Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Pat Proano/Mary Reyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES</strong></td>
<td>1. David Kriske/Roubik Golanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td>2. Mohammad Mostahkami/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities COG</td>
<td>3. Robert Brager/Nicole Benyamin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes Malibu COG</td>
<td>4. Trois Mieha/Mike Behen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td>5. Larry Stevens/Craig Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
<td>6. Jason Smisko/Dennis Ambayec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley COG</td>
<td>7. Robert Beste/Ted Semaan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td>8. David Feinberg/Sharon Perlstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Cities COG</td>
<td></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. Jasmin 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>PEDESTRIAN COORDINATOR</td>
<td>1. Valerie Watson/Dale Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Susan Price/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY (SCRRA - Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Anne Louise Rice/Karen Sakoda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SCAQMD -- Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Eyvonne Drummonds/Kathryn Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG -- Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Warren Whiteaker/Annie Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Lupe Valdez/LaDonna DiCamillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/</td>
<td>1. Mike Bagheri/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>2. Mark Hunter/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Naomi Inoguchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jimmy Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Michael Fretin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bryan Baldaveana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vincent Chu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Robert Wong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jeremiah Larose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lisa Yim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Kim/Stephen Finnegan (A)</td>
<td>AUTO CLUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Dilluvio/Michele Mowery (A)</td>
<td>BICYCLE COORDINATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Caldwell/Robert Portillo (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Leonard/Dana Pyrri (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgt. Steve Brancovier/Ol Christian C. (A)</td>
<td>CHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Slater/Steve Novohny (A)</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Faen/Kelly Lamare (A)</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Blackman/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>CITIZEN REP ON ADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Widdowson/Nathan Baird (A)</td>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne Ralph/Kari Dererian (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Mitchelli/Carlos Rios (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fardy Chan/Kevin Minne (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Marshall/Ayala Ben-Yehuda (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Walker/Mano Rodriguez (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Peano/Mary Reyes (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Keske/Roubik Gotsman (A)</td>
<td>ARROYO VERDUGO CITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Mostahkami/Lisa Rapp (A)</td>
<td>GATEWAY CITIES COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Brager/Ramilo Adeva (A)</td>
<td>LAS VEGAS MARBLU COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trolis Niebla/Mike Buhai (A)</td>
<td>NORTH L.A. COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Stevens/Craig Bradshaw (A)</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL VALLEY COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Smoika/Dennis Ambaye (A)</td>
<td>SAN FERNANDO VALLEY COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Best/Ted Semaan (A)</td>
<td>SOUTH BAY CITIES COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Feinberg/Sharon Perlstein (A)</td>
<td>WESTSIDE CITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian Hernandez/Feri Goodman (A)</td>
<td>LTSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justine Garcia/Linda Evans (A)</td>
<td>LTSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanny Pan/Brian Lam (A)</td>
<td>METRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Corral-Lopez/Carolyn Keslak (A)</td>
<td>METRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Watson/Dale Benson (A)</td>
<td>PEQ COORDINATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH COORDINATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Louise Rice/Karen Sakoda (A)</td>
<td>SCRRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyvonne Drummonds/Kathryn Higgins (A)</td>
<td>SCAQMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Whissak/Anne Nam (A)</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupe Valdez/LaDonna DiCamilla (A)</td>
<td>SUDS MOVEMENT REP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Bagheri/Phil Aker (A)</td>
<td>TDM/SUST SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hunter/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>TDM/SUST SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Warning
Attachment 4

October 26, 2017
Orange Line BRT Board Report
SUBJECT: ORANGE LINE BUS RAPID TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS

ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE:

A. the findings and recommendation resulting from the Orange Line Bus Rapid Transit Improvements Technical Study; and

B. advancing Orange Line Bus Rapid Transit Improvements into the public engagement, environmental review and engineering design concurrent processes.

DISCUSSION

Overview of Metro Orange Line

The MOL is a multi-modal transportation corridor. MOL provides a vital high-capacity transit link for San Fernando Valley and extends nearly 18 miles in length from the North Hollywood Metro Red Line station to Chatsworth, with a spur to Warner Center. It is a highly successful transit line in Metro's network, with approximately 25,000 daily riders.

Technical Study Analysis

A Technical Study was authorized by the Board in January 2016. Improvements studied included grade separations, minor street closures, better transit signal priority technology, electronic bus connectivity to facilitate bus platooning and a four quadrant gating system. The core goal is to improve operating speeds/reduce bus travel times to move customers more efficiently and safely. Six alternatives were packaged together out of numerous individual, potential improvements. Four alternatives studied a different mix of grade separations. One alternative studied solely using gating at all intersections. Another alternative evaluated a mix of grade separations and gating.

Technical Study Key Findings

Details of the Technical Study are outlined in Attachment A. Key findings are as follows:

- The gating system accomplished the highest benefit for the least cost relative to the other improvements. It allows buses to travel much faster than the current average of 21 miles per hour through roadway intersections while also improving safety by lowering the risk of vehicle
intrusions into the busway.

- Gating is a cost-effective approach to providing an equitable distribution of safety improvements along the busway, which allows for a time saving that is cumulatively substantial. With gating, there is far less benefit to closing minor roads in the MOL corridor, as gating would reduce uncertainty for bus drivers at the crossings and improve travel times and safety.

- Grade separations of major arterial roadways did not achieve the hoped-for benefit in time savings because the stations located at these intersections required buses to stop anyway and are costly. Grade separations provide an equivalent or superior safety improvement but, due to the cost, the safety improvement is limited to those grade separated intersections, versus a busway-length deployment of safety gating.

- In general, the minor roads identified as high candidates for closure were found to be important for local access, complicating closures as a solution.

The alternative that studied a mix of gating and grade separation performed substantially better in all measures compared to the other alternatives and fits within the Measure M budget.

- Travel time is reduced by 16 minutes between the North Hollywood station and Chatsworth stations (12 minutes to Canoga Park station) when combined with enhanced bus operations.

- Daily ridership could be increased by over 10,000. Vehicular cross-traffic wait time is longer when the gates are down as compared to existing road traffic signal condition, but the gates only come down to stop traffic when needed for a bus crossing and all other times will be open for the cross traffic. Also, the gates will be coordinated for bicycle and pedestrian users of the Class I bike path, in certain circumstances.

- Preliminary analysis indicates a change in cross-vehicle travel time to be a few seconds different during peak periods and is significantly improved during off-peak than without this Project. As the project advances further into the design and technical study processes, the results from these performance metrics may change.

Recommended Alternative

The recommended alternative addresses all modes along and crossing the corridor in a manner that will be more efficient and enhances safety. It is found to be consistent with the project in the Measure M Ordinance.

The recommended alternative involves a package of capital improvements:

- A new single-grade separation structure would span from Van Nuys to Sepulveda Boulevards and the existing stations at these locations would be relocated vertically to the new structure with side-loading station platforms. The new structure would also span three intersecting streets in between. The grade separation structure and stations would be designed to accommodate the long-term plan to convert MOL to light rail transit (LRT).

- All other intersections along the busway between North Hollywood and Chatsworth stations would receive four quadrant safety gates of the type used for LRT.
The Class I bike path adjacent to the span of the busway grade separation structure would, at a minimum, be grade separated at Van Nuys and Sepulveda Boulevards; another design option would grade separate the same span as the busway structure.

All the existing Class I bike path intersections with roadways would retain signalization, including at Van Nuys and Sepulveda Boulevards for local access.

One minor street, Tyrone Avenue, would be closed to accommodate the busway grade separation structure.

Other operational improvements to MOL may be implemented, which do not involve significant capital improvements.

Reasoning for Recommended Alternative

This alternative is recommended because:

- It achieves superior and significant travel time savings for MOL of up to 16 minutes/29 percent each direction;
- Ridership could be increased by approximately 39 percent;
- It readies the transportation corridor for LRT conversion;
- Safety is markedly improved by nearly eliminating vehicular intrusions into the busway; and
- It fits within the Measure M budget, based on the conceptual engineering done to date.

Moreover, this alternative provides commensurate improvements to the adjacent regionally-significant active transportation facility, in furtherance of first-last mile connectivity to transit. It also accommodates two other planned, intersecting transit: East San Fernando Valley and Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridors. This alternative would be designed to support the creation of Transit-oriented Communities (TOC). Therefore, it does not preclude or complicate a potential, future update of the land use plan and zoning to support the creation of TOC at this mobility hub by the City of Los Angeles, should the City decide to do so.

Measure M Consistency Finding

The Measure M ordinance identifies the capital investment as “Orange Line BRT Improvements” with a groundbreaking date of FY2019 and an opening date of FY2025. Footnote “n” states, “Critical grade separation(s) will be implemented early through Operation Shovel Ready.” The Operation Shovel Ready Initiative was transmitted to the Board in January 2016 as an informational memorandum. The approach of the Initiative is to bring projects to a “Shovel-Ready” state that enables Metro to take advantage of potential opportunities, which may develop and allow the projects to advance into the engineering design and construction stage sooner than planned. While assumptions were made for the purposes of preparing the Measure M Expenditure Plan, all Measure M project descriptions are finalized after planning study, public engagement and environmental review. The final project description must be consistent with the project identified in the Measure M ordinance.

The recommended alternative is consistent with the Measure M ordinance. It allows for a faster build
because it is less intense to construct overall. It allows for the fastest ride and greatest travel time improvements of all the alternatives studied, including a fiscally unconstrained alternative with five arterial roadway grade separations. And it is future ready because the improvements are designed to accommodate LRT to the extent feasible now. Measure M provides for converting MOL to LRT, with an opening date of FY2057. Because Measure M identifies the groundbreaking date for this project as FY2019, the recommendation is also consistent with Operation Shovel Ready, since the planning, environmental and design work must occur promptly to allow this early action project to be developed on schedule.

Additionally, the alternative accommodates the integration with two other planned Measure M projects: the East San Fernando Valley and Sepulveda Pass Phase 2 Transit Corridors. Importantly, the proposed combined grade separation and gating improvements allow MOL to be grade separated from these other two planned transit corridors.

Staff finds that each feature of the recommended alternative is distinctly consistent with Measure M:

- The busway grade separation structure provides for the critical separation set forth in footnote “n” of Measure M.
- It is critical because it separates the busway from two sub-regional arterial roadways with high peak period traffic volumes and accommodates future planned regional transit corridors by eliminating incompatible crossings of transit lines.
- Safety gating of all other intersections with the busway is a critical MOL corridor improvement because the safety benefits directly correlate with reducing bus travel times, while having a minimal effect on vehicular cross-traffic when combined with enhanced bus operations.
- The Class I bike path grade separation adjacent to the busway grade separation improves first -last mile connectivity by providing safer and faster active transportation crossings of Sepulveda and Van Nuys Boulevards, which is an MOL corridor improvement.
- Closure of Tyrone Avenue is necessary to accommodate the busway grade separation structure and does not significantly affect access or negatively impact traffic.
- The gating and project design also accommodates future LRT service, with the stations also being designed to accommodate LRT to the extent feasible now.

**Considerations**

While a good solution, every proposed capital improvement comes with its own set of issues to consider and address. The recommended alternative introduces safety gating that includes the standard warning bell sound. Some stakeholders may have hoped that the grade separations would have a substantial benefit to reducing vehicular travel times across the valley. Because this is an investment in MOL improvements, as set forth in Measure M, improving sub-regional roadway travel congestion was outside the scope of the this capital investment, but was a consideration when evaluating the effect of the project on vehicular cross-traffic. Measure M provides local return and Multi-year Sub-regional Funds that may be used for improving local and sub-regional roadway travel times. Construction impacts will occur, mostly associated with the grade separation component. The construction plan will need to maintain bus, bicycle, pedestrian and vehicular access and service to the maximum extent that is reasonably feasible. Detailed engineering design has not yet been done.
This additional step in the pre-development process may result in value engineering. Also, the project cost estimate will continue to be updated as the engineering advances. If any significant changes are identified that affect the future project description, the Board will be notified and provided with options for consideration.

**DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

This Board action will not have any adverse safety impacts on Metro’s employees and patrons. The Board is only authorizing additional study and engagement; no operational changes or construction result from this Board action.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The FY 2017-18 budget includes $750,000 in Cost Center 4370 (Transit Corridors Planning), Project 471405 (Orange Line Grade Separation) to support the environmental phase for the Metro Orange Line Grades Separations/Other Improvements project. Since work on this project would be multiyear, it will be the responsibility of the cost center manager and Chief Planning Officer to budget funds in future years.

In addition, FY 2017-18 budget includes $8,200,000 in Cost Center 8510, Project 471405 (Orange Line BRT Improvements) for engineering support and advanced utility relocation designs. Since work on this project would be multiyear, it will be the responsibility of the Project Manager and Chief Program Management Officer to budget funds in future years.

In June 2017, the Board of Directors authorized the CEO to execute a contract for Supplemental Engineering Services for Engineering Design of Rail and Highway Transportation Projects on a task order basis in the amount of $15,000,000 with options for a total contract value not to exceed $20,000,000, and execute individual Task Orders and changes within the Board approved contract amount. Since this is a multi-year project, the Chief Program Management Officer and the Project Manager will be responsible for budgeting for costs of future task orders related to this contract.

Measure M provides $286 million in 2015 dollars for MOL improvements. A preliminary estimate suggests that the recommended project fits within that budget. A refined cost estimate will be determined during the preliminary engineering phase. The source of funds for this recommendation is Measure M 35% funds earmarked for MOL Improvements, which is not eligible for bus and rail operating expenditures.

**ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The Board could consider:

1. Selecting another alternative from the Technical Study as the preferred alternative;
2. Identifying multiple alternatives from the Technical Study to be advanced further into the design process, without selecting a preferred alternative now; or
3. Directing staff to study alternatives that were not previously considered.
These alternative Board actions are not recommended because of the reasons staff discussed in reaching its recommendation. Alternatives that exceed the Measure M budget are infeasible and based on the technical study are unlikely to achieve the goal of improving MOL. Declining to move the study forward is inconsistent with the Measure M ordinance and is therefore not an alternative considered.

NEXT STEPS

Environmental Review

Staff is currently evaluating the applicable environmental determination on the future project, ranging from a statutory exemption to an Environmental Impact Report. Additional design, study and public engagement will determine the appropriate environmental clearance for the future project. Should it be found exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), thorough documentation will justify that determination.

Areas of Coordination

In addition to the public and stakeholder engagement process, special coordination is required to implement the recommended alternative. As it is entirely within the City of Los Angeles, the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) will need to approve gating of its streets, since the Public Utilities Commission does not regulate gating for buses. The application of gating for buses, while not inconsistent with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, will require further coordination and possibly formal approval from the Federal Highway Administration and review by the California Traffic Control Devices Committee.

Public and Stakeholder Engagement

No formal public engagement occurred as part of the Technical Study. The Technical Study created and analyzed alternatives, which gives the public feasible options to consider, in addition to the recommended alternative. This approach was taken because MOL is not a blank slate; it is an existing facility. Therefore, the Technical Study facilitated the focus necessary as a prerequisite to public engagement. Informal stakeholder engagement did occur, primarily with LADOT.

Metro will conduct a robust public engagement program to share information and gather input from key stakeholders. In addition to coordinating with LADOT, the public engagement will target a range of stakeholders and general public with a potential interest in the project. This recommended project is subject to further consideration following the public engagement process.

In conclusion, following the Board’s action, staff would simultaneously initiate the public and stakeholder engagement process, initiate the environmental review process, along with conducting engineering design to advance the future project and remain on schedule. Staff will report back on the outcomes from public engagement, environmental review and design development in 2018.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - Metro Orange Line Grade Separations/Other Improvements Technical Study Executive Summary
Attachment B - Presentation
Why Transfers Matter

My perfect transfer experience...

“is that I know exactly which way to go when getting off my train”

“little wait time between transfers, and room for my bike on the front of the bus”

“buses are on time and I don’t have to wait any longer than ten minutes for my transfer”

— Quotes from focus group interviews
Critical time to update planning and design practices
Resource for...

Metro
Planning, design, and installation for new transit facilities and retrofits

Local Jurisdictions
Capital projects along public right-of-way and design review of projects near transit

Local Transit Providers
Decisions on service planning and facilities maintenance

Developers and/Property Owners
Design of public realm near transit

Transit Riders
Transfer Zone

MULTIPLE STAKEHOLDERS

+/− 500 ft from transit stop/station

Private Property ← → Public R.O.W. ← → Metro Property

Private Entities
- Property Owners
- Building Tenants
- Business Improvement Districts (BID)
- Advertising Agencies

Transit Operators
- Bus Service
- Bike Share
- Rideshare
- Taxi
- Van Pool

Local Jurisdictions
- Planning
- Transportation
- Public Works/Engineering
- Street Services
- Street Lighting

Metro
- Planning
- Rail Operations
- Bus Operations
- Active Transportation
- Facilities & Maintenance
- Joint Development
- Communications
- Signage & Environmental Graphic Design
Project Challenges

- Expansive & Diverse Transit Environment
- Multi-Agency Coordination
- Balancing Operator Needs
- Non-ADA compliant sidewalks, curb cuts, etc
- Limited Space
- Limited Funding
- Maintenance
Guiding Principles

- Efficiency
- Accessibility
- Clarity
- Comfort

+ Consistency
Developing the Guide

- Literature Review
- Best Practices
- Ridership Data Analysis
- Collisions Data Analysis

- Site Visits
- Interviews, Focus Groups, Briefings
What We Heard
MEETINGS, INTERVIEWS & FOCUS GROUPS

**Efficiency**
Fewer crossings
Shorter distances
Easy vertical circulation
Timed transfers

**Clarity**
Real-time Info
Pictograms
Wayfinding
Tactile, audio information

**Comfort**
Shade
Seating
Lighting
Restrooms
Wifi
Ambassadors/security
Cleanliness

**Equipment/Design**
Durable
Adaptable

**Accessibility**
ADA access
Clear boarding zone
Engage Local Agencies/Jurisdictions & Accessibility Community
Gathered input from cities via presentations, conference calls, and email
Received recommendations from Accessibility Advisory Committee

Establish Hierarchy for Curb Space
Prioritize transit vehicles curb space, then other modes
Encourage enforcement to avoid private vehicles blocking bus stops

Prototypical Cost of Improvements
Could be addressed through demonstration project(s)
Transfer Locations

Sidewalk Stops
- Located in public right of way
- Owned and maintained by local jurisdictions
- Served by multiple operators
- Small footprint

Stations
- Owned, operated, and maintained by Metro*
- Large footprint
- May require vertical circulation
- Connect to sidewalk stops

*Stations could be owned by other transit provider or local jurisdiction (e.g. Metrolink)
MAKING DECISIONS > CLARITY

1. Schedule & Maps
2. Station Identifier
3. Decision Point
4. Wayfinding
5. Sidewalk Stop Pole
6. Station Entrance

Transit Info
Wayfinding
Decision Points
Transfer Experience

MOVING > EFFICIENCY + ACCESSIBILITY

Shortest / most direct path
Safe crossings
Special access needs
Transfer Experience

Waiting to Board > Comfort

Amenities
Cleanliness
Safety

1. Lighting
2. Shelter
3. Wifi
4. Shade Tree
5. Lean Bar
6. Seating
7. Trash & Recycling Receptacle
8. Clear Zone
9. ADA Accessibility
10. Bus Pad
Elements of Design Guide

1. Design Checklist
   Process to Design & Implement Improvements

2. Design Toolbox
   Adaptable Set of Design Tools & Amenities

3. Action Plan
   Leverage Existing Programs & Identify Demonstration Projects
Project Contact:
Georgia Sheridan, AICP
Senior Manager,
Metro Systemwide Design
sheridang@metro.net
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State ATP Board Report
SUBJECT: STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE the State Active Transportation Program Cycle 4 Priorities Framework.

ISSUE

With the passage of the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 (SB 1), the State Active Transportation Program (ATP) will receive $100 million in additional funding capacity each year, bringing the total annual ATP fund estimate to approximately $220 million. Early discussions for the next ATP funding cycle, Cycle 4, indicate that this cycle will include funding for Fiscal Years 2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22, and 2022-23. Depending whether any funding is carried over to future cycles, the total funds for Cycle 4 could range from approximately $680 to $880 million. In either case, the amount of ATP funds that will be programmed through Cycle 4 will be the largest ATP funding opportunity to date, and there is a need for a strategic approach to maximize funding to Los Angeles County.

DISCUSSION

The ATP is a competitive funding program created by Senate Bill 99 and Assembly Bill 101 in 2013 to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation such as bicycling and walking. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) administers the ATP as a multi-tiered program with various sub-competitions. Three cycles have been administered to date. As the ATP is a complex competitive program, Metro has provided grant-writing services for Metro project managers as well as local jurisdictions for the past three cycles to ensure that strong applications are developed to secure maximum funding for Los Angeles County.

The guidelines for ATP Cycle 4 have not yet been developed but staff anticipates that they will be similar to the guidelines for ATP Cycle 3. As such, Metro can expect that the same eligibility and project selection criteria will apply to Cycle 4. Key parameters include:

- No limit to the number of applications that can be submitted by a single project sponsor;
- No maximum funding request; and
At least 25 percent of program funds must benefit disadvantaged communities, as defined under a few different measures.

As Cycle 4 will be the largest ATP funding opportunity to date, there is a need for a strategic approach to maximize funding to Los Angeles County.

Recommended Priorities Framework for ATP Cycle 4

With expanded funding capacity, ATP Cycle 4 presents an opportunity to advance Board-adopted priorities that best align with ATP priorities and criteria. Staff recommends the following priority framework for ATP funding.

1. **First/Last Mile**

   In May 2016, the Board passed Motion 14.1 setting a clear priority for first/last mile implementation. A concurrent report on this agenda provides an update on the implementation of those first/last mile directives, including the status of the Blue Line First/Last Mile Plans for 22 Blue Line stations. With the pending completion of the Blue Line station plans, staff recommends that a package of Blue Line first/last mile projects be submitted for ATP Cycle 4, as a Metro sponsored project. There is opportunity to submit individual project applications or bundle projects. We recommend that Metro coordinate this particular proposed submittal, given the work recently completed and the tight timelines, and we would partner with the local jurisdictions in the corridor accordingly. The actual project application of these projects will reflect outcomes of the final Blue Line first mile/last mile plans.

   In addition, staff recommends that 75% of the overall grant assistance be directed to first/last mile projects sponsored by Metro and other local jurisdictions, to advance this cycle as a comprehensive response to the overall direction of Motion 14.1.

2. **Other Board Priorities**

   Acknowledging that first mile/last mile related investments are a high profile example of active transportation investments, the State criteria for Active Transportation Projects is fairly broad. Therefore, several other investments across the county will be eligible for state ATP funding. Among other candidates, there are existing Call for Projects programming commitments in the Bicycle, Pedestrian, Regional Surface Transportation Improvements, and Transportation Demand Management modes. As well, Measure M related projects funded under the 2% ATP Metro-sponsored program and ATP targeted multi-year subregional programs could potentially leverage state ATP funds. As the deadline for Cycle 4 applications is anticipated to be June 2018, there may be time to coordinate leveraging opportunities.

   Staff recommends that the Measure M Administrative Guidelines for Metro ATP 2% program and subregional program guidelines reinforce and encourage leveraging opportunities with this and future rounds of state ATP funding. Staff also recommends that 25% of the overall grant assistance be directed to other state ATP-eligible projects including but not limited to:
• Call for Projects that would meet outstanding Metro funding commitments
• ATP proposals that clearly advance other Board priorities such as:
  o LA River Bikepath
  o Rail to River
  o Regional Bike Share Implementation
  o I-710 Active Transportation Corridor
• Other eligible projects

In all cases, if requests for grant writing assistance exceed available resources, priority will be
assigned to project sponsors that can clearly demonstrate resource and/or technical limitations that
would hinder their submission of a complete and competitive grant application.

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

The recommendations in this report will provide a framework to seek funding to improve safety,
comfort, and convenience to the 75 to 88 percent of Metro customers accessing major transit
facilities via active transportation.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Impact to Budget

Approving the staff recommendations will have no impact on the FY 2018 Budget. Funds for grant
assistance have already been budgeted in the FY 2018 Budget for Cost Center 4420 under Project
405510, Task 05.05.01. Funds obtained for first/last mile projects will offset the need for resources to
implement the Countywide First/Last Mile Priority Network.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board could consider not using a framework to guide the prioritization of projects. This approach
is not recommended due to the competitive nature of the ATP and the opportunity to advance Board
priorities in the program.

NEXT STEPS

In November, staff will return to the Board with a related recommendation for the ATP Cycle 4 grant
assistance policy and to request the award of a contract for grant-writing services.

Prepared by: Shelly Quan, Transportation Planner, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-3075
Patricia Chen, Senior Director, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-3041
Wil Ridder, EO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-2887
Reviewed by: Therese W. McMillan, Chief Planning Officer, (213) 922-7077

Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer