Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

William Mullholland Conference Room

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

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

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

4. Consent Calendar
   - Approval of Minutes
   Attachment 3: Draft November 1, 2017 Minutes
   Action

5. LRTP Update
   5 min
   Information
   (Kalieh Honish/Mark Yamarone)

6. Supportive Transit Parking Program Update
   Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase 2 Parking
   30 min
   Information
   (Frank Ching)

7. TOD Grant Round 5 Update
   10 min
   Information
   (Desiree Portillo-Rabinov)

8. SB-1 Update
   5 min
   Information
   (Patricia Chen)

9. ATP Update
   5 min
   Information
   (Shelly Quan)
10. CTC Update
   Information
   5 min
   (Zoe Unruh)

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

12. Other Business

13. 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 February 7, 2018 at 9:30 a.m. in the William Mullholland Conference Room on the 15th Floor.
Attachment 1

Subcommittee Agendas
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
Gateway Conference Room – 3rd Floor
9:30 am

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

2. Approval of October 17, 2017 Minutes  
   (1 minute)  
   Action  
   BOS

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

4. Metro Report  
   (5 minutes)  
   Information  
   Scott Hartwell

5. TAP Interagency Transfers  
   (15 minutes)  
   Information  
   David Sutton

6. LIFE/RRTP Vendor Redemption Requirements  
   (10 minutes)  
   Action  
   Armineh Saint

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

8. Access Update  
   (10 minutes)  
   Information  
   Matthew Avancena

9. FAP Updates  
   (5 minutes)  
   Information  
   Manijeh Ahmadi
10. SB1 – STA Update
   (1 hour)
   Information
   Tim Mengle/Rufus Cayetano/Manijeh Ahmadi

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

12. New Business
    Information
    All

13. Adjournment

Information Items:

   90-day Rolling Agenda
   Summary of Invoices FY 2018
   Summary of EZ Pass Invoices FY 2018
   Subsidy Matrix FY 2018
   TDA-STA Capital Claims FY 2018
   TDA-STA Claims FY 2018
   FY 2016 Section 5307 Balance
   FY 2017 Section 5307 Balance
   Combined FY 2016 & FY 2017 Section 5307 Balance

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, January 16, 2017, at 9:30 am in the William Mulholland Conference Room, 15th Floor of the Metro Headquarters Building.
Attachment 2

Subcommittee Actions
Disposition of Subcommittee Actions

November 2017

Bus Operations Subcommittee:
  • Approved the October 2017 meeting minutes

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:
  • Did not meet in November 2017

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:
  • Did not meet in November 2017

TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee:
  • Did not meet in November 2017

December 2017

Bus Operations Subcommittee:
  • Did not meet in December 2017

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:
  • Did not meet in December 2017

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:
  • Did not meet in December 2017

TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee:
  • Did not meet in December 2017
Attachment 3

November 1, 2017 TAC Minutes

November 1, 2017 Sign-In Sheets
Meeting Minutes

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. Call to Order/Roll Call
Fanny Pan (Chair) called the meeting to order at 9:33 A.M. Brian Lam (Alternate Chair) took roll and declared a quorum was present.

2. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees
Bus Operations Subcommittee (BOS)
   - Last met on October 17, 2017
   - Received updates on:
     - Metro Transfers Design Study
     - Metro’s New Fair Subsidy Program – Low-Income Fair Subsidy (LIFE)
     - LA County Regional ITS Architecture
     - FTA
     - Access Services
   - Next meeting is scheduled for December 5, 2017

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee (LTSS)
   - Last met on October 19, 2017
   - Received updates on:
     - Metro’s New Fair Subsidy Program – LIFE
     - Group Transit Asset Management Plan Kick-Off
     - LA County Regional ITS Architecture
   - Will not meet in November

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee
   - Last met on October 19, 2017
   - Received updates on:
     - Metro Transfers Design Study
     - Arterial Performance Measurements Baseline Conditions Analysis
     - Metro Orange Line Improvements
   - Next meeting is scheduled for November 16, 2017
Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Sustainability Subcommittee
- Did not meet in October
- Next meeting is scheduled for November 15, 2017

3. Chairperson’s Report (Fanny Pan, Metro)
A handout of the October 26, 2017 Metro Board meeting recap was distributed in lieu of an oral report.

Ms. Pan reported that Ferdy Chan (City of Los Angeles) will be leaving the TAC after 10 years to work at Metro.

Ms. Pan welcomed Candice Vander Hyde (League of California Cities – North Los Angeles County) and Hany Demitri (League of California Cities – Westside Cities COG) as new TAC members.

4. Consent Calendar
A motion to approve the October 4, 2017 TAC minutes was made by Mohammad Mostahkami (League of California Cities – Gateway Cities COG) and seconded by Jane Leonard (BOS). Rich Dilluvio (Bicycle Coordinator), Sebastien Hernandez (LTSS), and John Walker (County of Los Angeles) abstained. The minutes were approved.

5. LRTP Update (Mark Yamarone, Metro)
Mr. Yamarone reported that staff presented an updated schedule and Financial Plan for the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update to the Metro Board at the October 26th meeting. Staff will bring a report on the Public Participation Plan to the Board in November.

Mr. Yamarone reported that there will be a series of white papers that support various policies that will go to the Policy Advisory Council (PAC) over the next few months. The next PAC meeting will take place on Tuesday, November 7th, at 1:30 P.M., in the Board Room.

6. LAUS Industry Forum/Master Commercial Developer RFQ (Jenna Hornstock, Metro)
No report was provided. This item was deferred to the January 3, 2018 TAC meeting.

7. Supportive Transit Parking Program Update (Frank Ching, Metro/Jeff Weckstein & Steffen Turoff, Walker Parking Consultants)
Mr. Ching reported that the goal of the Supportive Transit Parking Program (STPP) is to develop a parking program that ensures parking resources for transit patrons using a fee-based model and innovative solutions to control parking demand. The key objectives of the STPP include ensuring that there are no negative impacts to ridership, that there is no significant increase in overall commute time, and that there is increased availability of parking spaces for transit users.

Mr. Ching reported that approximately 13% of transit users park and ride at Metro parking facilities. Metro surveys show that 38% of transit users are dropped off at stations, 37% access stations by bus, and 22% walk to stations. Approximately 63% of park and ride patrons
live at least two miles from their preferred station, and 69% have a household income of at least $50,000.

Mr. Ching reported on the development of the STPP. Staff conducted comprehensive parking studies and provided recommendations, after which the Parking Ordinance and Fee Resolution was adopted. Staff brought three Management Alternatives forward: to charge for parking at market rate, to keep parking free, or to take an approach that focuses on transit patrons. The Pilot Program was approved and implemented at 12 locations and will be expanded to four more locations this year. Staff anticipates reporting to the Board on the STPP Master Plan for final approval in January 2018, with program implementation throughout the system to follow.

Mr. Ching reported that the Management Alternatives were developed based on the occupancy rate at parking facilities. Staff focused on locations that were at capacity or with relatively high occupancy rates and implemented a modest fee with a ridership verification system. Staff will consider implementing the STPP at locations with an occupancy rate of at least 70%. Mr. Ching reported that staff learned from the Pilot Program that it will be necessary to implement paid parking at stations in groups along the rail line to avoid spillover effects at nearby stations.

Mr. Ching reported that the Master Plan consists of a 10-year Implementation Plan that will transition the Pilot Program to a permanent Parking Management Program. The Program will first be implemented at 39 of the current 57 parking facilities. The Program will utilize recommended technology to operate and enforce parking regulations at all Metro parking facilities. Metro will maintain parking facilities in a state of good repair. Staff has developed the Long Term Parking Planning and Design Guidelines, which will be utilized for all future transit corridor stations.

Mr. Ching reported on the Toolkit for the Master Plan. Long range planning for parking includes analyzing the community inventory and potential shared use opportunities, a survey of community vehicle ownership, evaluating the surrounding parking program and market, determining neighborhood impacts (e.g., spillover, permit parking), parking management alternatives, and the Ridership vs. Parking Demand Model. System planning and design includes determining the facilities configuration (i.e., structures vs. lots), planning for potential future conversion as a result of demand changes, incorporating sustainable elements, determining traffic impacts, and deciding what equipment to use.

Mr. Weckstein reported that the Ridership vs. Parking Demand Model was developed to simulate the impacts that charging for parking would have on parking demand. There are four model inputs: base data, station typology assignment, demand ratios, and the elasticity curve. Base data includes parking occupancy data, weekday boardings by hour, and TAP card activity (percent first tap of day on rail). Station typology includes six station typologies: mid-point, terminus, terminus-urban, terminus-overflow, transfer, and transit hub. Demand ratios include: parked cars as percentage of total weekday boardings, and riders who park as percentage of first tap rail riders from opening to 10:00 A.M. The elasticity curve began with a baseline of free parking with reductions in parking demand based on parking rate increments of $1 per day, up to a maximum of $30 per day. The elasticity curve assumes transit parker
behavior and not behavior of non-transit parkers. Additional assumptions, which may be adjusted, include that each parking space accommodates 1.1 cars per day on average and that there are 1.1 transit riders per car on average.

Mr. Weckstein presented an example of the model for a hypothetical terminus station with 1000 weekday boardings, 350 of which occur before 10 A.M. The model shows low and high numbers for peak demand and riders: the low reflects the data on weekday boardings and the high reflects the data on first tap before 10 A.M., with an average of the two figures also included. As the parking fee increases from free to $3 per day, the results show lower parking demand and fewer riders who park at stations, though this does not mean that overall ridership is negatively impacted.

Ms. Leonard asked why the figures for riders parking at stations are different from the figures for peak parking demand? Mr. Weckstein and Mr. Ching explained that some people carpool and that some people are parking at stations after 10 A.M. Mr. Turoff added that there is turnover of 1.1 vehicles per parking space in addition to 1.1 riders per vehicle.

Michelle Caldwell (BOS) asked for clarification on how people pay for parking at stations. Mr. Ching replied that the TAP card cannot be used to pay for both transit and parking due to the federal tax code. The TAP card only verifies the patron as a transit rider, and parking must be paid for with cash or credit/debit card. Ms. Caldwell commented that instructions for payment should be clearer to avoid confusion that parking cannot be paid for by TAP. Mr. Ching replied that staff is working to clarify signage to fix this issue and stated that there is also an option to pay by mobile app. Mr. Ching added that, rather than adopt a dynamic pricing scheme, Metro is charging a flat fee both for simplicity and to minimize the additional cost to commuting.

Richard Marshalian (County of Los Angeles) asked what actions can Metro take if charging $3 per day at a station but occupancy remains above 90%? Mr. Ching replied that staff would determine if additional facilities could be built or purchased.

Larry Stevens (League of California Cities – San Gabriel Valley COG) asked if the numbers in the table presented by Mr. Weckstein reflect 13% of transit riders? Mr. Weckstein replied that the 13% figure is a systemwide average. Mr. Stevens asked if there is any distinction between urban and suburban stations? Mr. Ching replied that the model includes the six station typologies and that urban and non-urban termini are considered to be different from one another. Mr. Stevens asked if there is a difference between an urban midpoint station and a suburban midpoint station? Mr. Ching replied that there is currently no distinction but that adjustments can be made and additional station typologies could be added.

Mr. Ching reported that staff will bring the Master Plan to the Board on November 30th as a Receive and File and that Board Action on the Master Plan is anticipated to occur in January 2018.

Mr. Stevens asked if the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase 2B Paid Parking Study is included in the STPP? Mr. Ching confirmed. Mr. Stevens asked if the full report is available? Mr. Ching replied that the report will be included as an attachment with the Board Report in
the middle of November.

Justine Garcia (LTSS) asked if the four additional stations where paid parking will be implemented have been approved by the Board? Mr. Ching replied that the stations were approved by Metro and Caltrans in 2016. Ms. Garcia asked if staff will go back to the Board with data and findings from the four stations? Mr. Ching replied that staff will bring findings to the Board if they significantly impact the STPP, and reiterated that the Demand Model is adjustable and flexible.

Mr. Stevens asked if Metro considers the effects of paid parking on other parking spaces outside of park and ride facilities? Mr. Ching replied that staff examines ridership and spillover effects before and after the implementation of paid parking. Mr. Stevens commented that Metro needs to address how local jurisdictions are adversely affected by paid parking at Metro facilities. Mr. Ching reported that Metro does not have authority over local jurisdictions’ on-street and off-street parking or over private parking facilities. Metro’s Parking Enforcement Team currently operates within Metro facilities only.

Mr. Ching reported on how Metro will partner with surrounding communities. Staff recommends proactive parking policies for local jurisdictions, including permit parking programs and time restrictions to minimize impacts to on-street parking. Additionally, staff will make technical recommendations to jurisdictions and assist with exercising their parking policies. Metro will notify transit patrons of parking restrictions in areas surrounding transit stations. Staff will explore potential shared use options for non-peak transit hours for use by the surrounding community in order to more efficiently utilize existing parking inventory. Finally, staff will promote alternative modes of transportation to access transit stations, including first/last mile improvements.

Mr. Stevens asked if Metro has expended funds in conducting outreach and analyzing the impacts to jurisdictions from paid parking? Pat Proano (County of Los Angeles) commented that Metro should work with the jurisdictions proactively to determine what impacts may occur and how to create effective partnerships. Mr. Stevens commented that Metro did not conduct any outreach with jurisdictions before implementing paid parking. Mr. Proano commented that the County did not receive assistance from Metro in managing parking in the Del Aire neighborhood, since LAX employees park in residential neighborhoods to access the free shuttle to LAX from the Aviation/LAX Green Line station.

Eric Widstrand (City of Long Beach) commented that the City of Long Beach met with Mr. Ching to discuss parking concerns and changes that the City will make in coordination with Metro. Mr. Widstrand asked how Santa Monica dealt with parking challenges near stations after the Expo Line extension? Mr. Ching replied that Santa Monica already had parking restrictions in place before the extension opened, that there were existing parking facilities near the terminus station, that the City reworked its bus network, and that there were first/last mile improvements such as bike share and bike lane implementations. Mr. Ching stated that Metro’s Parking Enforcement Team can partner with jurisdictions to assist with parking enforcement, so long as the jurisdictions allow for it. Mr. Ching reported that there will be a workshop for Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase 2B jurisdictions on a date to be determined.
Mr. Dilluvio commented that for new transit lines, Metro should charge for parking from day one of operations to allow jurisdictions to prepare for the impacts of paid parking. Mr. Ching replied that on the Expo Line, charging for parking from day one did prevent adverse effects. Mr. Ching stated that the Gold Line Foothills Extension Phase 2B will provide parking for transit use and that if paid parking is intended to be implemented that it will be done on day one.

David Kriske (League of California Cities – Arroyo Verdugo Cities) commented that paid parking is a good policy but that Metro needs to proactively work with jurisdictions before implementing it. Mr. Kriske stated that outreach needs to be done with businesses, residents, and the local governments to plan for possible impacts. Mr. Stevens commented that Metro’s policy should state that outreach will be conducted before implementing paid parking in order to establish a parking management plan that all parties can agree on. Mr. Ching replied that this will be incorporated into the policy.

Ben Jong (Metro) commented that there will be new development efforts around new Gold Line station areas, which will require Metro to plan for future land use around stations as well. Mr. Ching replied that Metro is advocating for parking lots rather than parking structures in order to have more flexibility for future developments.

Matt Pilarz (City of Pomona) commented that the City of Pomona is not in favor of the paid parking program for the Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase 2B stations. Mr. Pilarz stated that the City objects to parking in residential areas being counted in the Phase 2B Study and that there are objections to spaces being available to Metrolink passengers but not to Phase 2B passengers. Mr. Pilarz further stated that excess parking at existing stations was designed to allow for future growth. Mr. Turoff replied that parking must be provided at stations but analysis needs to be done on how much parking to provide rather than providing more capacity without analysis. Mr. Ching replied that staff is not recommending completely eliminating new parking at Phase 2B stations but rather to reduce the number of parking spaces built.

Mr. Ching reported on the findings of the Phase 2B Study. The transit parking demand model output for the Phase 2B Study is recommending constructing nearly 1600 spaces as opposed to the 3710 spaces proposed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project. The Study considers Claremont Station as the terminus station with Metrolink parking demand. The Study identified potentially more than 2900 parking spaces available offsite. Mr. Ching reported that, even with the reduction of 2130 parking spaces, the amount of parking spaces available for all-purpose use is higher than the proposed reduction in spaces. The Study estimates that there is over 20 acres of off-street parking spaces that goes unused throughout business days. Updated models of parking demand generated by transit riders project significantly lower parking demand than was previously estimated. Overbuilding parking on sites is likely to attract drivers from cities beyond the immediate community.

Mr. Ching reported that the construction cost for the proposed spaces is nearly $150 million and that switching from parking structures to parking lots could reduce costs to $75 million. The savings from overbuilding parking could be used to fund first/last mile improvements, bike lanes and bike parking, pedestrian improvements, and other transportation demand
management improvements. Mr. Ching reported that the Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority is conducting a survey with passengers and that afterward staff will coordinate with the consultants. Staff will hold workshops with jurisdictions and conduct outreach to plan for the future.

Mr. Stevens asked what the process is for taking the Phase 2B Study forward? Mr. Ching replied that the Study will be included with the STPP Master Plan as a Receive and File at the November Board meeting, with Board Action to adopt the STPP Master Plan anticipated in January 2018. Ms. Garcia asked why the Study is being included in the November Board Report before jurisdictions have a chance to review it? Mr. Ching replied that the Study is part of the Master Plan.

Mr. Stevens made a motion to prevent the Phase 2B Study from going to the Board without consultation from the jurisdictions directly affected by the changes proposed in the Study until all associated studies are complete. Ms. Garcia seconded the motion. Ms. Caldwell commented that the STPP Master Plan will allow Metro to plan in advance for Phase 2B. Ms. Caldwell asked if delaying the Study from going to the Board would cause inconsistencies in Metro’s parking policies? Mr. Ching replied that the Construction Authority needs to make a decision by January. Ms. Garcia commented that jurisdictions would prefer to deal with the details of the Study before it goes to the Board. Mr. Ching replied that the Study can be separated from the Master Plan and can go to the Board after adoption of the Master Plan. Mr. Stevens commented that reductions in proposed parking will need to be incorporated into the EIR in order to prevent legal action and that the EIR would need to show that the reduction of spaces would not adversely impact on-street and off-street spaces. Mr. Ching replied that the Study and parking demand model showed that there would be no impacts. After further discussion, Mr. Stevens withdrew the motion.

Mr. Mostahkami suggested that Metro meet with cities on an annual or semi-annual basis to receive feedback on changes implemented at stations. Mr. Ching agreed.

Mr. Stevens asked when the workshop with city managers will take place? Mr. Ching replied that the Construction Authority recommended December 13th, December 14th, or December 15th.

8. Draft Measure M Early Project Delivery Strategy (Manjeet Ranu, Metro)
Mr. Ranu reported that staff is preparing a comprehensive Draft Measure M Early Project Delivery Strategy (Policy) to help guide the Board in making decisions about accelerating or decelerating projects. The Policy will establish clear, uniformly applied criteria and will allow rigorous and expeditious analyses and determinations. The Policy will also provide for transparency and financial accountability.

Mr. Ranu reported on the concept of accelerators and decelerators. Accelerators are factors beyond the control of Metro that could result in facilitating early delivery of projects (e.g., federal funds). Decelerators are factors beyond the control of Metro that could result in significant and costly delays to projects (e.g., litigation of environmental document).
Mr. Ranu reported that the Measure M Ordinance states that projects can be accelerated as long as the scheduling and sequencing of other projects are not negatively impacted. This implies that a project that is delayed negatively impacts the ability to advance others, since a delayed project is an overall drag on maximizing the implementation of capacity in the Measure M Expenditure Plan.

Mr. Ranu reported that there are four categories of accelerators and decelerators: Funding, Process, Partnerships, and Innovations.

Mr. Ranu reported on highlights of the Policy. The Policy establishes uniform criteria for decision making and promotes cooperation and discipline. The concept of decelerators can inform people on what to avoid in project delivery. The Policy protects performing projects, and the Board of Directors ultimately makes the decision on acceleration/deceleration through a two-thirds vote.

Mr. Ranu reported that there is an evaluation process that includes a screening tool developed by staff. The tool identifies if factors have occurred and gives point values relative to the factor’s ability to accelerate or decelerate a project. If the initial screening shows that there is moderate to high potential for acceleration or deceleration, staff conducts analysis that includes the impacts of taking action. The Board can decide to provide notice and take action to accelerate or decelerate a project; decline to find for acceleration or deceleration; or direct staff to conduct further analysis.

Mr. Ranu reported that the Executive Management Committee forwarded the Policy for full Board discussion without recommendation, but views the Policy favorably. Key takeaways from the Committee discussion include: the challenges for small communities to provide extra funding; making clear that the screening tool itself does not determine acceleration or deceleration; reiterating that a Transit-oriented Communities (TOC) policy (one of the factors) will be developed later, subject to Board approval; including time value of money as a factor; and forwarding the Policy to the PAC and the Measure M Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee. Input from the Board was similar to that of the Executive Management Committee, with clarifications needed about project deceleration.

Mr. Ranu reported that staff is seeking input from stakeholders and is anticipating Board adoption of the Policy in November. Mr. Ranu requested to submit feedback by November 15th but stated that there is no hard deadline for comments.

Ms. Leonard asked when does the evaluation of acceleration or deceleration occur? Mr. Ranu replied that the evaluation will be applied to individual projects. Factors that are unique to each project can influence project acceleration or deceleration. Staff can use the screening tool at any time for any project.

Mr. Mostahkami asked what triggered this Policy? Mr. Ranu replied that Metro receives numerous requests to accelerate projects on an ad hoc basis and that there have not been uniform criteria on the matter. Mr. Mostahkami asked if the Policy can be amended once adopted? Mr. Ranu confirmed.
Marianne Kim (Automobile Club of California) asked if there will be an appeals process for projects that staff recommends for deceleration? Mr. Ranu replied that the Board makes the ultimate decision on deceleration and that cities can ask the Board to have staff reconsider recommendations for deceleration.

Ms. Caldwell asked for clarification that acceleration of funds for a project would not decelerate another project. Mr. Ranu confirmed that one project's acceleration will not affect another project. Mr. Ranu stated that a project that is decelerated for several years due to factors out of Metro’s control will remain funded with a Schedule Recovery Plan and that funds for that project could be applied to other projects in the meantime.

Mr. Walker asked for clarification on the Partnerships factor for acceleration from the Draft Policy: “Has one or more of the local jurisdictions subject to the 3% contribution requirement for the project substantially advanced the implementation of one or more Metro Board adopted policies that would not have otherwise been achieved absent the actions of that jurisdiction related to the project?” Mr. Ranu replied that implementation of Board adopted policies would include sustainability policies, TOC policies, and other policies that advance the Board’s priorities.

Valerie Watson (Pedestrian Coordinator) asked if the Policy would apply to smaller projects as well as larger transit projects? Mr. Ranu replied that that Policy would apply only to projects listed in the Measure M Expenditure Plan.

Robert Beste (League of California Cities – South Bay Cities COG) asked if a Public-Private Partnership (P3) is included as a factor in the Policy? Mr. Ranu replied that P3’s are included in the Innovations category of acceleration factors.

9. Metro Orange Line BRT Improvements (Fulgene Asuncion, Metro)
Ms. Asuncion reported that the Orange Line Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Improvements Project is a Measure M funded project. The groundbreaking date for the Project is 2019 and is expected to open in 2025. Measure M earmarks $286 million for the Project.

Ms. Asuncion reported on the corridor characteristics. The Metro Orange Line (MOL) is an existing BRT line that stretches 18 miles from the North Hollywood Red Line Station to Chatsworth Station, with an additional extension to Warner Center. There are more than 25,000 average weekday boardings. Travel times for the North Hollywood-Canoga east-west segment are between 38 and 41 minutes, depending on the direction of travel. There are 39 at-grade crossings on the east-west segment, of which 31 are signalized street crossings that can cause delays at intersections and present safety concerns. The goal of the project is to improve bus speeds and to enhance safety along the corridor. There are approximately 8 miles of a multimodal bicycle and pedestrian path adjacent to the busway.

Ms. Asuncion reported that on October 26th the Board approved the findings and recommendation resulting from the Orange Line BRT Improvements Technical Study and approved advancing the Project into further environmental study, public outreach, and engineering design. The Board also approved an amendment to the recommended Project to continue studying additional grade separations that were included in the Technical Study.
Ms. Asuncion reported on the recommended Project which includes a hybrid package of grade separations and gating along the MOL. The grade separations include an approximately one-mile aerial structure from Van Nuys Station to Sepulveda Station. Tyrone Avenue would be closed to accommodate the grade separation structure. Staff is also recommending installing quad gates along the entire MOL. Staff is also proposing to grade separate part of the bike and pedestrian path, which would consist of either one continuous structure between Van Nuys and Sepulveda or separations at Van Nuys only and Sepulveda only.

Ms. Asuncion reported that grade separation locations for study in the environmental phase include Reseda Boulevard, Balboa Boulevard, Sepulveda Boulevard, Van Nuys Boulevard, Woodman Avenue, Fulton Avenue/Burbank Boulevard, and Laurel Canyon Boulevard.

Ms. Asuncion reported on the findings from the Technical Study. The Technical Study found that gating provides the highest benefit for the least cost and provides an equitable distribution of safety improvements along the busway. Grade separations are a good safety improvement but do not spread safety benefits across the entire corridor. Grade separations did not achieve the hoped-for benefit in time savings since locations are also stations where buses would need to stop. The effect of gates on roadway cross-traffic travel times ranges from minimal to improved, but further study and coordination with the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) will analyze cross-traffic travel times.

Ms. Asuncion reported that the staff recommendation would reduce the current travel time of 51 minutes from North Hollywood to Chatsworth by 16 minutes. Ms. Asuncion reported that Measure M allocates $286 million for the project and that the cost estimate for the recommended improvements is $283 million.

Ms. Asuncion reported that staff is coordinating with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC) to determine who must approve the gating, which has not been applied to a BRT system in the United States.

Ms. Asuncion reported that staff will hold community meetings to share information with the public and to solicit input on the proposed alternatives. The meetings will take place as follows: Wednesday, November 29th, 6 to 8 P.M. at the North Hollywood Recreation Center – Senior Building; Thursday, November 30th, 6 to 8 P.M. at the Rose Goldwater Community Center in Canoga Park; Saturday, December 2nd, 10 A.M. to 12 P.M. at the Marvin Braude Constituent Center in Van Nuys; and a live webinar on Thursday, December 7th, 6:30 P.M. at http://tinyurl.com/MetroOrangeLine.

Ms. Asuncion reported that the next steps are to initiate environmental clearance, public outreach, and engineering design. The groundbreaking date is expected to be 2019.

Ms. Caldwell asked if Measure M provides for conversion of the MOL to light rail? Ms. Asuncion replied that Measure M provides for the conversion in 2051. Ms. Caldwell commented that this means that funds will be expended on the MOL now and in the future. Mr. Hernandez commented that the Project would make some accommodations for light rail...
conversion. Ms. Asuncion replied that grade separation structures will be designed and built to LRT standards to allow for future conversion and that the conversion would utilize the gates being installed.

Ms. Watson asked if people on the bicycle and pedestrian path would cross intersections at the same time as the exclusive phase of the bus with gates? Ms. Asuncion replied that staff will further coordinate with LADOT.

10. Metro Transfers Design Study (Georgia Sheridan, Metro)
Ms. Sheridan reported that Metro staff has been working on the Metro Transfers Design Guide to improve the transfer experience for patrons. Staff is examining the whole journey experience on the Metro system.

Ms. Sheridan reported that 64% of Metro riders transfer at least once during their trip and that the experience can often be a factor attracting or deterring people from using the system. As the Metro system expands through Measure R and Measure M projects, there will be more transfer points throughout the system. These changes necessitate building stations to the best possible design standard. Ms. Sheridan reported that more than 80% of Metro passengers travel by bus and that it is important to improve the transfer experience between bus lines and between bus and rail.

Ms. Sheridan reported that the Transfers Design Guide will help guide Metro in the station design and bus stop improvement process, as well as aid local jurisdictions, local transit providers, developers, and transit riders.

Ms. Sheridan reported that the Transfer Zone encompasses a 500-foot radius from a transit stop or station. There are several parties in addition to Metro that influence the design, installation, and maintenance of transit improvements within the Transfer Zone. These include local jurisdictions, local transit operators, Business Improvement Districts (BIDs), and property owners. Metro staff has been reaching out to these other involved parties throughout the development of the Transfers Design Guide.

Ms. Sheridan reported that there are challenges involved with the project. Los Angeles County is an expansive and diverse transit environment, so the Transfers Design Guide is tailored to be flexible to fit various conditions across the county. Metro needs to work with local jurisdictions and transit providers who may be involved with improving the user experience within the Transfer Zone. As the region becomes multi-modal, it will be a challenge to balance operator needs to ensure that everyone can move efficiently and safely throughout the transfer process. Sidewalks and curb cuts that do not comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) are a barrier to the system. Additionally, there are many areas throughout the county with limited space to place new infrastructure. There will also be challenges in securing funding for improvements as well as maintaining improvements.

Ms. Sheridan reported that there are five guiding principles that will serve as a checklist when planning improvements: Efficiency, Accessibility, Clarity, Comfort, and Consistency. Efficiency refers to how easy it is to move from one transfer point to the next. Accessibility refers to the ease of movement itself and whether an elevator, escalator, or bike ramp is necessary or if
sidewalks need to be widened to accommodate wheelchairs. Clarity refers to transit information as well as wayfinding, including real-time signage and directional signage. Comfort refers to the experience while waiting, including feeling safe and secure. Consistency refers to a minimum standard of the transit experience for all trips.

Ms. Sheridan reported that staff looked at best practices, conducted interviews with focus groups, and received feedback from different groups such as the TAC, TAC Subcommittees, Accessibility Advisory Committee, and local jurisdictions. Ms. Sheridan reported that the process also involved interviewing internal Metro staff since improving the transfer experience involves different aspects of the agency. Staff conducted site visits to examine the different types of conditions.

Ms. Sheridan reported on the feedback received from meetings, interviews, and focus groups. Regarding efficiency, people wanted fewer crossings, shorter transfer distances, easy vertical circulation, and timed transfers. Regarding clarity, people asked for real-time information, simplifying signage, and providing tactile and audio information. Regarding accessibility, it is important to make it easy for people to get to the station on the sidewalk or across the street and ensuring that the boarding zone is clear. In terms of comfort, important factors to consider are shade, seating, lighting, restrooms, wifi, ambassadors, and cleanliness. Responses also recommended making equipment and design durable and adaptable to future conditions.

Ms. Sheridan reported that staff will work with local jurisdictions, local operators, and the accessibility community to ensure consistency in the design and installation of improvements as well as accessibility. Ms. Sheridan reported that there is a need to establish hierarchy for curb space by prioritizing transit vehicles over other modes. Ms. Sheridan reported that there is not currently a funding source attached to this project, so staff is examining leveraging existing projects. Staff is also exploring pilot projects for the future.

Ms. Sheridan reported that the Transfers Design Guide will give information on two transfer locations: sidewalk stops, and stations. These are separated because a bus stop typically has less room to work with than a station does. Additionally, bus stops are typically controlled by local jurisdictions while Metro typically owns stations (though stations could be owned by other transit providers or local jurisdictions, such as Metrolink).

Ms. Sheridan reported that the Transfers Design Guide examines three key behaviors as part of the transfer experience. The first involves the information or amenities that transit riders need to make a decision when transferring. The second involves moving between transfer points, including appropriate crosswalks and signal timing, vertical circulation elements, and ease of finding the right path. The third involves waiting experience, including feeling comfortable and safe with the necessary amenities.

Ms. Sheridan reported that there are three final elements of the Transfers Design Guide: the Design Checklist, the Design Toolbox, and the Action Plan. The Design Checklist is a planning process to walk users through how to make improvements. The Design Toolbox details design considerations for each type of infrastructure. The Action Plan seeks to leverage
existing programs and identifies pilot projects that Metro can take on. The Action Plan also includes recommendations for local jurisdictions and local operators.

Ms. Sheridan reported that staff is internally vetting a draft of the Transfers Design Guide and anticipates releasing the final document in early 2018. Questions and comments can be directed to Ms. Sheridan at sheridang@metro.net.

Mr. Proano asked if the study takes into account a pedestrian bridge as a means of accessibility and safety while transferring? Ms. Sheridan replied that multiple factors would be evaluated in providing the best way of crossing a roadway or rail tracks.

Mr. Walker asked if demonstration projects would focus on new stations as part of Measure M or on existing stations? Ms. Sheridan replied that Metro will incorporate the guidelines into the design process of new Metro stations. Demonstrations could take place at existing stations that will experience changes as the system expands.

Mr. Walker asked if the Transfers Design Guide will act as guidance or as Metro policy? Ms. Sheridan replied that the result could be that the Board adopts the Guide similarly to a strategic plan or that the Board could implement policies that incorporate the Guide. The Systemwide Design Team has been working with the First/Last Mile (FLM) Team so that FLM work also looks at transfer design. Ms. Sheridan stated that staff is utilizing the Guide to update standards for Metro’s stations but that this is only a guide, not a standard, for other jurisdictions and transit operators to examine.

Ms. Kim commented that there should be a threshold for major transfer points to incorporate certain elements to minimize conflicts between pedestrians and motorists. Ms. Kim added that there may be unintended consequences as a result of adding restrooms and wifi at transfer points. Ms. Sheridan replied that the study took major transfer points into account and that the recommendation is for major bus stops to be located in front of rail stations to avoid people crossing the street while transferring.

David Feinberg (League of California Cities – Westside Cities COG) asked if staff addressed prioritizing curb space as part of the study? Ms. Sheridan replied that this prioritization would be part of the process of identifying how to improve transfer points. Staff recommends placing buses as the highest priority for curb space, but it is up to the jurisdiction or operator to decide.

Ms. Leonard commented that many transfer points are in areas with transit-oriented development and that developers should understand the need for design at these locations. Ms. Sheridan replied that Metro-owned sites provide Metro the opportunity to enforce these design guidelines. Ms. Sheridan stated that staff could conduct outreach for sites that Metro does not own.

Mr. Marshalian asked when the Guide will be available? Ms. Sheridan replied that the Guide will be available in early 2018.

11. Division 20 Portal Widening and Turnback Facility (Cris Liban, Metro)
Mr. Liban reported that the Division 20 Rail Yard is approximately 45 acres, serving as a maintenance and storage facility for Metro Red Line and Purple Line trains. Division 20 is located between Commercial Street to north of the 6th Street Bridge, parallel to the Los Angeles River and east of Santa Fe Avenue.

Mr. Liban reported that the Red and Purple lines combined carry over 140,000 passengers per day and that ridership is expected to grow by 49,000 passengers per day when the Purple Line is extended to the Veterans Administration West Los Angeles Medical Center. The Project improvements aim to allow for faster service times at Union Station to accommodate this projected ridership growth.

Mr. Liban reported that an Initial Study/Mitigation Negative Declaration (IS/MND) was completed in March 2017. The IS/MND proposed widening the portal, constructing a turnback facility between the portal and 1st Street, and providing operator relief platforms just south of the turnback facility. In response to comments on the IS/MND, staff has revised the Project design to construct new storage tracks and re-adjust the turnback facility location not to preclude a future station at 6th Street. The new storage tracks would require acquisition of existing industrial uses and partial acquisitions of parcels. The current Maintenance of Way (MOW) building will be demolished, and a new power substation will be installed.

Ms. Caldwell asked how MOW will take place since the current building will be demolished? Mr. Liban replied that a new MOW building (MOW 64) is currently being constructed.

Mr. Liban reported that a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Project was issued on October 18th and that the 30-day public comment period ends on November 17th. The final Scoping Meeting will be held on Wednesday, November 8th, from 3-5 P.M. at the Japanese American Cultural and Community Center. Staff will conduct technical studies throughout Fall 2017 and Winter 2018. The Draft EIR will be prepared in Winter 2018, with public hearings expected to take place in Spring 2018. The Final EIR is expected to be completed in Fall 2018.

12. Regional Advance Mitigation Program/Regional Conservation Investment Strategy (Cris Liban)

Mr. Liban reported that a Board Motion formed a Regional Advance Mitigation Program (RAMP) Working Group to be led by Metro, with participation by agencies such as Caltrans, the County of Los Angeles, and state and federal wildlife agencies. RAMP looks for opportunities to designate mitigation areas in advance of projects and construction work undertaken by Metro and has a 30-year horizon.

Mr. Liban reported that the Working Group includes staff from Metro Planning, Highways, and Regional Rail, as well as other internal stakeholders. The Working Group is also aligned with the Metro Sustainability Council.

Mr. Liban reported that Metro procured a contract with ICF International for work on recommending ways to approach RAMP and any associated strategies.

Mr. Liban reported that on November 3rd the RAMP Working Group will have discussions with the Sustainability Council regarding ICF’s work and what the final products will be. External
agencies such as the Army Corps of Engineers and Caltrans were also invited to attend the meeting.

Mr. Walker asked who is representing the County of Los Angeles to the RAMP Working Group? Mr. Liban replied that the Chief Sustainability Officer’s Office has been invited to participate and that staff will ask the County who the formal representative is.

Mr. Marshalian asked if RAMP is tied into the Regional Conservation Investment Strategy (RCIS)? Mr. Liban confirmed, stating that there have been discussions with ICF on Metro’s formal participation in the RCIS.

Ms. Leonard asked if RAMP is an expansion on mitigation measures already in place? Mr. Liban replied that RAMP is looking forward to identify areas that may need mitigation in the future.

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

14. Other Business
Zoe Unruh (Metro) reported on the Local Streets and Roads Program through Senate Bill 1 (SB 1). Ms. Unruh reported that the Program allows cities and counties to double funds for local streets and roads through formula programs. The funds come with additional responsibilities and reporting guidelines. Jurisdictions were directed to submit project lists by October 16th. Ms. Unruh reported that 32 cities in Los Angeles County have incomplete project lists or have not submitted any projects. Lists may be incomplete when projects are not adopted into the budget or by a board or council resolution. Ms. Unruh reported that Assembly Bill 135 (AB 135) amended the requirements to allow project lists that have only been adopted by board or council resolution. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) has indicated that there is still time to meet the December meeting deadline, at which time project lists will be adopted. Project lists need to be verified by mid-November.

Ms. Leonard asked if there is any indication that cities are not moving forward with project lists because of potential efforts to repeal SB 1? Ms. Unruh replied that funds are now being collected and that repeal efforts will not retroactively negate those funds.

Ms. Caldwell asked if there is a list of cities that have submitted project lists? Ms. Unruh replied that the CTC provided a list that she can distribute. Mr. Stevens asked if Ms. Unruh is sharing the list with the Councils of Government (COGs)? Ms. Unruh replied that staff is providing support to ensure that jurisdictions in Los Angeles County have the opportunity to receive funding for Local Streets and Roads projects. Mr. Stevens requested that Ms. Unruh share the list with each of the COGs so that the COGs can reach out to their respective jurisdictions.

15. Adjournment
Ms. Pan adjourned the meeting and reported that TAC will be dark in December, as the Metro Board does not meet in December. The next scheduled TAC meeting is January 3, 2018 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.
# TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
## Sign in Sheet
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marianne Kim/Stephen Finnegan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICYCLE COORDINATOR</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rich Dilluvio/Michelle Mowery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (BOS)</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michelle Caldwell/Robert Portillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Leonard/Dana Pynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sgt. Steve Branconier/Ofc. Christian Cracraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gary Slater/Steve Novotny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greg Farr/Kelly Lmare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVE ON ADA</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen Blackman/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eric Widstrand/Nathan Baird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>1. Corinne Ralph/Kari Derderian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Dan Mitchell/Carlos Rios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Ferdy Chan/Kevin Minne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>1. Richard Marshalian/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>LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES</td>
<td>1. David Kriske/Roubik Golanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td>2. Mohammad Mostakhani/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. Candice Vander Hyde/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 Scmaan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Cities COG</td>
<td>8. David Feinberg/Hany Demitri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE (LTSS)</td>
<td>1. Sebastian Hernandez/Perri Goodman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Justine García/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/Valerie Watson/Dale Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Susan Price/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY (SCRRA - Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Anne Louise Rice/Karen Sakoda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SCAQMD – Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Eyvonne Drummonds/Kathryn Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG – Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Warren Whiteaker/Annie Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Lupe Valdez/LaDonna DiCamillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/ SUSTAINABILITY SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>1. Mike Bagheri/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Mark Hunter/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jamaica Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Christine Harrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mathew Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Matt Pilarczyk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Audrina Dominguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO CLUB</td>
<td>Marianne Kim/Stephen Finnegan (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICYCLE COORDINATOR</td>
<td>Rich Dilluvio/Vacant (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>Michelle Caldwell/Robert Portillo (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>Jane Leonard/Dana Pynn (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>Sgt. Steve Branconier/Ofc. Christian Cracraft (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>Gary Slater/Steve Novotny (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>Greg Farr/Kelly Lamare (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN REP ON ADA</td>
<td>Ellen Blackman/Vacant (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>Eric Widstrand/Michelle Mowery (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>Corinne Ralph/Kari Derderian (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>Dan Mitchell/Carlos Rios (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>Ferdy Chan/Kevin Minne (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>Richard Marshalian/Ayala Ben-Yehuda (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>John Walker/Mario Rodriguez (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>Pat Proano/Mary Reyes (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARROYO VERDUGO CITIES</td>
<td>David Kriske/Roubik Golanian (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATEWAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>Mohammad Mostahkami/Lisa Rapp (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS VIRGENES MALIBU COG</td>
<td>Robert Brager/Ramiro Adeva (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH L.A. COUNTY</td>
<td>Trolis Niebla/Mike Behen (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN GABRIEL VALLEY COG</td>
<td>Larry Stevens/Craig Bradshaw (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN FERNANDO VALLEY COG</td>
<td>Jason Smisko/Dennis Ambayec (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH BAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>Robert Beste/Ted Semaan (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTSIDE CITIES</td>
<td>David Feinberg/Sharon Peralta (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>Fanny Pan/Brian Lam (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>Anne Louise Reinhart/Sanford (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM/SUST SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>Mike Revelation/Vacant (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM/SUST SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>Mark Hamer/Vacant (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Warning:**

X = Present  
A = Alternate  

*Note: The table is incomplete and some names are repeated.*