Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

William Mullholland Conference Room

1. Call to Order/Roll Call  
   Action (Rena Lum, 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
   (Rena Lum)

4. Consent Calendar
   Action
   - Approval of Minutes
   - Attachment 3: Draft January 3, 2018 Minutes

5. Borrowing Guidelines for Prop A, Prop C, Measure R, and Measure M Local Return Programs
   Action
   (Susan Richan)
   - Attachment 4: Local Return Borrowing Guidelines
   - Attachment 5: Examples of Prior Local Return Borrowing
   10 min

6. 2017 Customer Satisfaction Survey
   15 min
   Information
   (Tham Nguyen)

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

8. Highway Program Updates
   20 min
   Information
   (Abdollah Ansari)
9. LADOT VMT Transition and TDM Ordinance Information
   20 min "David Somers, LADOT"

10. ATP Update Handout in lieu of oral report
11. CTC Update Handout in lieu of oral report
12. Other Business
   • TAC meeting minutes format
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 March 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
William Mulholland Conference Room – 15th Floor
9:30 am

1. Call to Order (1 minute) Action Jane Leonard
2. Approval of December 5, 2017 Minutes (1 minute) Action BOS
3. Chair’s Report (5 minutes) Information Jane Leonard
4. Metro Report (5 minutes) Information Scott Hartwell
5. FAP Document Status Report (5 minutes) Information Manijeh Ahmadi
6. FTA Update (10 minutes) Information Arianna Valle/Adam Stephenson/Stacy Alameida
7. Access Update (10 minutes) Information Matthew Avancena
8. Twenty-Eight by 28' Project List (10 minutes) Information Jody Litvak
10. Transit Industry Debriefing/Updates Information
   (5 minutes) All

11. New Business Information All

12. Adjournment

Information Items:

90-day Rolling Agenda
Subsidy Matrix FY 2018
TDA-STA Capital Claims FY 2018
TDA-STA Claims FY 2018
Summary of Invoices FY 2018
Summary of EZ Pass Invoices FY 2018
Twenty-Eight by ’28 Project List

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, February 20, 2018, at 9:30 am in the William Mulholland Conference Room, 15th Floor of the Metro Headquarters Building.
Agenda
Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE
Gateway Building – Union Station Conference Room – (3rd floor)

Call in (213) 922-4940
In house call ext. 4940

1. Call to Order
   Action
   Sebastian Hernandez, Chair

2. Approval of Minutes
   Action
   Sebastian Hernandez, Chair

3. LTSS elections for Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary
   (if no quorum this will go again after TAM Plan or by email)
   Action
   Sebastian Hernandez, Chair

4. Group TAM Plan – Data Collection Training for Group TAM Plan Participants
   Information
   Avital Shavit, Metro
   Randy Lam, Metro

5. Borrowing Guidelines for Prop A, Prop C, Measure R, and Measure M Local Return Programs
   Information
   Susan Richan, Metro

6. New Business, Schedule of LTSS meetings for the year
   Sebastian Hernandez, Chair
Agenda

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

Union Station Conference Room – 3rd Floor

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

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

3. Chair Report
   5 min
   Information (Bahman Janka)

4. Metro Report
   5 min
   Information (Fulgene Asuncion)

5. Caltrans Update
   5 min
   Information (Steve Novotny)

6. Autonomous Vehicle Summit Public Readout
   20 min
   Information (Ryan Snyder)

Call in by phone: (512)489-3100 Ext. 1640806

Connect over video:
Join with your web browser (Chrome, IE11):
https://call.lifesizecloud.com/call/1640806

Other ways to call:
https://call.lifesizecloud.com/otherways/1640806

Connecting from a Lifesize conference room system? Just dial 1640806 with the keypad.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
7. **CTC Update**  
   *Information (Zoe Unruh)*
   
   **10 min**

8. **ATP Update**  
   *Information (Shelly Quan)*
   
   **5 min**

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

10. **SB-1 Informational Workshop**  
    - SB 1 funding programs  
    - Metro’s SB 1 implementation strategy  
    - New funding opportunity for local cities with fees dedicated to transportation  
   
    **1 hour**

11. **New Business**  
    **5 min**

12. **Adjournment**  
    **1 min**

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

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

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority
(Metro)

TDM/ SUSTAINABILITY
SUBCOMMITTEE

Metro HQ
16th Floor, Catalina Conference Rm.

1. Call to Order/Roll Call  Action  (Mike Bagheri, Chair)
2. Introductions  All
3. City of LA TDM Ordinance  Update  (Rubina Ghazarian, City of LA)
4. Long Range Transportation Plan  Update  (Mark Yamarone, Metro)
5. Legislative Update  Update  (Marisa Yeager, Metro)
6. Bikeshare Program  Update  (Jenny Cristales-Cevallos, Metro)
7. Future Agenda Items  All
8. Adjournment  All

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

Subcommittee Actions
Disposition of Subcommittee Actions

January 2017

Bus Operations Subcommittee:

- Approved the December 2017 meeting minutes
- Approved the Borrowing Guidelines for Prop A, Prop C, Measure R, and Measure M

Local Return Programs

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:

- Approved the October 2017 meeting minutes
- Appointed the following positions:
  - Chair – Sebastian Hernandez
  - Vice-Chair – Vacant
  - Secretary – Luz Echavarria

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:

- Approved the November 2017 meeting minutes

TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee:

- No actions were taken
Attachment 3

January 3, 2018 TAC Minutes

January 3, 2018 Sign-In Sheets
1. Call to Order/Roll Call
Fanny Pan (Chair) called the meeting to order at 9:34 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 December 5, 2017
   • Received updates on:
     o TAP Interagency Transfers
     o LIFE/RRTP Vendor Redemption Requirements
     o FTA
     o Access Services
     o SB-1
   • Next meeting is scheduled for January 16, 2018

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee (LTSS)
   • Did not meet in December 2017
   • Next meeting is scheduled for January 18, 2018

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee
   • Did not meet in December 2017
   • Next meeting is scheduled for January 18, 2018
     o Will be holding elections for Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, and Bicycle Coordinator

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Sustainability Subcommittee
   • Did not meet in December 2017
   • Next meeting is scheduled for January 17, 2018

3. Chairperson’s Report (Fanny Pan, Metro)
Ms. Pan announced that prior TAC member, Ferdy Chan (City of Los Angeles), has retired. Kevin Minne (City of Los Angeles) will be the Primary Member and the Alternate Member will be Audrey Netsawang (City of Los Angeles).

Ms. Pan announced that Michelle Mowery (City of Long Beach) is the new Alternate Member for the City of Long Beach.

4. Consent Calendar
A motion to approve the November 1, 2017 TAC minutes was made by Mohammad Mostahkami (League of California Cities – Gateway Cities COG) and seconded by Robert Brager (League of California Cities – Las Virgenes Malibu COG). Kevin Minne (City of Los Angeles) and Dan Mitchell (City of Los Angeles) abstained. The minutes were approved.

5. LRTP Update (Mark Yamarone, Metro)
Mr. Yamarone reported that staff has begun to produce a series of policy papers on 17 different issues that will be addressed in the Long Range Plan. Staff has taken the first four one-page outlines to the Policy Advisory Council (PAC) which include the topics of Sustainability; Innovations, Trends and Disruptors; Highways and Streets; and Active Transportation. Staff will be taking four more outlines to the next PAC meeting. The purpose of the policy papers is to provide an overview of the topic, a listing of the various Metro Board actions/policies taken to date related to the topic, best practices, and a series of three to four framing questions about the topic that the Long Range Plan can address.

Candice Vander Hyde (League of California Cities – North Los Angeles County) asked who is the intended audience for the policy papers? Mr. Yamarone replied that the intended audience is everyone. The general idea is to provide an overview primer of each of the topics that could help drive the discussion on how the topics are addressed in the Long Range Plan. The policy papers also provide a good opportunity for the Metro Board and staff to understand all the prior policies that have already been adopted.

6. Supportive Transit Parking Program Update (Frank Ching, Metro)
Mr. Ching reported that since the last Supporting Transit Parking Program (STPP) Master Plan update at the November 1, 2017 TAC meeting, staff has presented the STPP to the Planning and Programming Committee as a Receive and File. Staff was asked to provide additional outreach in support of the STPP adoption. The Gold Line Extension 2B Parking Study was separated from the STPP as requested by TAC at the November meeting. The STPP has been revised and a final report to the Board is being prepared for the January 25, 2018 Board Meeting for final adoption.

Some of the revisions made to the STPP include the design criteria to ensure Electric Vehicles (EV) technology is included in future design of parking facilities and a suburban mid-point station typology has been added to the model as requested by TAC.

Metro’s Supportive Transit Parking Management Program has been recognized by the California Public Parking Association with a state-level award as the Parking Program of the Year 2017.
Staff will be hosting an STPP workshop on January 9, 2018 at 6 pm in Metro Headquarters. In addition to the workshop, staff has provided updates and presentations at five Regional Service Council Meetings, the Metro TAC, two Council of Governments meetings, the Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority Board Meeting, the Gold Line 2B TAC meeting, and at the City of Claremont Town Hall meeting.

Mr. Ching reported that Metro conducted the Gold Line Extension Phase 2B Parking Study and provided recommendations, however the Gold Line Construction Authority Board will ultimately decide on the capacity and configuration of the parking to be built. Mr. Ching replied that it is not necessary for the Metro Board to adopt the Gold Line Extension Phase 2B Parking Study.

The Gold Line Extension Phase 2B Parking Study looks to help determine how projected demand for parking at stations compares to the number of spaces planned for construction based on the updated parking demand data for the stations. In addition, the study analyzes the potential consequences of building parking structures as initially planned based on what is known regarding parking demand projections, available alternatives, and costs. With the revised Parking Demand Model, which includes the new suburban mid-point station typology, the model outputs a total of 1,959 parking spaces (1,621 spaces less than what was proposed in the Final Environmental Impact Report). This scenario considers the Claremont station as a suburban mid-point station with Metrolink parking demand as the base scenario. Staff also assessed various Claremont station scenarios: Base Scenario – Claremont as a mid-point suburban station with a Metrolink station; Alternative Scenario 1 – Claremont as a mid-point suburban station without a Metrolink station; Alternative Scenario 2 – Claremont as a terminus station with a Metrolink station; and Alternative Scenario 3 – Claremont as a terminus station without a Metrolink station. These scenarios could vary the total parking demand from 1,881 to 2,183.

The Parking Study also recommends using surface parking lot configurations to allow flexibility for future land-use, such as transit-oriented development projects. Overbuilding parking at these station sites is likely to attract traffic congestion, especially during peak ingress and egress periods.

Larry Stevens (League of California Cities – San Gabriel Valley COG) commented that much of the STPP is good and commended the efforts on maintenance, demand mitigation, and uniformity. Mr. Stevens commented that there are still aspects that could be further discussed in the STPP. For instance, a more robust discussion on the 11 data factors used in the model is needed and further explanation on how the model changes when using various parking rates. Mr. Stevens noted that $3 per day might not be the best rate for the entire system and suggested that a range of prices should be considered. Along the Gold Line, for example, perhaps parking rates closer to Downtown Los Angeles are $3 per day, while in the suburban areas the rate reduces to $1-$2 per day. Mr. Stevens stated that the parking study conducted by Loyola Marymount University (LMU) demonstrated that there is a substantial difference in suburban parking demand versus parking demand systemwide.

Mr. Stevens commented that it is not clear how the STPP evaluates first/last mile improvements and considers them in the demand model. He also noted that the STPP does
not address the lessons learned from the Paid Parking Pilot Program significantly enough, such as whether the pilot program caused negative impacts in surrounding neighborhoods due to spill-over parking. Paid parking has a large impact in suburban areas. Particularly when none of the cities around the station currently charge for parking. How parking operates in the vicinity of the station needs to be considered before charging for parking at the station.

Mr. Ching replied that the model was used to evaluate parking rates from $0 per day with parking management utilizing new technology systems through $25 per day. When a starting price was chosen, staff used $5 as the amount a typical commuter would spend on a round trip riding transit. The first criteria was to not double the overall commuting cost. Mr. Ching explained that $3 per day was also chosen due to the typical on-street metered parking rate, which averages $4 for 9 hours in Los Angeles County. As the environment changes, the parking rate can be adjusted. Mr. Ching explained that Metro currently has two locations charging $2 per day to observe the impact it has on demand. The parking pricing will not be implemented as a blanket pricing for all Metro parking locations, only at locations where the parking rate is above 70% occupancy.

From the Pilot Program, staff learned that if pricing throughout a corridor is not balanced, demand shifts to neighboring stations. For example, pricing was implemented at the Monrovia station, but demand simply shifted to Duarte and Arcadia stations. After the adoption of the STPP, Duarte and Arcadia stations are the top priority to implement the STPP to balance parking demand.

In response to overspill parking, Mr. Ching replied that Metro staff can help to recommend new policies, permit parking, time limits, etc. to the local jurisdictions in preparation of the STPP being implemented. However, Metro does not have the on-street jurisdiction to enforce parking. If the city decides to authorize Metro to do enforcement of on-street parking, Metro's parking enforcement team can assist.

Mr. Ching noted that the first/last mile team at Metro coordinates with all transit corridor projects and has been coordinating with the Parking team.

Mr. Ching agreed that more detail could be added to help explain each data factor in the model. At the January 9, 2018 workshop, the parking consultant will be in attendance to better explain and discuss each of the technologies and how the demand model was developed.

Mike Bagheri (TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee) asked if origin-destination information was used when developing the STPP? Mr. Ching replied yes, approximately 70% of all people who drive to a Metro station live 5 or more miles away.

Mr. Bagheri asked if subsidizing local jurisdictions for capital and operating costs of on-street parking enforcement has been considered? Mr. Ching replied that Local Return could be used for those needs.

Mr. Stevens commented that $3 per day for parking is reasonable in an area where metered parking is $4 per day; however that logic does not work in a suburban area where on-street parking is free. If $3 per day is charged at a station where on-street parking is free, transit
riders will all park on the street. The considerations applied in urban areas should be applied to suburban areas.

Mary Reyes (County of Los Angeles) asked if it is expected that local jurisdictions pay for mitigations of parking spillover with their Local Return funds? She noted that public funds are generally not used to pay for permit parking. Mr. Ching replied that there are other options such as setting on-street parking restrictions. For example, the City of Norwalk worked with Metro staff to develop on-street parking restrictions. The STPP shows that transit users typically park 9-10 hours per day. Setting on-street parking restrictions to 4 hour limits is enough time for other daily needs but is not enough for a transit user. Ms. Reyes replied that residents generally do not like time limits on parking. Mr. Ching agreed but noted that Metro has been receiving requests to add on-street time limits around the Aviation/Century station. Metro and City staff can work together in anticipation of the implementation of the STPP at Metro stations. Ms. Reyes asked if it is the local jurisdiction’s responsibility to implement the restrictions? Mr. Ching replied yes, but Metro staff can assist in those efforts.

Dan Mitchell (City of Los Angeles) asked what is the timing on revising the STPP? Mr. Ching replied that the STPP Master Plan has been developed over the last three years and has been presented to the TAC throughout the development process. The STPP was presented to the Metro Board in November as a Receive and File, and has since been revised based on input received. Staff anticipates Board Action on the STPP at the January 25th meeting.

Mr. Stevens asked if a section on TAC discussion and comments could be included in the Board Report? Ms. Pan replied that staff would need to check if there is still time to make revisions to the Board Report. Mr. Ching added that if the Board Report may not be able to be changed, revisions to the STPP can still be made.

Mr. Mitchell asked what the impact is for delaying the approval of the STPP Master Plan? Mr. Ching replied that it would delay the program implementation by at least a quarter.

**Motion – Approved**
Ted Semaan (League of California Cities – South Bay Cities COG) made a motion to change Item 6 – Supportive Transit Parking Program Update Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase 2 Parking from an Informational Item to an Action Item. The motion was seconded by Michelle Caldwell (BOS). 16 members voted Yes. The Motion was approved.

**Motion – Approved as amended**
Larry Stevens (League of California Cities – San Gabriel Valley COG) made a motion, which was amended by Dan Mitchell (City of Los Angeles), that staff consider the comments and input made by TAC and from the Parking Workshop to be held on January 9, 2018, and to forward the comments to the Planning and Programming Committee and Metro Board. Michelle Caldwell (BOS) seconded the Motion. The Motion was approved with no objections.

7. **TOD Grant Round 5 Update (Desiree Portillo-Rabinov, Metro)**
Ms. Portillo-Rabinov reported that TOD Grant Round 5 was released in March 2017 with a total program budget of $3.1 million. Round 5 is the final round and incorporates TOD planning grant regulatory documents as well as California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
environmental studies. The second component of the grant program is also the Transit Oriented Communities tax increment financing (TIF) district. Metro received 12 grant applications for Round 5 totaling approximately $5 million. The application evaluation teams were composed of Metro staff and external staff from public agencies. Funding is recommended to 8 of the applicants (5 from the TOD grant program and 3 from the TIF program, totaling approximately $3 million. The funding recommendation will go to the Planning and Programming Committee on February 14, 2018, and the full Metro Board on February 22, 2018.

Ms. Portillo-Rabinov reported that all applicants that did not get recommended for funding were offered an opportunity to appeal, but no requests for appeal were received.

8. SB-1 Update (Wil Ridder, Metro)

Mr. Ridder reported that in September 2017, Metro staff brought forward to the Board an evaluative criteria framework which established expectations and priorities for Los Angeles County when pursuing SB-1 funding opportunities. Metro views SB-1 as an important piece to deliver the adopted Measure M program. Guidelines for the SB-1 programs have been adopted and staff is in the process of submitting applications to the various programs. Staff has also been trying to ensure that local partners are aware of potential funding opportunities and is looking for opportunities to not only promote, but to support local projects on some of the programs as appropriate.

Ms. Caldwell asked if funds allocated by formula to Los Angeles County are eligible for operating and state of good repair costs? She referenced that the Willowbrook/Rosa Parks station was receiving some of the formula funds and asked if that project is a Measure M project? Mr. Ridder replied that there are a few different formula streams through SB-1. One of those is through the Local Partnership Program (LPP) which is divided 50/50 through formula funds and a competitive program. The other element of that is State Transit Assistance Program (STA). Within the STA program there is a dedicated revenue stream for state of good repair projects. The Willowbrook/Rosa Parks station is being recommended under the LPP formula and it is recognized as an LRTP priority that Metro is trying to ensure that we can fully fund.

Ms. Caldwell asked how can other partners in Los Angeles County participate in receiving some of the formula funds which are eligible for operating and state of good repair? Mr. Ridder replied that the STA program is still going through guideline adoption process.

Mr. Mostahkami asked if there are matching requirements for the programs? Mr. Ridder replied that there are different matching requirements per program. In certain situations, like the Trade Corridor Enhancements Program (TCEP), those matching requirements are different from projects being recommended from the State versus from the Regions. The guidelines can be found online at [http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/sb1/](http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/sb1/).

Kevin Minne (City of Los Angeles) commented that a workshop to go over the SB-1 programs would be helpful. Mr. Ridder replied that staff would be happy to facilitate a workshop. (An SB-1 workshop was scheduled and held on January 18, 2018).
9. ATP Update (Shelly Quan, Metro)
Ms. Quan reported that ATP Cycle 4 draft Guidelines, draft applications, workshop materials and schedule are available on the CTC website here: [http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/atp](http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/atp). The Guidelines will be adopted at the March 2018 meeting. Cycle 4 will cover four programming years: FY 20, 21, 22, and 23 with a total of $438 million available. There will be five project types, each with their own application: Large projects (project costs of $7 million or more), Medium projects (project costs of $1.5 million to $7 million), Small projects (project costs of $1.5 million or less), Non-infrastructure projects, and Plan projects. There will be a Cycle 4 Workshop on January 9, 2018 which will focus on the draft applications.

Metro is providing grant-writing assistance for ATP Cycle 4. 75% of grant assistance will be directed to first/last mile projects, and 25% to other eligible ATP projects that assist in implementing Metro active transportation plans and policies. If requests for grant assistance exceed capacity, priority will be given to agencies that can demonstrate resource/technical limitations.

10. CTC Update (Zoe Unruh, Metro)
Ms. Unruh reported that at the December 6-7, 2017 CTC meeting, the CTC took action on the Local Streets and Roads Project List. All but 10 cities in Los Angeles County were included in the action. Those cities were approved and their apportionment should be released by the Controller’s Office this month. Since the December meeting, many of the cities that did not submit projects in time, have since submitted complete lists to the CTC. Metro staff has been communicating with CTC staff to keep track of the progress and ensure that the cities in Los Angeles County are getting their lists in on time so they do not lose the opportunity to secure those funds. Since December 20, 2017, only four cities were outstanding. Staff expects that they will be approved in January 2018 and their apportionments will not be dissolved.

The SB-1 LPP formula share for all of the eligible jurisdictions was adopted at the December meeting. Los Angeles’ formula share is approximately $29.2 million annually. The Solutions for Suggested Corridors Program (SCCP) Guidelines were adopted which initiated a call for projects. Staff is in the process of submitting applications for that program which are due February 16, 2018.

On December 15, 2017, Metro submitted the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for Los Angeles County. The RTIP proposes $481.8 million in programming for Los Angeles County through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) cycle which will end in FY 23. The CTC is holding hearings on those proposals and their staff recommendations will be published on the February 28, 2018, with an anticipated March adoption of the 2018 STIP.

11. Legislative Update (Raffi Hamparian, Metro)
Federal
Mr. Hamparian reported that the second session Congress kicked off on January 3, 2018. The biggest issue at the start will be passing a Continuing Resolution. The biggest policy issue is going to be the Infrastructure Bill. The House is discussing Entitlement reform, while the Senate is discussing proposing an Infrastructure Bill. One of the most interesting parts of the Infrastructure Bill would be a provision that would prohibit access to federal money unless the
region has new local revenues. However it is unclear how far back the bill would allow new local revenues to be counted. Metro staff has made the case that local revenues generated from 2016 should be eligible. Mr. Hamparian also noted that if a long term funding bill is not passed, none of the federal grants will be issued.

12. Other Business
Mr. Stevens requested that for future TAC agendas to include links to past relevant documents, if available, or as an attachment to the agenda packet. Ms. Pan replied that staff would try to include relevant documents as links on future agendas.

13. Adjournment
Ms. Pan adjourned the meeting and reported that the next scheduled TAC meeting is February 7, 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**  
**January 3, 2018**

<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/Vacant</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 Lamare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVE ON ADA</td>
<td>1. Ellen Blackman/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1. Eric Widstrand/Michelle Mowery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>MEMBER/APPLICANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Susan Bok for</strong></td>
<td>Corinne Ralph/Kari Derderian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Rebecca</strong></td>
<td>Dan Mitchell/Carlos Rios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Kevin Minne/Audrey Netsawang</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Richard Marshalian/Ayala Ben-Yehuda</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Laurel Wart</strong></td>
<td>John Walker/Mario Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Pat Proano/Mary Reyes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td>1. David Kriske/Roubik Golanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities COG</td>
<td>2. Mohammad Mostahkami/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes Malibu COG</td>
<td>3. Robert Brager/Nicole Benyamin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td>4. Candice Vander Hyde/Mike Behen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
<td>5. Larry Stevens/Craig Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley COG</td>
<td>6. Jason Smisko/Dennis Ambayec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td>7. Robert Beste/Ted Semaan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Cities COG</td>
<td>8. David Feinberg/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 Garcia/Linda Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>1. Fanny Pan/Brian Lam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Metro)</td>
<td>Countywide Planning &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Carolyn Kreslake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane Corral-Lopez/Carolyn Kreslake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDESTRIAN COORDINATOR</td>
<td>1. Valerie Watson/Dale Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Vacant/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY</td>
<td>1. Anne Louise Rice/Karen Sakoda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SCERRA - Ex-Officio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT</td>
<td>1. Eyvonne Drummonds/Kathryn Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SCAQMD -- Ex-Officio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF</td>
<td>1. Warren Whiteaker/Annie Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNMENTS (SCAG -- Ex-Officio)</td>
<td></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>
</tbody>
</table>
## TAC Audience Attendance
**January 3, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young Gi Kim</td>
<td>Harabedian</td>
<td>(213) 974-4444</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ykimharabedian@gmail.com">ykimharabedian@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Errin</td>
<td>Sup. Harabedian</td>
<td>626 552-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marvin.e.ros@lacounty.gov">marvin.e.ros@lacounty.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Ross</td>
<td>City of Glendale</td>
<td>626 852-4814</td>
<td><a href="mailto:across@cityofglend.org">across@cityofglend.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kessey Brennan</td>
<td>City of Glendale</td>
<td>626 852-4814</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kbre23n3@c3tyofglend.org">Kbre23n3@c3tyofglend.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juana Martinez</td>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>213 949-0325</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmartzin@ncenet.com">jmartzin@ncenet.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Demitri</td>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>323 848-6507</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hddemitri@webo.org">hddemitri@webo.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Local Return Borrowing Guidelines
Attachment A

Borrowing Guidelines for Prop A, Prop C, Measure R and Measure M Local Return Programs

The following guidelines are provided to establish consistency for Local Return borrowing under Metro’s four sales taxes, facilitate the review and approval of Local Return Borrowings, and ensure equitable treatment of local jurisdictions. A Jurisdiction borrowing against its Local Return funds must adhere to the Local Return Guidelines for the respective sales tax/taxes committed to secure the borrowing.

Structures

There are three basic methods that a Jurisdiction may use to borrow against its Local Return funds:

Method 1) Issue its own debt – only Metro local return program/project approval with little financing oversight
Method 2) Metro issues the bonds on the Jurisdiction’s behalf – requires Metro Board approval and staff oversight
Method 3) Borrow directly from Metro – requires Metro board approval and Metro controls the execution of any bond sale

Approval Process and Issuance Procedures

Method 1) Direct Issuance by the Jurisdiction

A. The Jurisdiction requests approval for it to borrow via the normal Local Return approval process.
B. The Local Return Program Manager (“Program Manager”) is delegated the authority to approve the borrowing. The Program Manager also has the authority to approve eligible Local Return projects.
C. The Program Manager notifies the Jurisdiction and the Board in writing that the projects were in compliance with the LR Guidelines and the borrowing has been approved.
D. The Jurisdiction selects its debt issuance team, including financial advisor, bond counsel, and underwriters if the debt is sold through negotiated sale.
E. Metro Treasury staff assists the Jurisdiction by reviewing its borrowing documents as to information related to Metro.
F. The Jurisdiction issues the debt and is solely responsible for the repayment from its Local Return over the life of the bonds and compliance with Federal and State restrictions and requirements related to the issuance of tax-exempt or taxable debt.
Method 2) Issuance by Metro on Behalf of the Jurisdiction

A. The Jurisdiction takes the necessary legal actions to authorize the debt issuance, such as through an authorizing resolution by the governing body. The authorization should include the terms and conditions of the sale and the delegation of authority to enter into required agreements.

B. The Jurisdiction selects its financing team and determines whether to sell through competitive or negotiated sale. For a negotiated bond sale, the Jurisdiction approves selection of bond underwriters.

C. The Jurisdiction requests approval from Metro to borrow on its behalf via normal Local Return approval process. The Program Manager reviews the projects to be bonded to ensure compliance with the Local Return Guidelines.

D. Local Programs/Treasury with assistance from the Jurisdiction prepares an item for the Oversight Committee findings as required by Measure R or Measure M.

E. The Program Manager notifies the Jurisdiction that findings have been made by the Oversight Committee.

F. The Program Manager and Treasury staff request authorization from the Board to approve the borrowing and enter into the MOU and Master Trust Agreement. Board authorization will include terms and conditions of the bond issue and concurrence with the financing team selected by the Jurisdiction. Any subsequent Local Return bonds will be issued under the master trust and a supplemental trust agreement.

G. The Jurisdiction and Metro enter into a memorandum of understanding (“MOU”) and a trust agreement with a trustee bank. The MOU will cover the following points:
   a. Metro will issue the bonds on behalf of the Jurisdiction for the Jurisdiction’s benefit to be used for approved Local Return projects.
   b. The Jurisdiction and Metro will determine reasonable security features such as debt service coverage ratios and debt service reserve requirement sufficient to obtain ratings of A- from Standard & Poor’s or A3 from Moody’s.
   c. Negotiate associated fees provided that all fees are reimbursed by the Jurisdiction.
   d. The Jurisdiction will repay the bonds by pledging its share of the respective Local Return.
   e. One-twelfth of annual debt service will be withheld from the Jurisdiction’s monthly Local Return allocation and be transferred to the Trustee. The balance will be remitted to the Jurisdiction.
   f. The Jurisdiction will reimburse Metro for any and all costs incurred in the issuance and administration of these bonds.
   g. The Jurisdiction will indemnify the Metro against all other possible expenses, liabilities, or required actions resulting from the outstanding bonds that would not otherwise have been incurred by the Metro.

H. Following the sale of bonds the Jurisdiction is responsible for on-going debt management including arbitrage rebate calculations, annual continuing disclosure requirements and for spending bond proceeds in a timely manner.
Method 3) **Direct Loan between Metro and the Jurisdiction**

This method is reserved for circumstances where the Jurisdiction is unable to borrow under the first two methods. Should Metro choose to borrow through the capital markets to advance the funds, it would generally be part of a larger Metro bond issue. This method reduces the total amount of borrowing available for Metro’s own capital program.

A. The Jurisdiction requests approval to borrow via the normal Local Return approval process.
B. The Program Manager notifies the Jurisdiction in writing that the projects submitted for bonding are in compliance with the LR Guidelines.
C. The Jurisdiction and Metro negotiate the loan terms and develop required documentation.
D. The Jurisdiction obtains authorization from its governing body for the loan and to enter into the necessary legal documents to secure repayment of the loan.
E. The Program Manager and Treasury staff request authorization from the Board to approve the loan and to enter into all appropriate legal agreements (i.e., MOU/Assignment Agreement/Promissory Note, other required documents) required to provide for repayment of the loan to Metro.

The MOU/ Promissory Note will cover at a minimum the following:

A. Project description.
B. Principal amount, interest rate, term.
C. The Local Return committed by the Jurisdiction to repay the loan.
D. Amortization/ repayment schedule. Typically one-twelfth of annual debt service will be withheld from the Jurisdiction’s monthly Local Return allocation by Metro. The balance will be remitted to the Jurisdiction.
E. Jurisdiction to reimburse its allocable share of costs incurred in the issuance and administration of the outstanding debt if the advance is part of a larger Metro bond issue.
F. Other terms and conditions as appropriate.
Attachment 5

Examples of Prior Local Return Borrowing
Examples of Prior Local Return Borrowing

Method 1) Jurisdiction issues its own debt
In December 2012, the City of Lynwood issued certificates of participation secured by its Measure R Local Return through the California Statewide Communities Development Authority. The Board authorized the Local Return Program Manager to write a letter of concurrence for the City of Lynwood to use the funds as the City requested. The Lynwood debt issue required very little direct assistance from Metro staff. The Cities of Azusa and San Fernando used the same structure in 2016 for borrowing under Measure R.

Method 2) Metro issues bonds on the Jurisdiction’s behalf
In 1998, Prop C Local Return bonds were issued by the MTA at the request of the City of Los Angeles and were secured by the City’s Prop C Local Return. Under an MOU between the MTA and the City, the City was obligated to take all necessary actions for the issuance, sale and administration of the bonds and was also responsible for the costs of issuing the bonds.

Method 3) Jurisdiction borrows directly from Metro
In October 2004, the City of Covina borrowed $3.725 million as a part of Metro’s $176.345 million Prop C Sales Tax Bonds. Covina entered into an Assignment Agreement with Metro and the Trustee that allowed the City’s Prop C local return to be used for payment of Covina’s share of its debt service. In December 2012, the Board approved a loan to the City of Inglewood, which will be repaid from Inglewood’s Measure R Local Return.