Agenda

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

UNION STATION ROOM

1. Call to Order/Roll Call  
   Action (Renee Berlin, Randy Lamm)

2. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees
   - Bus Operations
   - Local Transit Systems
   - Streets and Freeways
   - TDM/Air Quality
   - Attachment 1: Subcommittee Agendas
   - Attachment 2: Subcommittee Actions
   - 10 min

3. Consent Calendar
   - Approval of Minutes
   - Attachment 3: Minutes of January 4, 2006
   - Action/Concurrence

4. Chairperson’s Report
   - 5 min
   - Information (Renee Berlin)

5. Legislative Update
   - Federal
   - State
   - 10 min
   - Information (Rafli Hamparian)
   - (Michael Turner)

6. Local Return Guidelines
   - Attachment 4: Draft Revised Guidelines
   - 20 min
   - Action/Concurrence (Patricia Chern)

7. Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan Policies
   - Attachment 5: Draft Policies
   - 20 min
   - Action/Concurrence (Lynne Goldsmith)
8. Approve Fund Exchange of Federal STP-L Funds for Non-Federal Funds with the County of Los Angeles for Interstate 5/Hasley Canyon Interchange Project
   Attachment 6: PowerPoint presentation
   10 min
   Action
   (Kaileh Hourish)

9. SAFETEA-LU -- State Implementation Bill
   10 min
   Information
   (Ashad Hamideh)

10. CTC Update
    10 min
    Information
    (Tim Papandreou)

11. Long Range Transportation Plan
    5 min
    Information
    (Heather Hills)

12. Congestion Mitigation Fee – Nexus Study
    10 min
    Information
    (Doug Kim)

13. New Business

14. Adjournment

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

Please call Randy Lamm at (213) 922-2470 or e-mail to "lammr@metro.net", if you have questions regarding the agenda or the meeting. The next meeting will be on February 1, 2006 at 9:30 am in the Union Station Room.
Attachment 1

Subcommittee December 2005 Agendas

Bus Operations Subcommittee – No Meeting in December

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

TDM/Air Quality Subcommittee – No Meeting in December
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE

Union Station Room — 3rd Floor

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes — October 27, 2005
   (to be handed out at meeting)

3. Request for 5310 Review Committee Volunteer (1)

4. ASI/UFS Update

5. City of Downey Transportation Programs

6. LTSS Goals and Objectives for 2006

7. Election of Officers (Feb. 2006)

8. Legislative Update

9. New Business

10. Adjournment

Action
   Joyce Rooney

Action
   Joyce Rooney

Action
   Joyce Rooney

Discussion
   Matthew Avacena, ASI

Presentation
   Amelia Jennings, City of Downey

Discussion
   Joyce Rooney

Discussion
   Joyce Rooney

Information
   Mike Turner, Metro

Information
   Joyce Rooney

Action
   Joyce Rooney
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

Board Overflow Conference Room,
3rd Floor

1. Call to Order
   1 min
   Action (Ed Norris)

2. Approval of the November 17, 2005 Minutes
   Attachment 1: Draft Minutes/Sign-in Sheet
   1 min
   Action (Subcommittee)

3. Chairperson Report
   10 min
   Information (Ed Norris)

4. Metro Report
   10 min
   Information (Renee Berlin)

5. Caltrans Report
   • Safe Routes to School Program
   • Inactive Project List
   30 min
   Information (Kirk Cessna)

6. Metro Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan (BTSP)
   Attachment 2: Metro BTSP Policies (DRAFT)
   Attachment 3: BTSP Slides
   20 min
   Action (Lynne Goldsmith)

7. Propositions A & C Local Return Guidelines
   20 min
   Action (Patricia Chen)
Attachment 2

Subcommittee Actions
Disposition of December Subcommittee Actions

BOS:
Did not meet in December

LTSS:
Not Available

Streets and Freeways:
December 8th Meeting
Metro Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan (BTSP)
The Subcommittee approved a motion to approve the Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan Policies as presented with the condition that the following recommendations be added: 1) Metro use triple bicycle racks on buses when replacing existing racks or purchasing new racks; 2) Metro permit driver discretion when allowing bicycle on buses when space is available; and 3) under Policy Objective V, Strategy 4, expand the "Metro Bicycle Commuter Clubs" to include employers. The motion was put forth by Michelle Mowery (Bicycle Coordination) and seconded by Steve Huang (South Bay Cities COG). The motion passed.

Propositions A and C Local Return Guidelines

The Subcommittee approved three motions:

Motion #1
Metro revise the Local Return Guidelines to define "heavily used by transit". Motion was put forth by Mike Uyeno (City of Los Angeles) and seconded by Ken Johnson (Arterial ITS Group). The motion passed.

Motion #2
Support the guidelines as presented with the provision that stand-alone traffic signal at bus stop locations that meet Caltrans requirements for Pedestrian Warrants be eligible for Propositions A and C under the Local Return Guidelines. The motion was put forth by Bahman Janka (San Gabriel Valley COG) and seconded by Maged-El Rabaa (County of Los Angeles). The motion passed.

Motion #3
Metro include the maintenance, operation, and upgrades of existing streetlights along bus routes to ensure the rider’s safety for those commuting to and from bus routes. The motion was put forth by Mohammad Mostakharni (Gateway Cities COG) and seconded by Ed Norris (City of Long Beach). Mike Uyeno and Maged El-Rabaa abstained.

TDM/AQ:
Did not meet in December
Attachment 3

Draft December 7, 2005 TAC Minutes
Sign-In Sheet
Handouts
Meeting Minutes

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. Call to Order/Roll Call
Renee Berlin (Chair) called the meeting to order at 9:43 a.m. Randy Lamm (Metro) took roll and declared a quorum was present.

2. Agenda Reports By Standing Committees

BOS (Andre Colaiace)
- Met on November 15th;
- Received reports on:
  - New Caltrans federal delivery plan requirements;
  - Disaster response planning coordination with Metro and Munis;
  - Status report on Pomona Regional Transit Center Security System Project, granted an extension in 2005 on the condition that project updates be provided every six months;
- Update on:
  - Universal Fare System (UFS);
- The December meeting is cancelled; the next meeting is January 17th.

LTSS (Joyce Rooney)
- Met on December 1st;
- Actions:
  - Approved second LTSS representative to the FTA Section 5310 Application Review panel;
- Received reports on:
  - City of Downey transit services;
- Updates on:
  - ASI annual meeting;
  - UFS;
  - Officer elections scheduled for February;
- Next meeting is January 26th.

Streets and Freeways (Ed Norris)
- Met on November 17th;
- Received reports on:
  - New Caltrans federal delivery plan requirements;
  - Procedural changes in managing obligations from Caltrans;
  - Status reports from several Call for Project sponsors whose projects received extensions in 2005 on the condition that they provide updates every six months;
  - I-405 Northbound HOV project;
  - Post 1989 Retrofit Soundwall program;
  - I-5/710 Interchange Mini-study;
  - Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) performance measures;
  - Wilshire BRT demonstration project;
- Next meeting will be held on December 8th.

TDM/AQ (Mark Yamarone)
- Met on November 16th;
- Action:
  - Passed a motion on Propositions A and C Local Return guidelines, with two recommendations to allow Local Return to be used as a local match for Hazard Elimination and Safety grants for eligible pedestrian and bicycle safety improvement projects, and to allow Local Return funds to be used to design and install traffic signals required to provide safe pedestrian access to transit stops;
- Received report on:
  - Metro ridesharing;
- The next meeting will be held on January 18th.

3. Consent Calendar (Renee Berlin)
Moved by Mike Uyeno (City of Los Angeles), seconded by Paul Maselbas (County of Los Angeles), motion to approve the Consent Calendar and minutes. Steve Huang (South Bay Cities COG) and David Liu (San Gabriel Valley COG) abstained. The motion carried.

4. Chairperson's Report (Renee Berlin) Handout
- The January TAC meeting will be held on the 4th;
- The November/December Board meeting will be held December 15th;
- Ernest Morales has been appointed as Director for Metro Countywide Planning's Gateway Cities Area Team;
• Diego Cardoso, Director of the Central Area Team, has been appointed to the City of Los Angeles Planning Commission;
• Amendments to the Call for Projects grant agreements were due November 30th. New MOUs/LOAs need to be executed by December 31st;
• At the November Planning and Programming Committee meeting, the Committee members approved the RTIP Board Report, except for the recommendation with regard to advancing ACE $68.7 million from Phase II to Phase I projects. This recommendation was forwarded to the full Board for consideration;
• The 4th Annual Mobility 21 Summit was held in Long Beach on November 14th;
• Metro’s Citizen Advisory Committee named former California State Senator James R. Mills as Person of the Year. Senator Mills introduced legislation that imposed sales tax on gasoline to fund transportation development.

5. Legislative Update (Kimberly Yu, Metro)

Federal Update
No Federal Update

State Update
Proposition 42 will be a priority in the coming year. The Legislative Analysts’ office projections show $5.2 billion in surplus budget reserves for next year. This is a good sign which could result in the Governor not suspending Proposition 42. Senate Bill 1024 (Perata) has been amended to increase the bond issuance amount to $10.3 billion, of which L.A. County is guaranteed only 5.75%, or $590 million. Mr. Uyeno asked how much funding northern California would receive. Ms. Yu replied that northern California receives much more than southern California. Mr. Colaiacce asked who would distribute the funds and whether it would be allocated to specific earmark projects or by formula. Ms. Yu replied that she did not know. Ms. Yu stated that Metro will be submitting written comments requesting that any formula must have a North-South funding split that is more beneficial to Southern California. Mr. Maselbas asked if there would be a hearing on December 13th. Ms. Yu replied that the hearing on Senate Bill 1024 will take place at SCAG and will be chaired by Senator Lowenthal, chairman of the Senate Transportation Committee. Mr. Uyeno asked how the region would be represented. Ms. Yu replied that Board member Richard Katz will represent Metro, Los Angeles City Council member Wendy Greuel will represent the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles City Council member Alex Padilla will represent the League of Cities, and Los Angeles City Council member Eric Garcetti will be speaking on housing.

The California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) and the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency (BT&H) will be releasing the Goods Movement Action Plan Foundations Report: Part Two, which includes a list of high-priority projects. A total of 17 projects costing $14.4 billion have been identified. Los Angeles County projects account for $12.7 billion. Metro has submitted its list of high priority projects to both BT&H and CalEPA in an effort to have some of its projects included in the plan.

The Go California Legislative package is on hold until the Governor’s State of the State speech. At that time, the Governor’s position on these bills should be made clear.
Ms. Berlin asked about the status of the State Implementation bill for SAFETEA-LU. Ms. Yu replied that the logistics are still being developed. Frank Flores, Deputy Executive Officer for Metro’s Programming and Policy Analysis Department is taking the lead. Mr. Uyeno asked about how the equity bonus is being addressed. Ms. Yu stated that she did not know the details of this issue. Mr. Uyeno said that if there is no agreement, these new funds will go into the Caltrans SHOPP program. Lisa Rapp (Gateway Cities COG) commented that the Cities and Counties are still pushing to get a share, but that Caltrans does not like that proposal. Ms. Yu said she will bring up the Equity Bonus issue at the next SAFETEA-LU Implementation meeting.

Mr. Uyeno asked about the $5.3 billion in reserve. If repaying Proposition 42 is only going to use $1.3 billion, the difference could be used to repay Proposition 42 in future years. Mr. Mascilbas commented that the Proposition 42 borrowing was supposed to be repaid with Tribal Gaming revenues. Ms. Yu responded that hearings scheduled in January could decide if the $800 million to $1 billion in bonds could be used to repay Proposition 42.

6. The 2006 Legislative Program Goals and Activities
No report. Ms. Berlin stated that the Legislative Program Goals and Activities could be found in Attachment 4, located on page 46 of the agenda packet. The Board report was also previously emailed to TAC members.

7. 2005 Conditional Extension Project Status Reports (Renee Berlin, Metro/Project Sponsors) Handouts
Ms Berlin referred the TAC members to Attachment 5, located on page 53 of the agenda packet, for the list of projects for which updates would be given. She also stated that the attachment contained the project status information received by TAC in June 2005. The following updates were given by project sponsors. In addition, each sponsor distributed written status reports.

- Project 6390: Sepulveda Blvd. from Centinela Ave. to Lincoln Blvd. (Ken Hustings, LADOT)
  Mr. Hustings stated that an extension was granted on this project to implement a revised scope of work that was developed with community involvement and previously approved by Metro staff. The revised scope meets the original intent of the grant as approved by the Metro Board. Mr. Hustings reported that the design plans should be completed by the end of December. The bid package should be finished by February. Construction will begin in July and will take about one year to complete.

Ms. Berlin asked if the community was now supportive of the project. Mr. Hustings replied that there was tremendous support from the community. Steve Lantz (Southern California Regional Rail Authority-SCARR) asked if the project was for both street widening and a reversible lane. Mr. Hustings stated that the project was just for widening. Mr. Mascilbas asked what type of environmental document was prepared. Mr. Hustings replied that a Categorical Exemption (CE) was prepared. He
also asked if there was right-of-way required. Mr. Husting stated that there was no right-of-way acquisition. Mr. Lantz asked, if the bid and award process was taking place in February, why wasn’t construction starting before July. Mr. Husting replied that the bid and award process was commencing in February and normally takes between five and six months to complete.

- **Project 6425: Sepulveda Blvd. and Bike Lane Intersection Improvement (Ken Husting, LADOT)**
  Mr. Husting stated that this project received a two-year time extension. The project was delayed due to community opposition. As a result, LADOT revised the scope of work, which has been approved by Metro. The Board of Public Works is expected to give final approval on the task order solicitation on December 12th. Design work has already begun informally with Parsons-Brinkerhoff. It is expected that design will be completed in March, with Right-of-Way certification to be completed by June. Construction will begin in November and is scheduled to be completed by June 2007. Mr. Husting stated that a LOA amendment to reflect the new scope of work and schedule was submitted. Ms. Berlin asked if the planned seven-month construction timeline was realistic. Mr. Husting replied that the project was less extensive than originally planned, focusing on intersection improvements instead of a major widening through the Sepulveda Pass, allowing for the shorter construction period.

Steve Lantz (Metrolink) asked if community opposition would still be a problem in completing the project on time. Mr. Husting replied that the new scope was completed with input from a task force representing local stakeholders. Ms. Berlin asked about the impact to traffic on Sepulveda Blvd. Mr. Husting replied that two lanes in the appropriate direction would remain open during peak hours, but that traffic in the non-peak direction would be inconvenienced. Ms. Berlin asked if the project had the support of the bicycling community. Mr. Husting replied that they were represented on the task force and were supportive of the project.

- **Project 6327: Ocean Ave. Signal System (Gerald Tom, City of Santa Monica)**
  Mr. Tom stated that the project was delayed until the City completed its Communication Master plan to ensure a cohesive system. The process is now complete and the City plans to move forward with this project in combination with the communication plan for the rest of downtown Santa Monica. Base maps for the Ocean Ave. segment are complete, while the maps for the rest of downtown are 75% complete. The PS&E package for Ocean Ave. and the rest of downtown should be complete by February. Construction will begin in September and should be completed by February 2007. Ms. Berlin asked when the base mapping was expected to be complete, since that was the current cause of delay. Mr. Tom replied that the base maps should be complete by the end of December.

- **Project 2314: East San Gabriel Valley SOM Pilot Project (Jane White, Los Angeles County)**
  - Arcadia Controller Replacement: Ms. White stated that once plans are complete, controllers will be ordered by the County and installed by the City of Arcadia.
- Information Exchange Network: The master agreement with Transcorp has been executed. In addition, four task orders to improve the software have been executed and two are being processed.

- LACo-4E Firmware Development: This support agreement is underway.
  Traffic Control System: A factory demonstration test of the system was successfully completed in November. The associated communications systems have been delayed.

- Project 2315: Pomona Valley Traffic Signal Forum Improvement Project (Jane White, Los Angeles County)
  - TSSP: Ms. White stated that all projects have been completed, except for one along Foothill Blvd.
  - ATMS: CCTV plans are currently being reviewed by the cities. The Cities of Claremont, Diamond Bar and San Dimas will be installing their own traffic control systems.

- Project 2318: West San Gabriel Valley Signal SOM and Bus Speed Improvements (Jane White, Los Angeles County)
  - TSSP: Ms. White stated that all outstanding synchronization projects are in construction, except for Route 66 in Glendora. This project is currently in the PS&E phase and will be constructed with the Foothill Blvd. project (#2315), scheduled to be advertised in early 2006. Construction has been completed for the Whittier Blvd. Metro Rapid Bus TSSP. Currently, the County is working on the signal timing.
  - ATMS: The project concept design is 99% complete. Upon completion, the consultant will begin preparing the scope of services for detailed design and implementation.

- Project 2316: SELAC-Traffic Signal Synchronization Corridors Project (Jane White, Los Angeles County)
  - TSSP: Ms. White stated that Imperial Highway at Garfield Avenue is the last project to be advertised. This is scheduled for January 10th. Construction on another project on Lakewood Blvd. will be completed in March.
  - ATMS (I-105): The County has provided comments on the consultant’s first submittal plans for the fiber and CCTV. The second submittal is scheduled for January.
  - ATMS (I-5): The County is currently reviewing the second submittal for fiber and CCTV plans.

- Project 4221: Gateway Cities Traffic Signal Corridors Project, Phase II (Jane White, Los Angeles County)
  - TSSP: Ms. White stated that all synchronization routes are under construction and that timing work has begun. Ms. White asked Ed Norris (City of Long Beach), about the status of the Long Beach Blvd. TSSP project, which is administered by the
City of Long Beach. Mr. Norris replied that the project should be advertised in the next few weeks.

- ATMS (I-710): The conceptual design stage is almost complete.

- **Project 2214: Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) Traffic Management System** (Jane White, Los Angeles County)
  Ms. White stated that first submittal design plans for the proposed CCTV locations are scheduled to be submitted in December. The consultant is finalizing a scope of work to amend its contract to procure the Highway Advisory Radio (HAR). CMS plans are being revised by the contractors after completing the first round of the Caltrans permit process. CNET is installed in the corridor with work underway to finalize the system's configuration.

Ms. Berlin asked about the problems with the Caltrans reviews and permits that Jeff Pletyak (Los Angeles County) had reported at the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee. Ms. White replied that there have been problems with Caltrans and that she would like the permit process to run more smoothly. Alberto Angelini (Caltrans) stated that he would look into the problem.

- **Project 2356: South Bay Signal Synchronization and Bus Speed Improvements TSSP** (Jane White, Los Angeles County)
  - TSSP: Ms. White stated that all projects are complete, except for timing on Sepulveda Blvd.

  - ITS: Plans have been received for CCTV and fiber optics on Hawthorne Blvd. Controller and cabinet upgrades are currently being performed. Proposals for wireless communications systems for the first 51 intersections are due December 12th. If successful, this contract could be implemented countywide.

- **Project 2346: Pomona Regional Transit Center Security System Project** (David Johnson, City of Pomona)
  Pomona City Council approved the bid on November 21st. The Contractor will begin the project on December 13th. The project will be complete by the end of January.

- **Project 6393: East Downtown Truck Access Improvements** (Vahik Vartanians, LADOT)
  Survey and base maps have been completed. The design will be complete by May. The bid-and-award process will commence in May and be complete in October. Construction will begin soon after and is scheduled for June 2007 completion.

- **Project 6297: Compton TMOC and Retrofit of City Traffic Signal System** (Charles Bergson, City of Compton)
  No report. Mr. Bergson will report to the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee on December 8th.
8. CI'C Update (Tim Papandreou, Metro)
No update

9. Caltrans Delivery Plan Requirement (Kaileh Honish, Metro)
Ms. Honish referred TAC members to Attachment 6, located on page 65 of the agenda packet. All local agencies requiring Federal Obligation Authority (OA) were required to complete and return the Delivery Plan form no later than November 28th. The delivery plan requirement applies to all federal funding sources, including RSTP, CMAQ, STPL, HBRR, TEA, etc, for which sponsors will request authorization to proceed from Caltrans during FFY 06. Some agencies have not yet submitted their information. Ms. Honish requested that all agencies submit the required information to her as soon as possible. If agencies will not be using federal funds this year, please notify her so that she can mark your jurisdiction as responding.

10. Caltrans Procedural Changes in Managing Obligations (Kirk Cessna, Caltrans)
Ms. Berlin referred TAC members to Attachment 7, located on page 67 of the agenda packet. Ms. Berlin stated that this memo discusses procedural changes in managing federal obligations and under what circumstances funds will be lapsed. Mr. Cessna will discuss this issue at the December 5th Streets and Freeways subcommittee meeting.

11. 2006 Long Range Transportation Plan (Heather Hills, Metro)
Ms. Hills stated that Metro staff is currently modeling financial data and is working with its travel demand model. As requested by the Metro Board, performance measures which will be used to evaluate projects were presented to the Planning and Programming Committee, Finance and Budget Committee and Executive Management and Audit Committee in November. Performance measures being used to develop the recommended plan are mobility, air quality, cost effectiveness and environmental justice. For the Strategic plan, corridor level performance and a project-level modeling analysis will be used. Depending on whether available funding is identified during the plan period, these projects could move forward into the funded plan.

12. New Business
No new business.

13. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 a.m. The next meeting will be held on January 4, 2006 in the Union Station Room, 3rd Floor, at 9:30 a.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>1. Dan Beal/Marianne Kim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (BOS)</td>
<td>1. Andre Calafia/Blynn Kernaghan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. David Reyno/Dana Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL</td>
<td>1. Capt. Susan Coulls/Lt. Joe Vizcarra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>1. Raja Mitwasi/Alberto Angelini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rose Casey/Kirk Cessna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVE ON ADA</td>
<td>1. Vacant/Mitch Portentantz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1. Sumi Gant/Ed Norris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>1. James Okazaki/James Lepton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Haripal Vir/Mike Uyeno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Gina Mancha/Ron Olive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>Mark Herwick/David Cowardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Maselbas/Maged El-Rabaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick V. DeChellis/Shari Afshari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES</td>
<td>Greg Herrmann/Cathi Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td>Desi Alvarez/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities COG</td>
<td>Jim Thorsen/Tom Gdala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes Malibu Conejo COG</td>
<td>Mark Bozigian/Tom Horne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td>David Liu/Dan Rix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
<td>Steven Huang/Victor Rollinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td>David Feinberg/Art Ida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side Cities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE (LTSS)                                      | 1. \(\text{Signatures}\)  
|                                                                             | Jono Besharian/Thomas Uwal  
|                                                                             | 2. \(\text{Signatures}\)  
|                                                                             | Joyce Rooney/Bertha Tafoya |
| METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (MTA)                                 | 1. \(\text{Signatures}\)  
|                                                                             | Renee Berlin/Randy Lamm  
|                                                                             | Countywide Planning & Development  
|                                                                             | 2. \(\text{Signatures}\)  
|                                                                             | Carolyn Flowers/Andrea Burnside  
|                                                                             | MTA Operations |
| SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY (SCERRA - Ex-Officio)           | 1. \(\text{Signatures}\)  
|                                                                             | Steve Lantz/Deandra Knox |
| SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SCAQMD -- Ex-Officio)          | 1. \(\text{Signatures}\)  
|                                                                             | Eyvonne Sells/Kathryn Higgins |
| SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG -- Ex-Officio)         | 1. \(\text{Signatures}\)  
|                                                                             | Joseph Alcock/Annie Nam |
| GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)                                  | 1. \(\text{Signatures}\)  
|                                                                             | LaDonna DiCamillo/Ron Guss |
| TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/ AIR QUALITY SUBCOMMITTEE                  | 1. \(\text{Signatures}\)  
|                                                                             | Mark Yamaneone/Phil Aker  
|                                                                             | 2. \(\text{Signatures}\)  
|                                                                             | Robert Newman/Brooke Geer Person |
## TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

### Attendance Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Finnegan/ Marianne Kim (A)</td>
<td>AUTO CLUB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andre Coelho/Bryan Kernaghan (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kiyokoe/ Dan Lee (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Bill Dandola/ Vic Vazquez (A)</td>
<td>GHP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilar Mijares/ Alberto Angelini</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Cassy/ Kirk Cassie (A)</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Whitley/Bob Pomerantz (A)</td>
<td>CITIZENS REP ON ADA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunil Gan/gEd Norris (A)</td>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Osorio/ James Elison (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harpal Vir/ Mike Uyong (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Montalvo/Ron Olive (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Heuwix/ David Cowardin (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bagnell/Scott Schnee (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick DeChello/ Olver Guleen (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg Hennemann/ Cath Cole (A)</td>
<td>ARROYO VERDE CITY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Alvarez/Lisa Rapp (A)</td>
<td>GATEWAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Thorp/ Tom Ocate (A)</td>
<td>LAS VEGAS MALIBU CONLIO COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Riehl/ David Liu (A)</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL CITIES COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Huang/ Vic Robinson (A)</td>
<td>SOUTH BAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Finksey/ Art Ida (A)</td>
<td>WEST SIDE CITIES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Bokhian/ Tom Horn (A)</td>
<td>NORTH L.A. COUNTY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Baghda/ Maria Gomberg (A)</td>
<td>LTSS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Abom/ Barbara Talbot (A)</td>
<td>LTSS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feena Bartlett/ Randy Lemmon (A)</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Frazier/ Andrea Burns (A)</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Lark/ Derek Knox (A)</td>
<td>SCRA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyse Silver/ Kathyrn Higgin (A)</td>
<td>SCRAM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Abol/Marie Nnam</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaJavion/ Regina Larn (A)</td>
<td>GOGO MOVEMENT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Yamamoto/ Phil Aker (A)</td>
<td>TDMAC SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Newman/ Robert Persson (A)</td>
<td>TDMAC SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Johnson</td>
<td>City of Pomona</td>
<td>909-620-2481</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dave-johnson@ci.pomona.ca">dave-johnson@ci.pomona.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walt Davis</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>213-922-3079</td>
<td><a href="mailto:DavisW@Metro.Net">DavisW@Metro.Net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Grace</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>(213)9224848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:GRACEJ@METRO.NET">GRACEJ@METRO.NET</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Chen</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>(213)922-3041</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chenp@metro.net">chenp@metro.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailich Honish</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>(213)922-3046</td>
<td><a href="mailto:HONISHK@METRO.NET">HONISHK@METRO.NET</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Hoendorf</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>183-922-3039</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Hoendorf@metro.net">Hoendorf@metro.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Maloney</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>213-922-2306</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Maloneym@metro.net">Maloneym@metro.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Husting</td>
<td>LA DOT</td>
<td>213-972-5208</td>
<td><a href="mailto:khusing@dot.lacity.org">khusing@dot.lacity.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane White</td>
<td>LA County DPW</td>
<td>626-300-2020</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jwhite@ladpw.org">jwhite@ladpw.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilawar Khandker</td>
<td>City of LA</td>
<td>213-897-0887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vahik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HAND OUTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Agency that I believe this project is for</th>
<th>Complete list of Los Angeles County Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3098</td>
<td>Agoura Hills</td>
<td>Modify and reconfigure Kanata Road interchange along US101 in Agoura Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>Santa Anita Avenue Corridor Improvement Project, Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>Reconstruct Azusa Ave and San Gabriel Ave for two way traffic in Azusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1285</td>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>Rehabilitate pavement on Azusa Avenue and San Gabriel Ave in Azusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3771</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Mission Blvd / SR-71 interchange - Corridor Improvements in Pomona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Will add landscaping enhancements along the Ronald Reagan Freeway Route 118 for aesthetic purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Begin construction of road from US 395 west towards SR-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Mission Blvd / SR-71 interchange - Corridor Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Construct one additional all purpose lane in each direction on I-405 and provide additional capital improvements from SR-73 through the LA County Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>I-5 HOV improvements from R-134 to R-170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Construct I-605 interchange capacity improvements in Irwindale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3085</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Widen and reconstruct Washington Blvd from westerly city boundary at Verno to I-5 Fwy at Telegraph Rd in Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>Construct safe access to streets for bicyclists and pedestrians including crosswalks, sidewalks and traffic calming measures, Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2978</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>Develop conceptual master plan to improve the efficiency of transportation facilities, Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>Construct new left turn lane at the State Route 19 and Telstar in El Monte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Gardena</td>
<td>Gardena, CA Purchase of alternative fuel buses for service expansion, on board security system and bus facility training equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2514</td>
<td>LA County</td>
<td>Widen Atlantic Blvd bridge over Los Angeles river in Vernon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>Long Beach, CA Museum of Latin American Art, Long Beach to build intermodal park and ride facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>Monrovia, California - Transit Village Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Montebello</td>
<td>Montebello, CA Bus Lines Bus Fleet Replacement Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Norwalk</td>
<td>Norwalk, CA Transit System Bus Procurement and Los Angeles World Airport Remote Fly-Away Facility Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>891</td>
<td>Pico Rivera</td>
<td>Rosemead Boulevard/Highway 19 renovation project, Pico Rivera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>San Gabriel Valley CA - Football Transit Park and Rides Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>Santa Monica, CA Purchase and service LNG buses for Santa Monica's Big Blue Bus to meet increased rider ship needs and reduce emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>Santa Monica, CA Construct intermodal park and ride facility at Santa Monica College campus on South Bundy Drive near Airport Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3229</td>
<td>Santa Monica Mountain</td>
<td>Construction and enhancements of trails in the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>Santa Monica Mountain</td>
<td>Scenic preservation and run off mitigation in the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area near PCH and US101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3807</td>
<td>SCAGMD</td>
<td>Diesel Emission Reduction Program of South Coast Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 7, 2005

To: Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority / Technical Advisory Committee

From: David L. Johnson, Public Works Superintendent
City of Pomona Representative

SUBJECT: Status Report on Pomona Regional Transit Center Security System Project - Call for Project # 2346

On July 6, 2005, Pomona City staff made a presentation to the MTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) regarding the deobligation of $52,288 from the FY1995/1996 Transportation Improvement Grant and were successful in securing the funding and using it for the security camera system upgrades at the Pomona Regional Transit Center. As was indicated in the presentation, Request for bids for the Security Camera Upgrade were sent out the first week of May and the City received one responsible bid from Inland Empire Security of Montclair for a total of $82,497.86. In July 2005, the City of Pomona also requested $31,000 from Proposition C Local Return Program Funds to complete the funding of the project. In September, the City was notified by MTA that their request for the additional funding was approved. A City Council Report on the appropriation of $82,498 of Prop C and Miscellaneous Grant funding and the Award of Contract to Inland Empire Security of Montclair was presented to Council and approved on November 21, 2005. The contractor ordered the equipment and material for the job and staff met with the contractor on site on November 29, 2005 to go over the schedule. The project will begin on December 13, 2003 and will take approximately 30 working days to complete, with project completion being scheduled for the mid-January, 2006.
CITY OF LOS ANGELES

DECEMBER 7, 2005

EAST DOWNTOWN TRUCK ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS

ENGINEERING

PRESENT: DESIGNING FOR THE FUTURE

LADOT
Moving LA Forward
City of Los Angeles and MTA are currently processing to execute MOU for this project. Concurrent with the MOU activities, City of Los Angeles started its design activities in July 2005, and completed survey, base and substructure maps in October 2005. The City of Los Angeles held design kick-off meeting on October 25, 2005. The design and construction for four elements of this project is scheduled as follows: 50% design by December 22, 2005, 75% design by February 2, 2006, 95% design by March 29, 2006, 100% design by May 12, 2006, bid and award May 2006 thru October 2006, construction October 2006 thru June 2007. The design for two elements of work is to start in May 2006 and to be completed by June 2007.
ARCADIA CONTROLLER REPLACEMENT

Plans are continually being developed for specific intersections requiring replacements of 170 controllers within the City of Arcadia. Once plans are complete, the controllers will be ordered by the County to be installed by the City.

INFORMATION EXCHANGE NETWORK

The Master Agreement has been executed. The Consultant has completed the Series 2000 CDI Modifications task and begun working on the following tasks: ATMS Explorer Diagram, IEN Site Integration ATP, and IEN Project Web-Site. The Scope of Work for the IEN Graphics Conversion & Map Database Migration task is being revised by the consultant. The LADOT-to-IEN XML Interface Connection task is under review by Public Works. It should be noted this task will not be funded with MTA funds, but with an AQMD grant.

LACO-4E FIRMWARE DEVELOPMENT

The purchase order for this agreement has been executed and will be valid for Fiscal Year 05-06. The first task for a Battery Backup System routine has been developed and completed. It will be evaluated and tested by County staff. The County has received three additional fee proposals for minor modifications from the consultant on additional tasks, and they are under review.

TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM

The Factory Demonstration Test, including LACO-4E, was successfully completed in mid-November. This is the first stage of System Acceptance. The equipment will be installed at the County TMC for further testing and staff training during the month of January. System installation has been delayed till mid-2006 due to delays associated with the procurement of the communications system to connect the signals.
#2315 POMONA VALLEY
TRAFFIC SIGNAL FORUM IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

TSSP

TSSP design improvements are continuing on Foothill Boulevard.

POMONA VALLEY ATMS PROJECT

Completed traffic communication needs assessment for the cities of Diamond Bar and Pomona to determine the best way to use their existing infrastructure with the proposed project. CCTV prioritization criteria was finalized and we selected 8 locations to install CCTV cameras. In addition, we added 7 cameras (3 in Diamond Bar, 3 in Industry, and 1 in County) to be financed with agency funds. First submittal plans were submitted for County and agency review on December 2, 2005. Second submittal plans for the fiber optic line on Collma Road is under review by the County. Procurement is moving ahead for the Cities of Claremont and Diamond Bar. A purchase order for the City of Diamond Bar's Local Control Site (LCC) was approved and construction has begun. The City of Claremont's draft cooperative agreement with the County to procure the City's Traffic Control System was approved by their City Council. The Cities of Claremont and Diamond Bar will be installing Kimley-Horn's KITS traffic control system. We are still waiting for the City of San Dimas to select their traffic control system.

#2318 WEST SAN GABRIEL VALLEY
SIGNAL SSM AND BUS SPEED IMPROVEMENTS

TSSP

The construction of the Whittier Boulevard Metro Rapid Bus TSSP project has been completed. Currently, we are working on the timing of this project.

Garfield Avenue (southerly segment) TSSP has been advertised. Construction started on 8/15/05 with an expected completion date by the end of this year.

The City of Glendora's purchase order to replace controllers on Route 66 has been processed. It is currently in the PS&E phase and will be constructed with the Foothill Blvd TSSP project scheduled for advertising in early 2006.

WEST SAN GABRIEL VALLEY ATMS PROJECT

The consultant has submitted the draft Conceptual Design Report and it is under review. The consultant is finalizing preliminary cost estimates to determine what to implement with project funding. A Conceptual Design workshop was held in November to obtain preliminary City review and concurrence on the proposed improvements. Once the proposed list of improvements is finalized, the consultant will submit the scope of services for the detailed design and implementation phase of the project.
#2316 SELAC
TRAFFIC SYNCHRONIZATION CORRIDORS PROJECT

TSSP PROJECTS

Construction clearance has been obtained for the Imperial Highway at Garfield Avenue project, and it scheduled to be advertised on January 10, 2006. Lakewood Boulevard TSSP between Paramount Place and Steams Street is under construction and scheduled to be completed in March 2006.

I-105 CORRIDOR ATMS PROJECT

The County has provided comments on the fiber and CCTV first submittal plans. The second submittal is scheduled to be submitted in January. The consultant is currently working on a fee proposal to prepare an RFP to procure a traffic control system (TCS) for the City of Santa Fe Springs. The co-operative agreement between the City of Downey and the County for the City's TCS was approved by the County Board of Supervisors. The City is currently re-evaluating traffic control system options. Econolite is working on a proposal to furnish the City of South Gate with the icons TCS. Negotiations with Econolite to furnish their TCS for the City of Norwalk are near completion. South Gate has also received a fee proposal for the construction of their traffic management center and it is under review.

I-5/TELEGRAPH ROAD CORRIDOR ATMS PROJECT

The County is currently reviewing the second submittal fiber and CCTV plans. The consultant is prepared an RFP for a video distribution system, and it is under review by the County. A fee proposal to upgrade the existing traffic control system for the City of Commerce's QuicNet II to QuicNet IV is being prepared. In addition, the consultant is currently evaluating the existing communications infrastructure within the City.
#4221 GATEWAY CITIES
TRAFFIC SIGNAL CORRIDORS PROJECT, PHASE II

TSSP

Construction continued on the Alondra Boulevard, Bellflower Boulevard, Eastern/Garfield/Cherry Avenue and Pacific/Long Beach Boulevard TSSP projects. Timing was completed on the Santa Fe Avenue TSSP project. Plans are being finalized for the Long Beach Boulevard (City Administered) TSSP project.

I-710 CORRIDOR ATMS PROJECT

Consultant has submitted the draft Local Control Center Analysis and Recommendations Report, and is currently developing the draft ATMS Alternative Analysis and Recommendations Report and draft Communications System Alternative Analysis & Recommendations Report. The City of Long Beach will request a scope of work from Bitran to develop a command data interface (CDI) for the IEN once Bitran's proposals to complete this interface for the Cities of Burbank and Glendale has been completed.
The consultant continued to work on the detailed design and implementation phase of the Pacific Coast Highway Advanced Traffic Management System project. First submittal design plans for the proposed CCTV locations is scheduled to be submitted in December. Consensus was reached on specific sites for Highway Advisory Radio (HAR) installations and the necessary plan development to obtain Caltrans permits was begun with an expected delivery in December. The consultant is currently working on finalizing scope to execute a change order/supplemental agreement to construct/install the HAR system. Final CMS plans are being developed with an expected submission in early January. CTNET is installed in the corridor with work underway to finalize the system's configuration.

#2356 SOUTH BAY
SIGNAL SYNCHRONIZATION AND BUS SPEED IMPROVEMENTS TSSP

TSSP

The County is preparing timing for Sepulvoda Boulevard TSSP project. All other tasks have been completed to date.

SOUTH BAY ITS PROJECTS

The consultant has completed the equipment lists and architecture diagrams for the local city traffic control centers. Currently, the consultant is preparing an RFP for wireless communications systems for the first 51 intersections to be connected to the County's traffic control system. In addition, the consultant is preparing a PS&E package for seven CCTV camera locations, as well as a PS&E package for deployment of fiber optics along Hawthorne Boulevard between Century Boulevard and Artesia Boulevard. The County is upgrading controllers and cabinets at the "First 51" intersections. The consultant is working with the City of Torrance to procure a new TCS and with the City of Gardena to upgrade their existing TCS.
December 7, 2005

Sepulveda Blvd. Widening - Centinela Ave. to Lincoln Blvd.

Status Report

At the June 2005 MTA TAC meeting, LADOT requested and was granted a two-year time extension for the Sepulveda Boulevard Reversible Lane project due to community opposition and changes in the scope of work. Since then, LADOT has been working with the Bureaus of Engineering, Street Lighting, and Street Services to expedite the completion of the design. It is anticipated that the engineering plans will be completed by the end of December 2005. Bid and Award will take place in February 2006 with project construction starting in July 2006 and ending in June 2007. LADOT has also been working with MTA to amend the Letter of Agreement to reflect the new scope of work and schedule.
Sepulveda Blvd. Reversible and Bike Lane and Intersection Improvements

Status Report

At the June 2005 MTA TAC meeting, LADOT requested and was granted a two-year time extension for the Sepulveda Boulevard Reversible Lane project due to community opposition and changes in the scope of work. Since then, LADOT has been working with the Bureau of Engineering to create a schedule to complete the project within two years. It was decided that a private consultant from the Bureau of Engineering’s on-call list be brought on board to expedite the design phase. LADOT and the Bureau of Engineering have been providing the consultant with the information it needs to prepare the design. Final approval of the consultant’s contract by the City’s Board of Public Works is scheduled for December 12, 2005. Design is anticipated to be completed in March 2006, right-of-way certification in June 2006, award construction in November 2006, and construction completion in June 2007. LADOT has also been working with MTA to amend the Letter of Agreement to reflect the new scope of work and schedule.
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Draft Local Return Guidelines
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidelines Area</th>
<th>1999 Guidelines</th>
<th>Proposed Revision</th>
<th>Reason/Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Return as a match to grant funds</td>
<td>Current guidelines do not address this issue.</td>
<td>LR can be used as a match to grant funds, provided the projects are LR eligible.</td>
<td>To clarify and ensure consistent guideline interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Transit Service</td>
<td>Has language regarding making trips available to the public, but local jurisdictions' interpretations and implementation practices have varied.</td>
<td>New language requiring local jurisdictions to advertise all trips to the public.</td>
<td>To ensure that recreational transit trips are made available to the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Improvements (codes 150, 160, 170)</td>
<td>Current language reads: Amenities should be within 8 feet to the stop.</td>
<td>Language will be changed to read: Improvements must be located within 25 feet of the bus stop sign post or have one edge or end within that area.</td>
<td>To accommodate street furniture items and power sources to provide bus stop lighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning (project code 270)</td>
<td>The guidelines do not currently address certain “planning and coordination costs”, such as membership dues, other costs for start-up and continuation of COG’s, JPA’s and TMA’s, and advocacy.</td>
<td>Planning and coordination costs will be allowed, provided the agencies are planning projects which are eligible for LR funds.</td>
<td>To clarify the issue and ensure consistent guideline interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Improvement (under street improvements project codes 440, 450 and 460)</td>
<td>Current language does not describe or define eligible safety projects.</td>
<td>New language requiring a direct benefit to both transit and safety.</td>
<td>To clarify eligible uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Administration (project code 480)</td>
<td>Current guidelines are not clear on the cap, i.e. “shall not exceed 20% of the LR approved project budget”.</td>
<td>20% cap will apply to annual expenditures.</td>
<td>Change will provide consistent interpretation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2007 Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines – Major Technical Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidelines Area</th>
<th>1999 Guidelines</th>
<th>Proposed Revisions</th>
<th>Reason/Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. PROGRAM SUMMARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description Form - Form A</td>
<td>Current language reads: Required for all transit, paratransit, administration projects with a 25% or greater change in approved project budget</td>
<td>Language will be changed to read: Required for all operating and capital projects with a 25% or greater change in approved Local Return project budget</td>
<td>All project budgets, including operating and capital budgets, that change more than 25% should be approved by Metro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description Form - Form A</td>
<td>Boxes are shown on form, which are to be checked off to indicate accessibility features at bus stops.</td>
<td>Boxes added to specify additional accessibility features; form streamlined</td>
<td>Request from the Board for additional accessibility information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Project Update Form - Form B</td>
<td>Blank form available in electronic spreadsheet or hard copy form.</td>
<td>Electronic form now available pre-loaded with cities' projects</td>
<td>To facilitate data input and ensure accuracy of local jurisdictions' and Metro's records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Expenditure Report - Form C</td>
<td>Blank form available in electronic spreadsheet or hard copy form.</td>
<td>Electronic form now available pre-loaded with cities' projects; summary section expanded.</td>
<td>To facilitate data input and ensure accuracy of local jurisdictions' and Metro's records; expanded information will facilitate audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. PROJECT ELIGIBILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit Services – Operating (project codes 110-140)</td>
<td>Current guidelines place restrictions on school services</td>
<td>No change to language. Section moved to improve organization and clarity of the language.</td>
<td>To clarify and ensure consistent guideline interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Transit Service</td>
<td>Current guidelines do not include Kern County in eligible area.</td>
<td>Map and language changed to make trips in nearby Kern County eligible</td>
<td>To ensure equity for the North County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Security (project codes 220 &amp; 230)</td>
<td>The language currently exists under Rail (project codes 360,370 &amp; 390)</td>
<td>Language will be added under project code for Transit Security:</td>
<td>The proposed change will consolidate transit security projects for all modes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridesharing (project code 260)/Transportation Demand</td>
<td>Project code currently set to allow for vanpool/carpool formation/subsidy/operation, and ride matching programs.</td>
<td>Deleted project code since it duplicates project code 410 –</td>
<td>Recommend deleting redundant project code.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## 2007 Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines – Major Technical Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidelines Area</th>
<th>1999 Guidelines</th>
<th>Proposed Revisions</th>
<th>Reason/Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management (project code 410)</td>
<td>TDM projects allow for vanpool formation, operation, new rider subsidy, and ride matching programs.</td>
<td>Category added: Eligible projects may include building rehabilitation and restoration for transportation-related purposes. Project itself must be LR eligible.</td>
<td>These projects are funded by the federal government as important transportation projects. Local Return funds could be used to match federal funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Enhancement (project codes 300 and 310)</td>
<td>Current language does not exist. Add, match to TEA grants</td>
<td>New language added restricting jurisdictions from using LR funds to alter signal timing that was implemented under a traffic form unless coordinated with all affected local jurisdictions in the corridor</td>
<td>To ensure that traffic forum signal plans are fully implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Synchronization (project code 400) (PROP A and C)</td>
<td>No language currently addressing local jurisdictions changing signal timing.</td>
<td>Language added to allow eligibility of operational costs of bus priority systems and technologies that allow the sharing of traffic data across multi-jurisdictional or inter-community systems. Eligible costs would include: lease lines for communication; software licenses and maintenance; hardware maintenance, repair and warranties; and upgrades and enhancements for software or hardware.</td>
<td>The capital costs of the IEN are funded through Metro’s regional Call-for-Projects (CFP) process. This would allow continued funding for operation of the systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Synchronization (project code 400) (PROP C ONLY)</td>
<td>Current language does not exist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Demand Management (TDM) (project code 410) (PROP C ONLY)</td>
<td>The language currently reads: TDM projects require a public transit benefit.</td>
<td>• The language “require a public transit benefit” will be retained under Proposition A and deleted under Proposition C. • Vanpool operations allowed</td>
<td>• The new language differentiates between Proposition A and Proposition C. • Change made for clarity and consistent guideline interpretation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2007 Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines – Major Technical Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidelines Area</th>
<th>1999 Guidelines</th>
<th>Proposed Revisions</th>
<th>Reason/Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bikeways and Bike Lanes (project code 430)</td>
<td>Bikeway projects allowed but only allowed for employment-related destinations.</td>
<td>Language added that allows for bike parking rather than lockers only, and broader definition of commuter purpose, allowing non-work utilitarian trips.</td>
<td>New language broadens eligibility slightly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PROP C ONLY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Effort Requirements (under street improvements project codes 440, 450 and 460) (PROP C ONLY)</td>
<td>Current language referenced Prop. 111; exceptions may be allowed on a case by case basis if it is difficult for jurisdictions to meet MOE requirement.</td>
<td>Language added that does not reference Prop. 111. Metro will accept the State Controller's finding of a jurisdiction's compliance with the California Streets and Highways Code.</td>
<td>The MOE requirement did not change – the language was updated to exclude any specific reference to Propositions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Management System (PMS) (project code 470)</td>
<td>Current language allows only one-time development cost; requires biennial update</td>
<td>Language modified to allow upgrade or replacement of obsolete system; local jurisdictions will now be required to update PMS's triennially rather than biennially.</td>
<td>Many cities need to replace obsolete systems. Not feasible for larger jurisdictions to survey all roads within 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) (project codes 210, 400, 410 and potentially others)</td>
<td>Current Guidelines do not address Countywide ITS Policy</td>
<td>Language added: local return projects with an ITS component must follow Los Angeles Countywide ITS policy. Appendix added: summary of ITS policy and procedures, and ITS self-certification form.</td>
<td>The Board has adopted an ITS policy, covering all local, state and federal funds programmed or administered by Metro.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. METRO'S ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Maintenance of Effort</th>
<th>The Guidelines were approved prior to the final implementation of Access Services. New language will reflect the current need for cities to continue their minimum level of service.</th>
<th>To assure adequate funding for services to meet the needs of those who are unable to use regular fixed route public transit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Coordination process</td>
<td>Current language did not identify current responsible department.</td>
<td>Updated language to reflect current responsible department. Adamant change made for clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursement</td>
<td>No current language exists. Current practice is to clarify reimbursement on Form A.</td>
<td>Includes language that allows jurisdictions to use LR funds in advance of other grant funds, as long as no impact – change made for clarity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidelines Area</th>
<th>1999 Guidelines</th>
<th>Proposed Revisions</th>
<th>Reason/Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV. FINANCE SECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td>as LR funds are returned to the fund and the project itself is eligible under LR Guidelines. Additionally, see change under Audit Findings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Transit Database (NTD)</td>
<td>Policy and procedures did not exist.</td>
<td>Language added to reflect current NTD policies and examples of applicable projects</td>
<td>No impact – change made for clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. AUDIT SECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matrix will be used as work program for audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix of audit areas/tasks and penalties for non-compliance</td>
<td>Current audit matrix does not address many of the conditions requirements of the guidelines.</td>
<td>Matrix expanded to cover all major elements of the guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDICES</td>
<td></td>
<td>ITS Policy and Self-Certification Form added; Glossary added</td>
<td>ITS Policy section added to facilitate ITS Policy compliance; glossary added for clarity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. PROGRAM SUMMARY

A. INTRODUCTION

The Proposition A and Proposition C Programs are funded by two 1/2 cent sales tax measures approved by Los Angeles County voters to finance a Transit Development Program. The Proposition A tax measure was approved in 1980 and the Proposition C tax measure was approved in 1990. Collection of the taxes began on July 1, 1982, and April 1, 1991, respectively.

Twenty-five percent of the Proposition A tax and twenty percent of the Proposition C tax is designated for the Local Return (LR) Program funds to be used by cities and the County (Jurisdictions) in developing and/or improving public transit, para-transit, and the related transportation infrastructure.

LR funds are allocated and distributed monthly to Jurisdictions on a "per capita" basis by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro).

1. PROPOSITION A LOCAL RETURN FUNDS

The Proposition A Ordinance requires that LR funds be used exclusively to benefit public transit. Expenditures related to fixed route and para-transit services, Transportation Demand Management, Transportation Systems Management and fare subsidy programs that exclusively benefit transit are all eligible uses of Proposition A LR funds. Proposition A LR funds may also be traded to other Jurisdictions in exchange for general or other funds.

2. PROPOSITION C LOCAL RETURN FUNDS

The Proposition C Ordinance directs that the LR funds also be used to benefit public transit, as described above, but provides an expanded list of eligible project expenditures including, Congestion Management Programs, bikeways and bike lanes, street improvements supporting public transit service, and Pavement Management System projects. Proposition C funds cannot be traded.

The tables in Appendix I, page 36, summarize the Proposition A and Proposition C LR Programs and the respective eligible project expenditures.

B. GENERAL PROVISIONS CONCERNING PROPOSITION A AND PROPOSITION C LOCAL RETURN EXPENDITURES

Jurisdictions are required to use LR funds for developing and/or improving public transit service. As a general rule, an expenditure that is eligible for funding under one or more existing state or federal transit funding programs would also be an eligible LR fund expenditure provided that the project does not duplicate an existing regional or municipal transit service, project or program.
Allocation of LR funds to and expenditure by Jurisdictions shall be subject to the following conditions:

1. **TIMELY USE OF FUNDS**

   Metro will enforce regulations to insure the timely use of LR funds. Under the Proposition A and Proposition C Ordinances, Jurisdictions have three years to expend LR funds. Funds must be expended within three years of the last day of the fiscal year in which funds were originally allocated. Therefore, by method of calculation, each Jurisdiction has the Fiscal Year of allocation plus three years to expend Proposition A and/or Proposition C funds. For example, a Jurisdiction receiving funds during FY 2005-06 must expend those funds, and any interest or other income earned from Proposition A and/or Proposition C projects, by June 30, 2009.

2. **AUDIT OF PROPOSITION A AND PROPOSITION C FUNDS**

   Jurisdictions shall annually account, through a fiscal and compliance audit, to Metro on the use of LR funds. The Audit Section, (Section V, page 33), details Project Expenditure Criteria, Allowable Costs, Audit Deliverables, and Administrative Accounting Procedures.

3. **INELIGIBLE USE OF FUNDS**

   If LR funds have been expended prior to Metro approval and/or used for ineligible purposes, Jurisdictions will be required to reimburse their Proposition A or C LR account, including interest and/or earned income, as indicated in the Audit Section (page 33).

   Stand alone projects, such as, lighting, landscaping, traffic signals, storm drains, or Transportation Planning projects unrelated to an eligible project, are not eligible.

4. **STANDARD ASSURANCES**

   If a new Jurisdiction is formed within Los Angeles County, Metro will require that a Standard Assurances and Understanding agreement be submitted prior to participation in the LR Program. A sample Standard Assurance and Understanding Agreement form is included as Appendix II (see page 37).
C. **PROPOSITION A AND PROPOSITION C FORMS AND SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS**

To maintain eligibility and meet LR Program compliance requirements, Jurisdictions shall submit a Project Description (Form A) as required, an Annual Project Update (Form B) and Annual Expenditure Report (Form C). Form submittal information is detailed in the Administrative Process section, page 21. Sample forms along with instructions for their completion are included as Appendix VIII (page 49). An electronic version is available on the website @www.Metro.net (under Projects/Programs; Local Return Program).

**Project Description Form (Form A)**

Jurisdictions shall submit for approval a Project Description Form prior to the expenditure of funds for: 1) a new project; 2) a new route; 3) a 25 percent change (increase or decrease) in route or revenue vehicle miles for an established LR funded transit service; 4) a 0.75 miles or greater service change that duplicates/overlays an existing transit service; or 5) a 25 percent or greater change in an approved LR project budget or scope on all operating or capital LR projects.

**Annual Project Update (Form B)**

Jurisdictions shall submit on or before August 1 of each fiscal year an Annual Project Update to provide current information on all approved on-going and carryover LR projects. Metro will review and accept or return the report for changes. Cities shall report the anticipated expenditure cash flow amounts for the covered fiscal year.

**Annual Expenditure Report (Form C)**

On or before October 15th of each fiscal year, the Jurisdictions shall submit an Annual Expenditure Report to provide an update on previous year LR fund receipts and expenditures.

The following provides a summary of form use and due dates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>DETERMINATION</th>
<th>DUE DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Description Form - Form A</td>
<td>New and amended projects</td>
<td>Any time during the year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Project Update - Form B</td>
<td>All on-going and/or capital (carryover) projects</td>
<td>August 1st of each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Expenditure Report - Form C</td>
<td>Report expenditures</td>
<td>October 15th of each year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*METRO Appeals Process:*

If a Jurisdiction's proposed project is formally denied by Metro project manager, the Jurisdiction may request a formal appeal. See Section III METRO's Administration Process - Appeal of eligibility.
II. PROJECT ELIGIBILITY
The Proposition A and Proposition C Ordinances specify that LR funds are to be used for “public transit purposes” as defined by the following: “A proposed expenditure of funds shall be deemed to be for public transit purposes to the extent that it can reasonably be expected to sustain or improve the quality and safety of and/or access to public transit services by the general public or those requiring special public transit assistance.”

For simplification and user ease, project categories that share common eligibility requirements and/or project code designations are defined and listed as either Proposition A and Proposition C Eligible, Proposition A Exclusive, or Proposition C Exclusive. Local Return can be used as a match to grant programs such as the Metro Call for Projects, the Safe Routes to School, and the Hazard Elimination and Safety programs, so long as the projects are LR eligible. Note: The following project eligibility criteria provide for general guidance only and are not the sole determinants for project approval. The authority to determine the eligibility of an expenditure rests solely with Metro. Jurisdictions may appeal projects deemed ineligible as described in Section III, Metro’s Administrative Process, page 22.

A. ELIGIBLE USES OF PROPOSITION A AND PROPOSITION C

1. PUBLIC TRANSIT SERVICES - OPERATING (Codes 110, 120, 130 & 140)
New or expanded Transit or Paratransit services are subject to review under the Service Coordination Process (SCP) as detailed in Section III, page 24. The process will, in part, determine the proposed service’s compatibility with the existing regional bus transit system provided by Metro and services provided by the municipal transit operators. Metro may request that modification be made to proposed services that duplicate or compete with existing services. Proposed services must also meet the criteria outlined under Non-exclusive School Service and Specialized Transit discussed on the following page. Note that Emergency Medical Transportation is not an eligible use of LR funds.

Exclusive school bus services are not eligible. The following conditions apply to codes 110 through 140:
- The bus Vehicles utilized cannot be marked “School Bus” or feature graphics that in any way indicate they are not available to the general public. Yellow paint schemes should not be for the specific purpose of meeting the vehicle code definition of a school bus
- The bus Head Sign is to display its route designation by street intersection, geographic area, or other landmark/destination description and cannot denote "School Trip" or "Special." In cases where the service includes an alternate rush-hour trip to provide service by a school location, the dashboard sign is to indicate the line termination without indicating the school name
- Timetables for such services will be made available to the general public, shall provide the given schedule and route but must not be labeled “school service”
- Drivers must be instructed that such service is available to the general public and board and alight all passengers as required at designated stops
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• The same fare payment options must be made available to all users
• The overall transportation service provided in the Jurisdiction must not be for school service hours only

Examples of Fixed Route, Paratransit, and Recreational Transit Service projects follow:

1.1 **FIXED ROUTE SERVICE** *(Project Code 110)*
• New fixed route or Flexible Destination bus service
• Extension or augmentation of an existing bus route(s)
• Contracting with a transit operator or private provider for commuter bus service
• Contracting with a transit in an adjacent county to provide transit within Los Angeles County
• Operating subsidy to existing municipal or regional bus operator
• Service enhancements related to Bus/rail Interface
• ADA improvements to fixed route operations
• Shuttle service between activity centers

1.2 **PARATRANSIT SERVICE** *(Project Codes 120 & 130)*
• Expansion/coordination of existing paratransit service
• Subsidized, shared-ride taxi service for disadvantaged residents
• Taxi coupon programs used to provide intermittent or temporary capacity to support paratransit systems for senior and disabled patrons
• New paratransit service
• General public paratransit service
• ADA-related improvements to paratransit operations

**Non-Exclusive School Service**
Fixed-route bus services or Demand-responsive services available to the general public, which also provide school trips, are eligible for LR funding. Exclusive school bus services are not eligible.

**Specialized Public Transit**
Metro will approve special-user group service or social service transit where it can be incorporated into the existing local transit or paratransit program. Jurisdictions must demonstrate that existing services cannot be modified to meet the identified user need. Projects must meet the following conditions:
• The special user group identified does not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, sex, disability or ethnicity
• Service shall be available to all members of the general public having that specialized need and not be restricted to a specific group or program
• Service shall be advertised to the general public
• Metro may require, as a condition of approval, inter-jurisdictional project coordination and consolidation
• LR funds may only be used for the transportation component of the special user group program, i.e., direct, clearly identifiable and auditable
transportation costs, excluding salaries for specialized escorts or other program aides.

• The designated vehicle(s) used must be made available for coordination with other paratransit programs if space permits.

1.3 RECREATIONAL TRANSIT SERVICE (Project Code 140)
Jurisdictions shall submit a listing of Recreational Transit Services no later than October 15 after the fiscal year. Recreational Transit Service projects must meet the following conditions:

• Travel within the area of Los Angeles, Orange and Ventura Counties, and portions of Kern, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties (see map Appendix VII, page 48) are eligible expenditures. Trip segments to areas shown on the proportionately eligible areas of the map must be funded through other sources. Trips to locations not within either the eligible or proportionately eligible area are not eligible.

• Trips may be limited to certain general age groups (e.g., children under 18, senior citizens, persons with disabilities), however, trips must be made available to all individuals within that designated group.

• Special events or destinations (e.g., city parks, concerts, special events) may be served, however, all members of the general public including individuals with disabilities must be allowed to use the service. School field trips are not eligible.

• LR funds may not be used to pay the salaries of recreation leaders or escorts involved in recreational transit projects.

• All recreational transit trips must be advertised to the public, such as through newspapers, flyers, posters, and/or websites.

2. BUS STOP IMPROVEMENTS AND MAINTENANCE (Codes 150, 160 & 170)
Examples of eligible Bus Stop Improvement and Maintenance projects include installation/replacement and/or maintenance of:

• Concrete landings - in street for buses and at sidewalk for passengers
• Bus turn-outs
• Benches
• Shelters
• Trash receptacles
• Curb cuts
• Concrete or electrical work directly associated with the above items

Amenities shall be integral to the bus stop. Improvements must be located within 25 feet of the bus stop signpost, or have one edge or end within that area. At high volume stops, where more than one bus typically uses the stop at a time, improvements must be placed at the immediate locations where buses normally stop.

Curb cuts may be located on or adjacent to street segments (blocks) with bus stops.
Conditions:
Jurisdictions shall coordinate bus stop improvements (excluding curb cuts) with affected Transit Operators. A letter of coordination must be submitted with the Project Description Form. Jurisdictions that propose replacing privately owned benches or shelters must notify the Operator before requesting City Council project approval. The Operator shall have seven (7) days to respond to the notification before the Jurisdiction takes further action.

3. **PUBLIC TRANSIT - CAPITAL** (Project Codes 180, 190 & 200)
Public Transit Capital projects will be approved only for the percentage of vehicle or equipment use, as determined by Metro staff, exclusive to public transit service.
A list of sample Public Transit Capital projects follows:
- a. Vehicles/parts purchases and repairs
  - Transit vehicles for passenger service
  - Mechanical parts and supplies for buses or vans
  - Non-revenue support vehicles, such as supervisor’s cars, service trucks
  - ADA-related improvements to vehicles
  - Retrofits or additions to buses or vans, such as lifts, fare boxes, or radios
  - Security equipment, for example, cameras on buses
- b. Equipment
  - New or modified transit maintenance facilities
  - Maintenance equipment for new or existing transit or paratransit operations
  - Office equipment and furnishings for new and existing transit and paratransit operations

NOTE: Jurisdictions shall reimburse their LR Account, in the amount of the current appraised value or purchase price from resale, for Public Transit Capital projects no longer used for public transit purposes.

4. **TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT (TSM)** (Project Code 210)
TSM projects are relatively low-cost, non-capacity-enhancing traffic control measures that serve to improve vehicular (bus and car) flow and/or increase safety within an existing right-of-way. Proposals must include an element demonstrating the project’s benefit to public transit. A list of sample TSM projects follows:
- Reserved bus lanes (no physical separation) on surface arterials
- Contra-flow bus lanes (reversible lanes during peak travel periods)
- Ramp meter by-pass (regulated access with bus/carpool unrestricted entry)
- Traffic signal priority for buses (to allow approaching transit vehicles to extend green phase or change traffic signal from red to green)
- Preferential turning lanes for buses
- Other traffic signal improvements that facilitate bus movement

If a Local Return funded project is or has an Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) component, it must be consistent with the Regional ITS Architecture. ITS projects must comply with the Countywide ITS Policy and Procedures adopted by the Metro Board including the submittal of a completed, signed self-certification.
5. **TRANSIT SECURITY** (Project Codes 220 & 230)

Transit Security projects may include Transit Safety, Security Operations and Safety Education Programs, provided that they demonstrate a direct benefit to public transit service and do not supplant general law enforcement programs.

A list of sample Transit Security Programs follows:

- Local police deployment for direct and specific transit security
- Private security (state licensed) deployment for transit security
- Contracted police services for direct and specific transit security
- Capital improvements for transit security
- Innovative and/or advanced technology transit security
- Community-based policing activities in direct support of transit security
- Security awareness, graffiti prevention, Safety education and/or crime prevention programs
- Transit security at commuter rail stations and park and ride facilities

**NOTE:** Jurisdictions are encouraged to participate in existing local and regional transit security efforts, which should be coordinated through Mctro.

6. **FARE SUBSIDY** (Project Codes 240 & 250)

Fare Subsidy programs provide residents within Jurisdictions a discount fare incentive for using public transit. The method, amount of subsidy and user group(s) shall be determined by Jurisdictions. A list of sample Fare Subsidy Programs follows:

- User-side subsidies (buy down of passes, tickets, or coupons) for the general public or segments of the general public (i.e., elderly, individuals with disabilities, or low-income residents)
- Subsidy of bus/rail passes, tickets or tokens for transit riders

7. **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING** (Project Code 270)

Planning, coordination, engineering and design costs incurred toward the implementation of eligible LR projects are eligible when the following conditions are met:

- The projects being planned (designed, coordinated, etc.) are LR eligible.
- Coordination includes: local jurisdictions; start up costs or dues for Councils of Governments (COG’s) and Transportation Management Associations (TMA’s); advocacy; and funding for Joint Powers Authorities (JPA’s) by local jurisdictions or (COG’s).
- If some of a COG’s, TMA’s or JPA’s projects or activities are LR eligible and some are not, partial payment of dues must be made, in proportion to the organization’s budget for LR eligible projects.
- Proposition A must be used to plan for Proposition A eligible projects. Proposition C must be used to plan for Proposition C eligible projects.
8. **TRANSIT MARKETING** (Project Code 280)

Transit Marketing projects may include:
- Transit user guides, maps, brochures
- Transit information Kiosks
- Transit information/pass sales centers
- New rider subsidy programs

9. **PARK-AND-RIDE LOTS** (Project Code 290)

Park-and-Ride Lot projects must be coordinated with Metro and appropriate affected transit operator(s). Additional justification including, for example, surveys or studies that provide a basis for determining the project’s level of public transit use and related funding, may be requested prior to project evaluation.

**Park-n-Ride Lot projects shall:**
- be located adjacent to (no greater than 0.25 mile away from) a fixed route service bus stop, HOV lanes and/or rail stations.
- be located on unimproved land unless a specific Metro waiver is granted.
- have received environmental clearance by the Jurisdiction prior to Metro approval for construction funds
- require a letter from the affected transit operator(s) to the Jurisdiction and Metro, as reasonable assurance, that park-and-ride lot users will be assured of continued access to services.
- be used primarily by transit/rideshare patrons during commute hours.
- have appropriate exclusive-use signage posted and enforced.
- be open for general parking during non-transit use time, e.g., evenings and weekends, provided that transit user demands are not adversely impacted. All revenues, for example, parking, advertising or related revenue) generated during the non-transit use time must be returned to the Jurisdictions’ LR Account in the same proportion as the original LR investment in the facility. In the event that the facility ceases operation, the Jurisdiction shall be required to repay its LR Account as determined by the audit, see page 33.

10. **TRANSIT FACILITIES/TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENTS (TE)** (Project Codes 300 & 310)

Examples of Transit Facility projects include:
- Bus-only transit malls or stations
- Transit/paratransit accessible Transfer Centers that feature, for example, shelters, telephones, information displays/centers, and other related amenities
- Eligible as match to TE grants.
- Eligible projects may include building rehabilitation and restoration for transit-related purposes.
- Project itself must be LR eligible.

**Conditions:**
Jurisdictions shall submit a project budget and scope of work that specifies the proposed facility’s public transit and, if applicable, joint development. Additional
documentation may be required to determine project eligibility and level of funding.

If the facility ceases to be used for public transit purposes, LR funds used toward land purchase for a facility must be returned at the original purchase price or present appraised value, whichever is greater, to the Jurisdiction's LR Account. Repayment of facility expenditures shall be based on the schedule outlined on page 31.

Prior to land and/or facility purchases, Jurisdictions shall provide the following:
• Documentation of the financial resources for facility implementation, operation and maintenance
• Assurance(s) from the affected transit carrier(s) to provide facility service
• Land appraisal
• Assurance that the Jurisdiction will proceed with the project per the implementation schedule outlined in the application
• Environmental clearance in conformance with, wherever applicable, all local, state and federal requirements. Jurisdictions preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must coordinate with Metro Regional Transportation Planning and Development Department.

11. **METRO RAIL CAPITAL** (Project Codes 320)
Metro Rail Capital projects may include, for example, Metro Red, Blue, Green, or Gold Line or Mid-City Exposition Light Rail Transit station or line improvements, local match toward Metro Rail Capital projects, Metro Art or related Metro Rail enhancements.

12. **RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPROVEMENTS** (Project Code 350)
Right-of-Way Improvements or land purchases must be coordinated through Metro to ensure consistency with adopted regional corridors, priorities or preferred alignments. Right-of-Way Improvement project proposals must also demonstrate direct, quantifiable, environmental and/or economic benefit to given LR-eligible projects.

13. **COMMUTER RAIL** (Project Codes 360 & 370)
Rail (commuter system and station enhancement) projects must be consistent with Metro's existing and planned program of rail projects. Eligible project may include match to TE grants for building rehabilitation and restoration for transit-related purposes. Project itself must be LR eligible. Examples of Rail projects include:
• Signal upgrades at rail crossings
• Signage and marketing materials to promote increased commuter rail ridership
• Landscaping, lighting, fencing and environmental enhancements at or along commuter rail facilities
• System safety
• Safety education programs
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• Commuter rail station operating, maintenance, insurance, or other station-related costs
• Commuter rail station capital costs

14. **CAPITAL RESERVE** 
   (Project Code 380)
A Capital Reserve project provides Jurisdictions the opportunity to accumulate LR funds (over and above the year of allocation and three year expenditure requirement see page 30, Timely Use of Funds) to finance a large project. Projects are limited to construction of bus facilities, bus purchases, transit centers, park-and-ride lots, construction of major street improvements or rail projects along Metro's planned and adopted rail corridors.

A Capital Reserve project constitutes a long-term financial and planning commitment. For specific information on the Capital Reserve approval process, see Section III, Metro’s Administration Process, page 26.

15. **DIRECT ADMINISTRATION** 
   (Project Code 480)
Direct Administration is defined as those fully burdened costs which are directly associated with administering Local Return program or projects, and includes salaries and benefits, office supplies and equipment, and other overhead costs.

Direct Administration project conditions:
• All costs shall be associated with developing, maintaining, monitoring, coordinating, reporting and budgeting specific LR project(s)
• Expenditures must be reasonable and appropriate to the activities undertaken by the locality
• The administrative expenditures for any year shall not exceed 20 percent of the total LR annual expenditures, based on year-end expenditures, and will be subject to an audit finding if the figure exceeds 20%.
• The annual expenditure figure will be reduced by fund trades to other cities and/or funds set aside for reserves; conversely, the annual expenditure figure will be increased by expenditure of reserves or LR funds received in fund exchanges;
• Jurisdictions are required to report all administrative charges to Direct Administration in order to verify compliance of 20% administration cap.

16. **OTHER** 
   (Project Code 500)
Projects that do not fit under any of the project codes, but are for public transit purposes, may be included in the “other” category. Note that “public transit purposes” are defined as follows: “A proposed expenditure of funds shall be deemed to be for public transit purposes to the extent that it can reasonably be expected to sustain or improve the quality and safety of and/or access to public transit services by the general public or those requiring special public transit assistance”.

B. **EXCLUSIVE USES OF PROPOSITION A FUNDS**
Projects listed below are eligible for Proposition A LR funding only. Jurisdictions must certify that all project conditions will be met and include all supporting documents with submittal of the Form A. Stand alone amenities such as traffic signals, landscaping and storm drains are ineligible. Note: The following project eligibility criteria provide general guidance only and are not the sole determinant for project approval. The authority to determine the eligibility of an expenditure rests solely with Metro. Jurisdictions may appeal projects deemed ineligible as described in Section III, page 22.

1. **SIGNAL SYNCHRONIZATION** *(Project Code 400)*

   Signal Synchronization projects must meet the following eligibility conditions:
   
   - **Bus priority** must be included as an element of the project
   - The project arterial must be used by a minimum of ten transit buses, counted bi-directionally, per hour, or five buses hourly in each direction
   - Projects may be implemented only on major arterials
   - Documentation of coordination with affected public transit operators is required for approval (e.g., correspondence between the Jurisdiction and the transit operator with written concurrence between the transit operator and Metro)
   - Local return funds shall not be used to alter system/signal timing that was implemented under a traffic forum project/grant unless coordinated with all affected jurisdictions in the corridor.

   If a Local Return-funded project is or has an Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) component, it must be consistent with the Regional ITS Architecture. ITS projects must comply with the Countywide ITS Policy and Procedures adopted by the Metro Board including the submittal of an approved, signed self-certification form. Please go to http://RITSnet/RegITSPolicy.html and choose “Los Angeles Countywide ITS Policy and Procedures Document” or see Appendix VI (page 45) for information on Countywide ITS Policy and Procedures, and the self-certification form.

2. **FUND EXCHANGE** *(Project Code 405)*

   Proposition A funds may be given, loaned, or exchanged by Jurisdictions provided that the following conditions are met:
   
   - Participants are responsible for insuring that the traded funds will be utilized for public transit purposes
   - The exchange of funds should not result in a net loss of revenues available for public transit in Los Angeles County (i.e., trade of Proposition A funds for farebox or other transit revenues)
   - Traded Proposition A LR funds retain their original date of allocation and lapse date. Jurisdictions submitting Fund Exchange projects shall note the year of allocation on their Form A so that the fund lapse policy may be monitored.

   In addition, Jurisdictions shall provide the following detail in submitting Fund Exchange projects for approval:
• Source of funds to be exchanged
• Fund amounts to be exchanged
• Period of exchange
• Assurance that the end use of Proposition A LR funds will be for eligible transit uses
• Provision for circumstances should source of funds (one or both) become unavailable during the exchange period.
• Certification by participating Jurisdictions (e.g. City Council action)

A sample Fund Exchange Agreement is included in Appendix V page 43.

NOTE: Jurisdictions participating as the “seller” in a Proposition A Fund Exchange projects will, for two years from the date of transaction, be subject to disqualification or reduced project application scores in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Call for Projects.

3. TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (Project Code 410)

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) projects are defined as strategies/actions intended to influence the manner in which people commute, resulting in a decrease in the number of vehicle trips made and vehicle miles traveled during peak travel periods.

TDM projects funded by Proposition A require a public transit element and will be evaluated on their projected impact on reduction of single-occupancy vehicle trips, corresponding vehicle miles traveled, and potential to increase transit use. A list of sample TDM projects follows:

• Formation and operation of vanpool and/or vanpool incentive programs, including ride matching programs (must be made available to all employers and/or residents within the Jurisdiction boundaries
• Community-based shuttles for employees as long as such services complement existing transit service
• Parking Management incentive programs, such as, parking cash outs or parking pricing strategies
• Employer or citizen ride-matching programs and subsidies
• Formation or ongoing operation of a Transportation Management Association to administer and market local TDM programs (provided that the 20 administrative cost stipulated for Proposition A and Proposition C is not exceeded)
• Transit and TDM-related activities required by the Congestion Management Program (CMP) including; preparation of TDM ordinances; administration and implementation of transit or TDM-related projects pursuant to CMP deficiency plans; and monitoring of transit standards by transit operators
• Funding Transportation Management Organization's (TMO) insurance costs or individual employer’s vanpool programs under the umbrella vehicle insurance policy of the Jurisdiction
• Providing matching funds for LR eligible Safe Routes to School projects.
Jurisdictions are encouraged to adopt monitoring and evaluation performance standards for funding TDM projects. Jurisdictions are encouraged to utilize regionally adopted standards, and demonstrate, for example, how AQMD trip reduction targets are addressed through the TDM measure.

In conformity with regional, state and federal air quality objectives, Metro encourages use of alternative-fuel vehicles (e.g. LNG, CNG, Methanol) for any TDM-related shuttle, vanpool or paratransit vehicles.

If a Local Return funded project is or has an Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) component, it must be consistent with the Regional ITS Architecture. ITS projects must comply with the Countywide ITS Policy and Procedures adopted by the Metro Board including the submission of a completed, signed self-certification form. Please go to http://RITS.net/Reg13Docs.html and choose “Los Angeles Countywide ITS Policy and Procedures Document” or see Appendix VI (page 45) for information on Countywide ITS Policy and Procedures, and the self-certification form.

C. EXCLUSIVE USES OF PROPOSITION C FUNDS
Projects listed below are eligible for Proposition C LR funding only. Jurisdictions must certify that all project conditions will be met and include all supporting documents with submission of the Form A. Jurisdictions are encouraged to use LR funds for improved public transit services and for multi-jurisdictional cooperation of arterial traffic signal control operations. Agency costs for operating a centralized traffic signal system, including those costs linked to a local agency’s participation in the countywide Information Exchange Network (IEN), are now eligible for reimbursement. Stand alone amenities such as traffic signals, landscaping, storm drains are ineligible. Note: The following project eligibility criteria provide for general guidance only and are not the sole determinant for project approval. The authority to determine the eligibility of an expenditure rests solely with Metro. Jurisdictions may appeal projects deemed ineligible as described in Section III, page 22.

1. SIGNAL SYNCHRONIZATION & TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (Project Code 400)
Synchronized Signalization projects must meet the following conditions:
- Projects shall be implemented only on major arterials.
- Operation costs associated with centralized traffic signal control systems, including updating traffic signal coordination timing and costs associated with multi-jurisdictional or inter-community systems, (such as the IBN or ATSAC/ATCS) or with transit signal priority systems, are eligible. Costs may include: lease lines for communication; software licenses and maintenance; hardware maintenance, maintenance and repair of hardware, vehicle detection devices and interconnect lines; warranties; and upgrades and enhancements for software or hardware. Cities shall coordinate the signal timing or systems with other affected jurisdictions.
- The major arterial targeted for implementation must have full-sized transit buses operating on regularly scheduled fixed routes.
• Documentation of coordination with affected public transit operators is required for approval (e.g., correspondence between the Jurisdiction and the transit operator with written concurrence from the transit operator to Metro).

• Local return funds shall not be used to alter system/signal timing that was implemented under a traffic forum project/grant unless coordinated with all affected jurisdictions in the corridor.

If a Local Return funded project is or has an Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) component, it must be consistent with the Regional ITS Architecture. ITS projects must comply with the Countywide ITS Policy and Procedures adopted by the Metro Board including the submittal of a completed, signed self-certification form. Please go to http://RIITS.net/RegITSDocs.html and choose “Los Angeles Countywide ITS Policy and Procedures Document” or see Appendix VI (page 45) for information on Countywide ITS Policy and Procedures, and the self-certification form.

2. TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (Project Code 410)

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) projects are defined as strategies/actions intended to influence the manner in which people commute, resulting in a decrease in the number of vehicle trips made and vehicle miles traveled during peak travel periods.

TDM projects funded by Proposition C will be evaluated on their proposed impact on reduction of single-occupancy vehicle trips and corresponding vehicle miles traveled. A list of sample TDM projects follows:

• Formation and operation of vanpool and/or vanpool incentive programs, including ride matching programs (must be made available to all employers and/or residents within the Jurisdiction boundaries)

• Community-based shuttles for employees as long as such services complement existing transit service

• Parking Management incentive programs, such as, parking cash outs or parking pricing strategies

• Employer or citizen ride-matching programs and subsidies

• Formation or ongoing operation of a Transportation Management Association to administer and market local TDM programs (provided that the 20% administrative cost stipulated for Proposition A and Proposition C is not exceeded)

• Transit and TDM-related activities required by the Congestion Management Program (CMP) including: preparation of TDM ordinances; administration and implementation of transit or TDM-related projects pursuant to CMP deficiency plans; and monitoring of transit standards by transit operators

• Funding Transportation Management Organization's (TMO) insurance costs or individual employer’s vanpool programs under the umbrella vehicle insurance policy of the Jurisdiction

• Providing matching funds for L.R. eligible Safe Routes to School projects.

Jurisdictions are encouraged to adopt monitoring and evaluation performance standards for funding TDM projects. Jurisdictions are encouraged to utilize
regionally adopted standards, and demonstrate, for example, how AQMD trip reduction targets are addressed through the TDM measure.

In conformity with regional, state and federal air quality objectives, Metro encourages use of alternative-fuel vehicles (e.g. LNG, CNG, Methanol) for any TDM-related shuttle, vanpool or paratransit vehicles.

If a Local Return funded project is or has an Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) component, it must be consistent with the Regional ITS Architecture. ITS projects must comply with the Countywide ITS Policy and Procedures adopted by the Metro Board including the submittal of a completed, signed self-certification form. Please go to http://RITS.net/RegITSDocs.html and choose “Los Angeles Countywide ITS Policy and Procedures Document” or see Appendix VI (page 45) for information on Countywide ITS Policy and Procedures, and the self-certification form.

3. CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP) (Project Code 420)
   The following provides a list of sample CMP projects:
   • Land use analysis as required by CMP
   • Computer modeling as required to support CMP land use analysis
   • Administration, monitoring and implementation of transit- or TDM-related projects as part of deficiency plans
   • Monitoring of transit standards by transit operators

4. BIKEWAYS AND BIKE LANES (Project Code 430)
   Bikeway projects include bikeway construction and maintenance, signage, information/safety programs, and bicycle parking, and must meet the following conditions:
   • Shall be linked to employment or educational sites
   • Shall be used for commuting or utilitarian trips
   • Jurisdictions must have submitted a PMS Self Certification (see page 19, and Appendix III on page 39).

5. STREET IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE (Codes 440, 450 & 460)
   Proposition C Local Return funds are to be used for the maintenance and improvements to street and highways used as public transit thoroughfares. Street Improvement and Maintenance Projects Capacity enhancements include repair and maintenance projects with a direct benefit to transit. Projects must meet the following conditions and reporting requirements:

   A. CONDITIONS:
      Public Transit Benefit
      Projects must demonstrate a public transit benefit or be performed on streets heavily used by public transit, where such streets carry regularly-scheduled, fixed-route public transit service, and where service has operated for a minimum of one (1) year and there are no foreseeable plans to discontinue such service.
If there are no fixed-route systems within a Jurisdiction, or if all the streets supporting fixed-route systems are already in a satisfactory condition as documented by the required Pavement Management System (PMS), a Jurisdiction may use LR funds for street improvements and maintenance and repair on streets within their community on which they can demonstrate that public paratransit trips, that have been in service for a minimum of one year, concentrate.

The method of demonstrating heavy-use by paratransit vehicles is to document trip pick-up and drop-off locations, including street-routing, for a consecutive three month time period. The data will be used in making a determination on which street segments have heavy-use by this form of transit.

**Pavement Management System (PMS)**

If Proposition C LR funds are to be used for street improvement or maintenance, a jurisdiction must have a PMS in place, and use it. (See PMS code 470 for self certification requirements, page 19).

**Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Requirement**

The goal of the Proposition C LR Program is to improve transportation conditions, including the roadways upon which public transit operates. When used to improve roadways, the additional funds provided to local jurisdictions through the Proposition C LR Program are intended to supplement existing local revenues being used for road improvement purposes. Cities and counties shall maintain their existing commitment of local, discretionary funds for street and highway maintenance, rehabilitation, reconstruction, and storm damage repair in order to remain eligible for Proposition C LR funds to be expended for streets and roads.

Metro will accept the State Controller's finding of a Jurisdiction's compliance with the California Streets and Highways Code as sufficient to demonstrate the required Maintenance of Effort during any fiscal year in which Proposition C LR funds are expended for streets and roads.

**B. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

Street maintenance, rehabilitation or reconstruction projects should be submitted individually. Jurisdictions shall submit a Project Description Form listing all new project street segments prior to undertaking each street maintenance or improvement project. Jurisdictions will be advised as to any eligible and ineligible street segments within 30 days of project submittal.

The projects must be reflected on subsequent Annual Project Update (Form B) submittals and Annual Expenditure Reports (Form C) until the project is completed or deleted from the work program. Once deleted, a segment must be re-submitted for approval if a new street maintenance project on the segment is subsequently planned.

**Eligible Street Improvement and Maintenance Projects**

1. Exclusive Bus Lane Street Widening
Such projects are for exclusive bus lanes (physically separated) on surface arterials.

2. **Capacity Enhancement**
   Capacity Enhancement projects are level-of-service and/or capacity improvements capital projects. These projects must include a public transit element that is comprised of transit vehicles on streets that are "heavily used by transit." Examples of these projects include street widening or restriping to add additional lanes.

3. **Street Repair and Maintenance**
   Eligible Street Repair and Maintenance projects are limited to pavement maintenance, slurry seals, and chip seals, pavement rehabilitation and roadway reconstruction. Required curb, gutter, and catch basin repair (storm drains) on streets "heavily used by transit" that are part of a rehabilitation or reconstruction project are eligible. Betterments are not eligible for LR funding.

4. **Safety**
   Street improvement projects to increase safety are eligible, but must have a direct and clearly demonstrable benefit to both safety and transit. At Metro's discretion, a project may be approved on a down-scope demonstration basis. The local jurisdiction would be required to conduct a before and after evaluation prior to Metro approval of the full project scope.

5. **Americans with Disabilities Act Related Street Improvements**
   In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the provision of curb cuts or passenger boarding/boarding concrete pads at or adjacent to bus stops and other accessible improvements on roadways "heavily used by transit" is an eligible use of Proposition C LR funds. Such modifications must meet ADA and California Title 24 specifications.

7. **PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (PMS) (Project Code 470)**
   Sample Pavement Management System projects include:
   - Cost to purchase, upgrade or replace a Pavement Management System.
   - The ongoing cost of maintaining a PMS equal to the proportion of a Jurisdiction’s eligible street mileage to total street mileage; or 50% of the PMS maintenance cost, whichever is greater.

   **Note:** Jurisdictions are required to certify that they have conducted and maintain Pavement Management Systems when proposing "Street Repair and Maintenance" or "Bikeway" projects (see Appendix III, page 39). The requirement for a PMS is consistent with Streets & Highways Code Section 2108.1.

   **PMS must include the following:**
   - Inventory of existing pavements including, as a minimum, arterial and collector routes, reviewed and updated biennially;
   - Inventory of existing Class I bikeways, reviewed and updated biennially;
• Assessment of pavement condition including, as a minimum, arterial and collector routes, reviewed and updated biennially;
• Identification of all pavement sections needing rehabilitation/replacement; and
• Determination of budget needs for rehabilitation or replacement of deficient sections of pavement for current and following biennial period(s)

Self-certifications (included in Appendix III) executed by the Jurisdiction’s Engineer or designated, registered civil engineer, must be submitted with a Form A for new street maintenance or bikeway projects, or Form B (biannually) for ongoing projects, to satisfy “Street Repair and Maintenance” and “Bikeway” project eligibility criteria.
III. METRO'S ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS

A. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR JURISDICTIONS

STANDARD ASSURANCES
In the event that a new Jurisdiction is formed within Los Angeles County, Metro will require that a Standard Assurances and Understanding agreement be submitted prior to participation in the LR Program. A sample Standard Assurance and Understanding agreement form is included as Appendix II, see page 37.

PROPOSITION A AND PROPOSITION C FORMS
To maintain legal eligibility and meet LR Program compliance requirements, Jurisdictions shall submit to Metro a Project Description Form as required, an Annual Project Update and Annual Expenditure Report. A Project Description Form, Annual Project Update and Annual Expenditure Report (Forms A, B and C along with instructions) are included in Appendix VIII, starting on page 49.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM (FORM A)
A new project that meets the eligibility criteria listed in Section II, Project Eligibility, must be submitted to Metro on Project Description Form (Form A) prior to the expenditure of funds. Metro will review the project to determine if it meets the statutory eligibility requirement and notify Jurisdictions of the project's LR funding eligibility. If a Jurisdiction expends Proposition A or Proposition C LR funds for a project prior to Metro approval, the Jurisdiction will be required to reimburse its LR Account. Additionally, approvals cannot be retroactive.

A Project Description Form (Form A) may be submitted any time during the fiscal year. Metro will review and accept or return the report for changes. All projects must be identified with their own unique sequence and project code, e.g. 01-200, and the form must be filled out completely. Once a Jurisdiction decides to proceed on a new or revised project, the Jurisdiction should comply with the following process before expending any funds:

STEP 1 - Form Submittal
A Project Description Form (Form A) shall be submitted whenever a Jurisdiction proposes a 1) a new project; 2) a new route; 3) a 25 percent or more (increase or decrease) in route or revenue vehicle miles for an established LR funded transit service; 4) a 25 percent or greater change in an approved LR project budget or scope, or 5) a service change that duplicates/overlays an existing transit service equal to or greater than .75 miles.

A change is defined as any modification to route, budget, service area, stops, frequency, fare or clientele for the project as originally approved or subsequently approved by Metro.

NOTE: a.) All new transit or paratransit service projects, existing services with a change of 25% or more (increase or decrease), or cancellation of services, are subject to review under the Service Coordination Process (as described on page 24).
b.) If transit service is canceled, Jurisdictions should notify Metro in writing, secure review by the Service Review Process, and inform the public.

**STEP 2**
Metro staff will review Form A to determine if the project is eligible for LR expenditure.

**STEP 3**
After it is determined that the project is eligible, Metro staff will notify Jurisdictions in writing authorizing the expenditure of the LR funds. This will be done within thirty days of receipt of Form A. However, if additional information/justification for the project is required, it may take longer for the approval.

**STEP 4**
Form A will be used as the basis for a Jurisdiction's annual compliance audit required under the LR Program. Records should be maintained as stated in Audit Section V, page 33.

**ANNUAL PROJECT UPDATE (FORM B)**
Jurisdictions shall submit on or before August 1 of each fiscal year an Annual Project Update (Form B) to provide Metro with an update of all approved, on-going and carryover LR projects. Jurisdictions will be informed in writing of approval for project continuance. Metro will review the report and accept or return the report for changes. Staff review will consist of verification that the status of the projects listed corresponds to the originally approved projects. All projects should have their own identifying code, e.g. 01-200.

Projects for service operations whose anticipated start-up date is in the middle of the fiscal year, should be budgeted for services through the end of the fiscal year only. After the first year of service operations, project updates should be submitted annually, by August 1 of the new fiscal year.

**ANNUAL EXPENDITURE REPORT (FORM C)**
On or before October 15 of each fiscal year, Jurisdictions shall submit an Annual Expenditure Report (Form C) to notify Metro of previous year LR fund receipts and expenditures. Metro will review the report and approve or return for changes.

For Jurisdictions with Recreational Transit projects, Jurisdictions are required to annually submit an accounting of Recreational Transit trips, destinations and costs. This information should be submitted along with the Form C, no later than October 15 after the fiscal year.

Jurisdictions are required to call out administration charges to Direct Administration (Project Code 480) in order to verify compliance of 20% cap on administration costs.

The following provides a summary of form use and due dates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>DETERMINATION</th>
<th>DUE DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Description Form - Form A</td>
<td>New and amended projects</td>
<td>Any time during the year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Project Update - Form B</td>
<td>All on-going and/or capital (carryover)projects</td>
<td>August 1st of each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Expenditure Report - Form C</td>
<td>Report expenditures</td>
<td>October 15th of each year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. APPEAL OF ELIGIBILITY**
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Jurisdictions submitting a project, which has been classified by Metro staff as ineligible, may appeal the determination. An appeal should be submitted in writing to the Deputy Executive Officer (DEO) of Programming and Policy Analysis. The project will then be reviewed for eligibility.

Should the project be denied eligibility status by the DEO, a final appeal may be submitted in writing to the Chief Executive Officer. The project will then come before the Metro Board for final determination of eligibility.

The appeal process is administered as a Board Public Hearing by the Board Secretary's office at the regularly scheduled Planning and Programming meetings. The Board has the authority to act on the transcript of the Hearing or to conduct its own hearing. The Metro Board decision is final.

Once the determination is final (either by an administrative determination that is not appealed within the 10-day statute of limitations, or as a result of the appeal process), Metro staff will send a notice of final determination of project eligibility to the Jurisdiction with conditions described or attached.

C. GOVERNING BODY AUTHORIZATION
   While Metro does not require Jurisdictions to file a governing body authorization when submitting LR Forms (e.g., a city resolution or minute order), it is the responsibility of the Jurisdiction to keep these documents on file for audit purposes.

D. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW RESPONSIBILITY
   Jurisdictions are the lead agencies for the projects with which they propose to implement using LR funds. Therefore, those agencies are responsible for preparing the necessary state and/or federal environmental documentation, and must comply with all applicable provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, or if federal funds are involved, the National Environmental Policy Act.

E. PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORMS AND THE PROPOSITION A AND PROPOSITION C 40% DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM
   If a Jurisdiction submits a project description for operating assistance for an included transit operator, the amount of operating assistance applied for will be considered as an operating subsidy in the fiscal year specified in Forms A or B. The full LR operating assistance amount shown in Form A or B will be considered when determining the eligible Proposition A or C Discretionary grant amount in accordance with the Proposition A and Proposition C 40% Discretionary Program Guidelines. Any changes must be approved prior to the close of the specific fiscal year. No changes will be approved after November 1 of the following fiscal year (e.g., changes in FY 2005-2006 projects must be received by Metro prior to November 1, 2006 to allow adequate time for staff review).

In addition, depreciation is not an eligible operating expense for which LR funds can be allocated, committed, encumbered, or claimed.

F. ANNUAL PROJECT UPDATE SUBMITTALS BY RECIPIENTS OF METRO FORMULA FUNDS
Jurisdictions with municipal bus operations receiving Metro formula funds (e.g. TDA Article 4, FTA Section 5307 and State Transit Assistance funds) should submit projects with the regular Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and TIP amendment cycle to facilitate processing and coordination. Other Jurisdictions may submit Project Description Forms at any time. LR projects and revenue may be shown in the Los Angeles County TIP for information purposes.

G. OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES OF JURISDICTIONS
It is the responsibility of Jurisdictions to ensure that all applicable federal, state and local requirements are met with regard to public health and safety, affirmative action, fair labor practices, transit accessibility to disabled persons, etc. Metro has no responsibilities in these areas with regard to local transit projects carried out by Jurisdictions receiving Proposition A or C revenues.

H. AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT (MOE)
Metro will continue to monitor the operations of LR funded paratransit services to ensure that ADA paratransit-eligible riders continue to receive non-discriminatory transportation service on local paratransit systems pursuant to ADA and TDA. If Metro determines that ADA paratransit-eligible individuals are disproportionately being denied service, Metro will work with the LR funded agency to resolve the issue, up to and including a Maintenance of Effort.

Jurisdictions that currently provide paratransit service are required to continue to provide either ADA-eligible individual transportation service, or fund transportation trips that are completely within their jurisdictional boundaries, when requested. This obligation may not exceed 20 percent of the total LR allocation to the jurisdiction. If no requests for service within the jurisdiction are received, there will be no obligation to provide service or funding.

To better determine the accessibility of pathways to and from bus stops in Los Angeles County, all jurisdictions and the County of Los Angeles are requested to submit their projects on the Project Description Form (Form A) indicating what accessible features are being updated. Examples include curb cuts, installation or repair of pedestrian walkways, bus pads, and/or removal of sidewalk barriers (telephone poles, light poles, and other barriers). This form shall be submitted as required under these Guidelines.

I. SERVICE COORDINATION PROCESS
If a Jurisdiction is proposing to use LR funds for a new or expanded paratransit or transit service project, it is required to comply with the following Service Coordination Process:

The Service Coordination Process has four principal steps: Early Consultation by the proposing Jurisdiction with Metro Operations, and Contract Departments as the service is being developed at a local level; Proposition A or Proposition C LR eligibility review; service coordination administrative review; Metro Board Appeal Process to review the administrative determination, if requested. The following instructions should assist Jurisdictions in completing the service coordination review process:
Under the Proposition A and Proposition C Ordinances, transit services provided by Jurisdictions with LR funds should not duplicate existing transit or paratransit services.
The Proposition A and Proposition C LR Guidelines require Jurisdictions to follow the service coordination process under the following conditions: when a new service is proposed or when current service is modified by expanding service by 25 percent (increase or decrease) in route miles, revenue vehicle miles, service areas, stops, frequency or fare; when a proposed new route or change duplicates an existing route for 0.75 miles or more; or if a service is canceled.

1. **Implementing A Proposed New or Modified Transit or Paratransit Service**

   When implementing a new or modified transit service or paratransit service project, Jurisdictions should comply with the following process:

   a. **Prior to Submittal of the Project Description Form** -- Metro encourages Jurisdictions to work closely with Programming and Policy Analysis staff and Metro's Operations Unit (Sector General Managers and Deputy Executive Officer of Service Development) when a service project is being developed, in order to avoid or reduce service duplication impacts.

   b. **Submitting a Project Description Form** -- Similar to other LR projects, Jurisdictions are required to submit a Form A describing the new or modified service.

   c. **Letter of Conditional Approval Will Be Sent to Jurisdictions** -- After Metro Operations staffs have reviewed Form A, a letter of conditional approval is sent to Jurisdictions, subject to Metro Service Development Team review. This letter is then forwarded with a recommendation to the Service Development Team, to potentially affected Jurisdictions and transit operators, with the Form A and any route maps, service schedules and fare information provided by the proposing Jurisdiction.

   d. **Role of Service Development Team** -- Metro Service Development Team is an executive level committee that is chaired by Metro Chief Executive Officer (CEO). This committee reviews key issues concerning agency transportation and planning projects. The Service Development Team will use the following criteria for evaluating the impacts of new or expanded services funded:

      - Potential for passenger and revenue diversion from the existing transit services, resulting from service duplication, to the proposed new or expanded service
      - Operational considerations such as available street capacity, bus zone curb space, street configuration and traffic congestion
      - Type of service and/or markets served by the new service, compared to existing services in the area
      - Early coordination and project development with existing service providers and Jurisdictions (efforts beyond the minimum 60 days)

   Metro will encourage fare coordination and connectivity with other interfacing transit operators.

   e. **Letter of Final Approval or Disapproval** -- Based on the evaluation criteria, the Service Development Team will either grant approval or deny a Jurisdiction's request. The Committee will notify the Jurisdiction of the outcome.

   f. **Board Appeal Process** -- If the project is disapproved, the Jurisdiction may file an appeal. See Appeal of Eligibility, page 22.

2. **Seasonal or Emergency Temporary Service**
Seasonal service lasting less than 60 days will be administratively reviewed and considered for approval without Metro Board review, unless an Metro Board action is specifically requested. In the event of an emergency, staff reserves the right to temporarily waive the service coordination requirements. Any projects begun under emergency waiver conditions must undergo the New Service Coordination review process within 60 days after the emergency has ended, in order to continue to be eligible for expenditure of LR funds. Seasonal or emergency services are not considered ongoing projects. Equipment purchased during the emergency waiver period will not be subject to prior approval. Emergency service may continue during the subsequent New Service Review process.

3. **Contracting With Other Service Providers**

   Jurisdictions may use their LR funds to contract with other public or private service providers for new or improved transit services, subject to non-duplication/competition requirements.

J. **CAPITAL RESERVE PROCESS - APPROVAL PROCEDURE**

   Jurisdictions who wish to establish a Capital Reserve fund with LR revenues should note that establishing a Capital Reserve fund constitutes a long term financial and planning commitment. The approval procedure is as follows:

   a. The Project Description **Form (Form A)**, submitted by the Jurisdiction, must be reviewed by Metro staff and approved by Metro Board;

   b. If the project is approved, the Jurisdiction is required to:

      • Enter into a Capital Reserve Agreement (see sample in Appendix IV, page 40) with Metro to reserve funds
      • Establish a separate account, or a sub-account, for Capital Reserve funds. Any interest accrued on the Capital Reserve Account would remain in said account
      • Include the Capital Reserve amount and the current project status in their Project Annual Update (Form B) and on the Annual Expenditures Report (Form C, including any expenditures or interest accrued.

   c. Conditions of the Capital Reserve Agreement:

      • The annual audit will include a detailed audit of the jurisdiction's capital reserve account.
      • Every three (3) years, Metro must evaluate the Capital Reserve Account as it pertains to the status of the project; and the projected amount of funds available.
      • If the funds are expended for projects other than the originally-approved capital project, the jurisdiction must pay the funds back to Metro.
      • If the capital project is not completed within the time specified under the terms of the Capital Reserve Agreement, its funds will be subject to lapse. However, if the project is delayed, Jurisdictions should request in writing to Metro approval to extend the life of the reserve. Such projects will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
      • For rail projects, if it is decided by Metro that the Rail corridor is no longer a high priority, the agreement will be terminated and the Jurisdiction must:

         1. Dissolve the Capital Reserve fund and return the accumulated funds, including any interest earned, to the Jurisdiction’s LR fund; and
         2. Reprogram the funds, within the next three (3) years from the Agreement termination date (see Appendix IV for Sample Agreement, page 40). While
the Jurisdiction is not required to expend all of the funds within these three years, Metro reserves the right to impose a reasonable limit on the period of expenditure for reprogrammed funds.

- If there is action by Metro to suspend a rail project, the Jurisdiction may continue to hold onto the reserve until such time the project is reinstated as active or terminated.
- If, at any time a Jurisdiction, independent of any Metro action, desires to reprogram all or part of the funds in the Capital Reserve Account, the Jurisdiction must indicate the proposed use of the accumulated funds to be reprogrammed, and receive Metro approval.
- If, at any time either party decides to terminate the Capital Reserve Project, a letter shall be submitted giving 30 days notice of the termination.
- If the Capital Reserve Project is terminated, the Timely Use of Funds period on the lapping date of the reserved funds will be reviewed and determined by the audit.

Metro approval for reprogramming funds will be based on the following:

- If after exhausting all LR funds, additional funds are necessary to meet critical immediate or pending transit needs
- If the reprogramming request is approved, the agreement between Metro and the Jurisdiction will be either terminated or amended accordingly
- If the reprogramming request is disapproved, the Jurisdiction would be required to continue the capital reserve account as stipulated or apply to draw the fund down for another Metro approved capital-related project.

K. **FUND EXCHANGE**
Only Proposition A funds may be exchanged or traded. Refer to page 13 for conditions.

L. **LOANING LR FUNDS BETWEEN JURISDICTIONS (FOR PROPOSITION A ONLY)**
In order to meet short-term project needs while preserving longer-term reserves or to avoid loss of funds due to the timely-use provisions, the Jurisdictions may arrange a mutually acceptable temporary transfer or loan from one Jurisdiction to another. These loans are to be made on terms to be negotiated between the involved parties. The participating Jurisdictions are held mutually responsible for ensuring that the end uses of Proposition A is for statutorily-allowed purposes. The timely use provision as indicated on page 30 will apply to loaning of such funds. Metro must be notified of the amount, terms and period of such arrangements within thirty days of such arrangements.

Note: Metro reserves the right to temporarily reallocate funds. Any temporary reallocation would be subject to full review by the Planning and Programming Committee and approved by Metro Board.

M. **GIVING PROPOSITION C LR FUNDS TO ANOTHER JURISDICTION**
Since the Proposition C Ordinance does not allow trades or exchanges of these funds, a Jurisdiction can give its Proposition C funds to another Jurisdiction for the implementation of a mutual project. However, the Jurisdiction giving the funds away cannot accept an exchange or gift of any kind in return. Jurisdictions involved in giving funds should obtain Metro approval and keep official agreements on file.

N. **REIMBURSEMENT**
IV. FINANCE SECTION

A. METRO'S METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT
The Proposition A Ordinance specifies that twenty-five percent (25%) of all Proposition A revenues, while the Proposition C Ordinance specifies that twenty percent (20%) of all Proposition C revenues, are to be allocated to Jurisdictions for local transit on a "per capita" basis. The annual estimate of Proposition A and Proposition C revenues will be derived by Metro staff based on projections by the State Board of Equalization.

After administrative costs of the Proposition A and Proposition C Programs are deducted, apportionments are made to all Jurisdiction within Los Angeles County, currently 88 cities and the County of Los Angeles (for unincorporated areas), on the basis of population. These population shares are based on the projected populations derived from annual estimates made by the California State Department of Finance.

B. METRO'S FUND DISBURSEMENT
The Proposition A and Proposition C funds are disbursed by Metro on a monthly basis. The disbursements to an individual Jurisdiction will equal that Jurisdiction's population-based share of actual net receipts for the month.

C. ACCOUNTING FOR PROPOSITION A AND PROPOSITION C REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES BY JURISDICTIONS

1. ESTABLISHING A SEPARATE ACCOUNT
Jurisdictions which do not use the State Controller's Uniform System of Accounts and Records must establish a separate Proposition A and Proposition C Local Transit Assistance Account and deposit all Proposition A and Proposition C LR revenues, interest earnings received, and other income earned from Proposition A and Proposition C LR in that account.

In accordance with the State Controller's instructions, Jurisdictions which use the Controller's Uniform System do not need to establish a separate Proposition A and Proposition C Local Transit Assistance Account but will list all Proposition A and Proposition C revenues (including interest) and expenditures as special line items in the Uniform System. In any case, all Jurisdictions will be required to account for and identify all Proposition A and Proposition C receipts, interest, and expenditures. This will enable financial and compliance audits to be conducted in an organized and timely fashion. Sufficient unrestricted cash or cash equivalent must be available at all times to meet the needs of general Jurisdiction operations without impairment of the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Transit Assistance Accounts.

2. EXCEPTIONS FOR RECIPIENTS OF TDA ARTICLE 4 FUNDS
A separate account or fund is not mandatory when Proposition A and Proposition C LR funds are accounted for in an enterprise fund and are exclusively used as transit...
operating subsidies as long as the Jurisdiction/operator is able to maintain accounting records. These records should allow for the preparation of financial statements, which present assets, liabilities, revenues, expenditures (if any) and transfers out. While it is necessary that Proposition A and Proposition C Program recipients be able to demonstrate that they have complied with applicable guidelines in expending Proposition A and Proposition C funds as operating subsidies, it is not necessary that such expenditures be separately identifiable for audit purposes.

3. **POOLING OF FUNDS**
   Metro will allow Jurisdictions to pool Proposition A and Proposition C LR funds in order to obtain maximum return on investments. Such investment earnings must be reported and expended consistent with these guidelines. As in fund exchanges or transfers, Jurisdictions involved in such arrangements should keep adequate records of such transactions in order to allow for subsequent audits.

4. **INTEREST AND OTHER EARNED INCOME**
   Jurisdictions are entitled to retain any and all interest revenues, which they may earn on their Proposition A, and Proposition C revenues. Other income earned from Proposition A and Proposition C projects such as fare revenues, revenue from advertising, etc., may also be retained by Jurisdictions in their LR accounts. Such earnings must be reported and expended consistent with these guidelines. Jurisdictions must maintain accurate records for the amount of interest earned each year. Interest must be allocated to the Local Transit Assistance Account on an annual basis, and reported as part of the annual audit.

5. **PROJECT REVENUE**
   The Jurisdictions need only report project-generated revenues, such as fares, when such revenues are retained and recorded by the Jurisdiction. Revenues should be reported on the accrual basis.

6. **INTER-FUND TRANSFERS**
   On an accrual basis of accounting, Jurisdictions should make note of the following: expenditures for an approved project, which are made from a fund other than the Proposition A or Proposition C LR fund and will be reimbursed by Proposition A and Proposition C LR funds, should be included in the Annual Expenditure Report to Metro in the period such expenditures are made and not in the period in which the disbursing fund is reimbursed for such expenditures.

7. **UNEXPENDED PROJECT FUNDS**
   All unexpended project funds remaining upon completion of an approved project must be re-programmed.

8. **ONGOING OPERATING PROJECTS**
   Continuing administration, transit or paratransit projects, are ongoing projects. Such projects which have unexpended funds at the year end (excluding any outstanding...
liabilities) may not carry fund balances into the next fiscal year. Ongoing projects must be resubmitted on an annual basis (see Annual Project Update on page 22).

9. **CARRYOVER CAPITAL PROJECTS**
   All other types of projects not cited above which 1) are not completed within the applied fiscal year and 2) have unexpended funds (i.e., fund balance), may be carried into the next fiscal year without resubmitting a project description. However, until completed, such projects must continue to be reported in the Annual Project Update and Annual Expenditure Report (Forms B and C).

10. **REIMBURSEMENT**
    Local Return funds may be used to advance a project which will subsequently be reimbursed by federal, state, or local grant funding, or private funds, if the project itself is eligible under LR Guidelines. The reimbursement must be returned to the appropriate Proposition A or Proposition C LR fund.

D. **NON-SUBSTITUTION OF FUNDS**

1. Proposition A and Proposition C revenues should only be used to maintain and/or improve public transit services. They may not be used to substitute for property tax revenues, which are currently funding existing programs. If the Jurisdiction is unable to segregate property tax from other general fund revenues which cannot be so distinguished, substitution of Proposition A and Proposition C funds for general funds is also prohibited.

2. Jurisdictions which currently receive federal and/or state transit assistance funds may use Proposition A and Proposition C revenues to replace or supplement any other state, federal, or local transit funds, as long as there is no relation to the property tax (as noted above).

3. Metro Staff reserves the right to bring project proposals involving the substitution of funds before Metro Board.

E. **TIMELY USE OF FUNDS**

1. **PROPOSITION A AND PROPOSITION C FUNDS**
   Under the Proposition A and Proposition C Ordinances, Jurisdictions have three years to expend LR funds. Funds must be expended within three years of the last day of the fiscal year in which funds were originally allocated. Therefore, by method of calculation, each Jurisdiction has the Fiscal Year of allocation plus three years to expend Proposition A and/or Proposition C funds. For example, a Jurisdiction receiving funds during FY 2004-05 must expend those funds, and any interest or other income earned from Proposition A and Proposition C projects, by June 30, 2008.

   30  Proposition A and Proposition C
   Local Return Guidelines 2007 Edition
Proposition A and Proposition C disbursements, interest income and other income earned from LR projects, such as fare revenues or revenues from advertising which are not expended within the allocated time will be returned to Metro for reallocation to Jurisdictions for discretionary programs of county-wide significance.

2. **DETERMINING COMPLIANCE WITH TIMELY USE PROVISION**
   In applying the timely use provision, Metro will use a "First-In-First-Out" (FIFO) accounting principle, to afford Jurisdictions maximum time to expend funds. For example, City A had a fund balance of $1,000,000 as of June 30, 2004. In order to avoid lapsing LR funds, City A must expend a total of $1,000,000 or more from its LR funds during Fiscal Years 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07. This calculation will be done individually for Proposition A and Proposition C funds.

3. **EXTENSION OF TIMELY USE PROVISION**
   Metro will allow Jurisdictions to reserve funds for multi-year capital projects.

F. **RELATIONSHIP TO TDA ENTRY AND FORMULA DISTRIBUTION**
   Provision of transit services with LR funds will not qualify Jurisdictions for Transit Development Act (TDA) funding programs. In addition, mileage will not be counted in Metro's subsidy allocation formula for TDA operators.

G. **NATIONAL TRANSIT DATABASE (NTD)**
   Locally funded transit systems are encouraged to report NTD data, either directly to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), or through Metro's consolidated NTD report. Examples of locally funded transit systems include community-based fixed route circulators, community shuttles, MetroLink feeder services and other rail station and neighborhood shuttles (Code 110). Also included are locally funded paratransit, dial-a-ride and demand response services, including taxi voucher and specialized transportation programs (Codes 120, 130).

   Benefits of increased NTD reporting include additional Federal Section 5307 capital funds for the LA County region, and improved data collection for regional transportation planning purposes. At this time, NTD reporting is voluntary for locally funded operators. The Proposition A Incentive Guidelines, as adopted by Metro Board, provide a mechanism to reimburse voluntary reporters dollar-for-dollar for additional funds generated to the LA County region, subject to funds availability.

H. **REPAYMENT OF FUNDS FOR FIXED ASSETS PURCHASES**
   If a facility ceases to be used for public transit use as originally stated in the project description, all Proposition A and Proposition C funds expended for the project must be returned to the Proposition A and Proposition C LR accounts.

General guidelines for repayment are as follows:

**Land:** Repayment of purchase price or appraised value, whichever is greater.

**Facilities:** 100% repayment of Proposition A and Proposition C LR funds if discontinuation of public transit use occurs between 0-5 years.

75% if discontinuation occurs in more than 5 years but less than 10 years.

50% if discontinuation occurs in more than 10 years but less than 15 years.

25% if discontinuation occurs in more than 15 years.

Repayment must be made no later than five years after the decision is made to cease utilizing the project as a public transit facility. Payback may be made in one lump sum or on an annual equal payment schedule over a five-year period.

**Vehicles:** Jurisdictions that cease to utilize vehicles for "public transit" purposes before their useful life, will be required to repay the funds into their Proposition A and Proposition C LR accounts in proportion to the useful life remaining. Federal standards for useful life will apply.

Repayment will be made in the same fiscal year as the vehicles ceased to be used for "public transit" purposes.
V. AUDIT SECTION

A financial and compliance audit will be conducted annually as part of Metro’s Consolidated Audit Program to verify adherence to the Proposition A and Proposition C guidelines. Audits will be performed in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that the audit is planned and performed to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the basic financial statements are free of material misstatement. The audit shall include examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the basic financial statements. The audit shall also include review of internal control procedures, assessing the accounting principles used, as well as evaluation of the overall basic financial presentation.

It is the jurisdictions’ responsibility to maintain proper accounting records and documentation to facilitate the performance of the audit prescribed in these guidelines. Jurisdictions are required to retain Local Return records for at least three years following the year of allocation and be able to provide trial balances, financial statements, worksheets and other documentation required by the auditor. Jurisdictions are advised that they can be held accountable for excess audit costs arising from poor cooperation and inaccurate accounting records that would cause delays in the completion of the required audits.

A. FINANCIAL AND COMPLIANCE PROVISIONS

The Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Audits shall include, but not limited to, verification of adherence to the following financial and compliance provisions of this guidelines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Area</th>
<th>Penalty for Non-Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verification that jurisdictions which do not use the State Controller’s Uniform System of Accounts and Records has established a Separate Proposition A and Proposition C Local Transit Assistance Account for local return purposes.</td>
<td>Suspension of disbursements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification of revenues received including allocations, project generated revenues, interest income.</td>
<td>Audit exception.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification that funds were expended with Metro’s approval and have not been substituted for property tax.</td>
<td>Jurisdiction will be required to reimburse its Local Return account for the amount expended prior to or without approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification that the funds are expended within three years from the last day of the</td>
<td>Lapsed funds will be returned to Metro for reallocation to jurisdictions for discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification that administrative expenditures (project code 480) did not exceed over 20% of the total annual LR expenditures.</td>
<td>Jurisdictions will be required to reimburse their Local Return account for the amount over the 20% cap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification that projects with greater than 25% change from the approved project budget has been amended by submitting amended Project Description Form (Form A).</td>
<td>Audit exception.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification that the Annual Project Update (Form B) was submitted on or before August 1st following the end of fiscal year.</td>
<td>Audit exception.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification that the Annual Expenditure Report (Form C) was submitted on or before October 15th following the end of fiscal year.</td>
<td>Audit Exception.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where expenditures include Street Maintenance or Improvement projects (project codes 430, 440 or 450), verification that Pavement Management System (PMS) is in place and being used.</td>
<td>Any Local Returned funds spent must be returned to the Local Return Funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where funds expended are reimbursable by other grants or fund sources, verification that the reimbursement is credited to the Local Return account upon receipt of reimbursement.</td>
<td>Audit exception and reimbursement received must be returned to the Local Return Funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where Proposition A funds were given, loaned or exchanged by one jurisdiction to another, verification that the receiving jurisdiction has credited its Local Return Accounts with the funds received.</td>
<td>Audit exception and reimbursement of affected funds to the Proposition A LR account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where funds expended were for Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) projects or projects with ITS elements, verification that a Self Certification has been completed and submitted to Metro.</td>
<td>Audit exception.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Verification that jurisdictions have a LR | Audit exception.
Assurances and Understandings form on file:

Where a capital reserve has been established, verification that a Capital Reserve Agreement is in effect, a separate account for the capital reserve is established, and current status is reported in the Annual Project Update (Form B).

Audit exception.

B. AUDIT DELIVERABLES

The auditor shall submit to the Jurisdictions and to Metro a Comprehensive Annual Report of Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds no later than March 31st following the end of fiscal year. The report must contain at the minimum, the following:

- Compliance Report, Summary of Exceptions, if any, and ensuing recommendations.
- Supplemental Schedules – Capital Reserves, if any; Schedule of Detailed Project Expenditures; and Capital Assets.

C. SUSPENSION OR REVOCATION

Jurisdictions are expected to take corrective action in response to the Local Return financial and compliance audit. Notwithstanding the provisions of this guidelines, Metro reserves the right to suspend or revoke allocation to jurisdictions who may be found to be in gross violation of this guidelines, or repeatedly committing violations, or refusing to take corrective measures.
# APPENDIX I

## PROPOSITION A AND PROPOSITION C LOCAL RETURN PROGRAM

### SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION A AND PROPOSITION C USES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT TYPE</th>
<th>PROPOSITION A</th>
<th>PROPOSITION C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streets and Roads Expenditures</td>
<td>• Allowed exclusively for Bus Lanes and Curb Cuts at corners located or adjacent to Bus Stops</td>
<td>• Allowed only on streets that carry regularly scheduled, Fixed-Route Public Transit Services and on streets that carry public Paratransit trips (see conditions outlined in eligibility section of the Guidelines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Synchronization</td>
<td>• Allowed if performed to predominantly benefit Transit.</td>
<td>• Allowed on streets that are heavily-used by Public Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bus Priority must be included as part of the project.</td>
<td>• The street must have full-sized transit buses operating on a regularly scheduled fixed-route (no minimum number of buses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The street must have a minimum of five (5) full-sized transit buses in each direction per hour</td>
<td>• Operating costs such as software and hardware maintenance are allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeways and Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>• Not allowed</td>
<td>• Commuter bikeways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Shall be linked to employment sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Management Activities</td>
<td>• Not allowed</td>
<td>Most elements allowed, such as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Preparation of TDM Ordinances and Deficiency Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Land Use Analysis required by CMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitoring of Transit Standards by transit operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Management System</td>
<td>• Not allowed</td>
<td>Some elements allowed, such as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• One-time development costs of a Pavement Management System.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The ongoing costs of maintaining the Pavement Management System (see Guidelines for conditions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading or Exchanging of Funds</td>
<td>• Allowed if the traded funds are used for Public Transit purposes</td>
<td>• Not allowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSURANCES AND UNDERSTANDINGS REGARDING
RECEIPT AND USE OF PROPOSITION A and PROPOSITION C FUNDS

The undersigned, in conjunction with the receipt of funds derived from the one-half cent sales tax imposed by Ordinance No. 16 (Proposition A) and the one-half cent sales tax imposed by the Proposition C Ordinance of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), and as required by Metro's Local Return Program Guidelines, hereby provides the following assurances and understandings.

A. The undersigned hereby assures Metro:

1. That the Proposition A and Proposition C funds will not be substituted for property tax funds which are currently funding existing public transportation programs;

2. That Proposition A and Proposition C funds will be used for public transit purposes as defined in Metro's Local Return Program Guidelines;

3. That the undersigned will submit to Metro a description of the use of funds:
   a. For service expansion or new service: at least 60 days before encumbrance of funds;
   b. For other projects: at least 30 days before encumbrance of funds;
   c. Annually, by August 1st of each year, an update of previously approved projects;
   d. Annually, by October 15th of each year, an update of the prior year's expenditures;

4. Any proposed use of funds will not duplicate or compete with any existing publicly-funded transit or paratransit service;

5. That Proposition A and Proposition C funds will be expended by the date that is three years from the last day of the fiscal year in which funds were originally allocated;

6. Unless otherwise required by Metro, an audit certified by a Certified Public Accountant, will be conducted by Metro within 180 days of the close of the fiscal year;

7. That the description of the intended use of the funds, as submitted to Metro, is an accurate depiction of the project to be implemented;

8. That a 25 percent change in project scope or financing for those projects defined in the Guidelines will be submitted to Metro at least 60 days before that change in scope is implemented;

9. That all projects proposed for Proposition A and Proposition C funding will meet the legal requirements of the Proposition A and Proposition C Ordinances and Metro's Local Return Program Guidelines criteria.
B. The undersigned further understands and agrees:

1. That Metro will require the undersigned to return any Proposition A and Proposition C funds and may impose interest penalties on any expenditure found to be illegal or improper under the terms of the Proposition A and Proposition C Ordinance or the Metro's Local Return Program Guidelines;

2. That the undersigned will, for projects to be funded in part or in whole with Proposition A and/or Proposition C funds, comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations, including without limitation: American With Disabilities Act (ADA), CEQA and NEPA, affirmative action, transit accessibility and public health and safety requirements and fair labor practices;

3. That the undersigned will either utilize the State Controller's Uniform System of Accounts and Records to accommodate uses and disbursements of Proposition A and Proposition C funds or will establish a separate Proposition A and Proposition C Local Transit Assistance accounting system which will allow financial and compliance audits of Proposition A and Proposition C funds transactions and expenditures to be conducted;

4. That any Proposition A and Proposition C funds not expended within the year of receipt of funds plus three years thereafter will be returned to Metro upon request thereafter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned has executed this "Assurances and Understandings Regarding Receipt and Use of Proposition A and Proposition C Funds" this ______ day of ____________, 20__ by its duly authorized officer:

CITY OF ________________________________

BY ___________________________________  

___________________________________  

(Title)

DATE ________________________________
APPENDIX III

LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (METRO)
PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM CERTIFICATION
PROPOSITION C

The City of ______________________ certifies that it has a Pavement Management System (PMS) in
conformance with the criteria stipulated by the Proposition C Local Return Guidelines (identical to the criteria
adopted by the Joint City/County/State Cooperation Committee, pursuant to Section 2108.1 of the Streets and
Highways Code).

The system was developed by ______________ and contains, as a minimum, the following elements:

* Inventory of arterial and collector routes (including all routes eligible for Proposition C funds), reviewed
and updated triennially. The last inventory update was completed ________________, 20___.

* Inventory of existing Class I bikeways, reviewed and updated triennially.

* Assessment (evaluation) of pavement condition for all routes in the system, updated triennially. The last
review of pavement conditions was completed ________________, 20___.

* Identification of all sections of pavement needing rehabilitation or replacement.

* Determination of budget needs for rehabilitation or replacement of deficient sections of pavement for
current triennial period, and for following triennial period.

If PMS was developed in-house, briefly describe it on an attached sheet.

FROM:

AGENCY __________________________ DATE __________________________

____________________________________________________
(Please Print Name)

____________________________________________________
(Please Print Name)

____________________________________________________
(Title)
CAPITAL RESERVE AGREEMENT

This Capital Reserve Agreement (this "Agreement") is entered into as of _______, by and between the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority ("Metro") and the City of _________ (the "City").

RECITALS:

A. The City receives Proposition [A] [C] local return funds (the "Local Return Funds") from Metro.

B. Pursuant to the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines, which are incorporated herein by reference, the City has three years, beginning the last day of the Fiscal Year in which funds were originally allocated, to expend the Local Return Funds. By method of calculation, each jurisdiction has three years plus the Fiscal Year of allocation to expend the Local Return funds. This period is identified in the Guidelines as Timely Use of Funds.

C. As of Fiscal Year _______, the City desires to commit and accumulate its Local Return Funds beyond the Timely Use of Funds period in order to construct and/or purchase ______________ as more particularly described in City's project description attached hereto as Exhibit A (the "Project").

D. The Metro Board at its _______ board meeting approved the City's establishment of a capital reserve fund for the Project.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereby desire to agree to the following terms and conditions:

AGREEMENT

1. The City acknowledges that establishing a capital reserve fund for the Project constitutes a long term financial and planning commitment.

2. The City shall establish a separate interest bearing account or sub-account to be designated as the Capital Reserve Account. Commencing with Fiscal Year _______, the City shall deposit $_______ of its Local Return Funds into the Capital Reserve Account. For future Fiscal Years, the City shall deposit the amount specified in its Project Annual Update submitted to Metro for that fiscal year, provided, however, if the City fails to submit its Project Annual Update, the City shall deposit its Local Return Funds in an amount equal to the amount deposited into the Capital Reserve Account for the immediately preceding fiscal year.
3. All interest accruing on the Capital Reserve Account shall remain in such account.

4. The City shall complete the Project by ____________.

5. The City shall comply with all terms and conditions for the Capital Reserve Account as provided in the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines, including, without limitation, the following:

   A. Each fiscal year, submitting the following items:
      
      (i) an updated Project Description Form (Form A); and
      (ii) an Annual Project Update (Form B), including the amount to be reserved and the current project status;

   B. Every three years commencing with the Commencement Date of this Agreement, Metro will evaluate the Capital Reserve Account, the status of the Project and the projected amount of available funds. Based on this evaluation, Metro may require the City to take certain actions including, without limitation, terminating the Capital Reserve Account.

   C. If the City uses the Local Return Funds in the Capital Reserve Account for a project different from the Project described above, the City shall return an amount equal to the improperly used funds to the Proposition A or Proposition C Central Account held by Metro. If the City fails to return the amount within 30 days from the date Metro notifies City that it must return the funds, the City hereby authorizes Metro to offset future Local Return allocations to the City in an amount equal to the improperly used funds.

   D. If the City fails to complete the Project as specified by the date in paragraph 4 above, the Local Return Funds in the Capital Reserve Account may be subject to lapse unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the parties.

   E. If the Project is a rail project, Metro may decide that the rail corridor is no longer a high priority. Metro can then terminate this Agreement and the City shall:
      
      (i) close the Capital Reserve Account and return the outstanding balance of the Capital Reserve Account, including accrued interest (the “Returned Funds”), to the City’s local return account; and
      (ii) reprogram the Returned Funds to be used within three years from the termination date of this Agreement. Any funds remaining after such three-year period shall lapse.

   F. If the City, independent of Metro action, desires to reprogram all or part of the funds in the Capital Reserve Account, the City must prior to such reprogramming, receive Metro’s written approval. The City shall provide Metro with notice of its desire to reprogram the funds in the Capital Reserve Account and indicate the proposed use.
of the funds to be reprogrammed and the effect of such reprogramming on the Project. Metro approval may be based on, among other things, whether after exhausting all Local Return funds, additional funds are necessary to meet the City's critical immediate or pending transit needs. If Metro approves reprogramming the funds, this Agreement shall be amended or terminated as appropriate. If Metro does not approve reprogramming the funds, the City must continue the Capital Reserve Account as provided herein or draw the funds down for Metro approved capital related project.

6. This Agreement shall commence on __________. This Agreement shall continue until such time as terminated by either party with a 30 day written notice under the conditions set forth in the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Capital Reserve Agreement by their duly authorized representatives as of the date above.

City of ______________________  Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

By: ________________________  By: ________________________
Name: ______________________ Name: ______________________
Its: ________________________  Its: ________________________

Approved as to form:

__________________________
Name: ______________________

Its: ________________________

Approved as to form:

__________________________
Name: Raymond G. Fortner, Jr. County Counsel

By: ________________________
Deputy
SAMPLE FUND EXCHANGE AGREEMENT

(PROPOSITION A LOCAL RETURN ONLY)

This Fund Exchange Agreement is made and entered into this 20 day of 2020, by and between the City of Surf City, California and the City of Mountain Valley, California with respect to the following facts:

A. The City of Mountain Valley proposes to provide Dial-A-Ride services to its elderly and individuals with disabilities. Approximately 20% of the City population is unable to use the available fixed route service due to frailty or handicap. No door-to-door public transit services are available in the City of Mountain Valley. Adequate Proposition A Local Return funding for such a service is not available given the limited amount of the City of Mountain Valley's Local Return allocation and the needs of other priority transit projects in the City.

B. City of Surf City has uncommitted funding authority for its Fiscal Year 2000-01 allocation of Proposition A Local Return funds which could be made available to the City of Mountain Valley to assist in providing the services discussed in Paragraph A of this Agreement.

C. City of Mountain Valley is willing to exchange its general funds in the amount indicated in Section 1 below in exchange for City of Surf City's uncommitted Proposition A Local Return funds.

D. City of Surf City is willing to exchange its uncommitted Proposition A Local Return funding in the amount indicated in Section 1 below to City of Mountain Valley, for the purpose identified in Paragraph A above, for City of Mountain Valley's general funds.

Now, therefore, in consideration of the mutual benefits to be derived by the parties and of the premises herein contained, it is mutually agreed as follows:

1. Exchange. City of Surf City shall transfer $100,000 of its Fiscal Year 2020-2021 Proposition A Local Return Funds to City of Mountain Valley. In return, City of Mountain Valley shall transfer $50,000 of its General Funds to City of Surf City.

2. Consideration. City of Surf City shall transfer the Proposition A Local Return funds to City of Mountain Valley in twelve equal installments due the first day of each month (or in one lump sum payment). City of Mountain Valley shall transfer its general funds to City of Surf City in twelve equal installments due the first of each month (or in one lump sum payment).

The first installment shall be due and payable upon approval by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority ("Metro") of City of Mountain Valley's project description Form (Form A) covering the services discussed in Paragraph A above.

3. Term. This Agreement is effective on the date above written and for such time as is necessary for both parties to complete their mutual obligations under this Agreement.
4. **Termination.** Termination of this Agreement may be made by either party before the date of approval of the project description covering the funds in question by the Metro so long as written notice of intent to terminate is given to the other party at least five (5) days prior to the termination date.

5. **Notices.** Notices shall be given pursuant to this agreement by personal service on the party to be notified, or by written notice upon such party deposited in the custody of the United States Postal Service addressed as follows:

   a. City Manager  
      City of Surf City  
      101 Main Street  
      Surf City, CA 90000

   b. City Manager  
      City of Mountain Valley  
      401 Valley Boulevard  
      Mountain Valley, CA 90000

6. **Assurances**

   A. City of Mountain Valley shall use the assigned Proposition A Local Return funds only for the purpose of providing the services discussed in Paragraph A of this Agreement and within the time limits specified in Metro's Proposition A Local Return Program Guidelines.

   B. Concurrently with the execution of this Agreement City of Mountain Valley shall provide Metro with the Standard Assurances and Understandings Regarding Receipt and Use of Proposition A Funds specified in the Guidelines regarding the use of the assigned Proposition A Local Return funds.

7. This Agreement constitutes the entire understanding between the parties, with respect to the subject matter herein. This Agreement shall not be amended nor any provisions or breach thereof waived, except in writing signed by the parties hereto.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Fund Exchange Agreement to be executed by their respective officers, duly authorized, on the day and year above written.

CITY OF __________________________  CITY OF __________________________

BY __________________________  BY __________________________

ATTEST:

City Clerk __________________________  City Clerk __________________________

Approved as to Form: __________________________  Approved as to Form: __________________________
Policy Summary

Federal regulations (23 CFR Parts 655 and 940 Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Architecture and Standards; Final Rule) now require ITS projects funded with the Highway Trust Fund to conform to the National ITS Architecture and Standards; be guided by a regional architecture with geographic boundaries defined by stakeholder needs; and use systems engineering analysis on a scale commensurate with the project scope. It is Metro's Policy to abide by the Federal ITS regulations and requirements for those agencies seeking federal funding programmed by Metro for projects subject to this rule. For consistency and to maximize benefits, Los Angeles Countywide ITS Policy and Procedures is also applied to projects with state and local funding sources programmed and administered by the Metro.

Procedures Summary

To ensure compliance with the ITS Policy, all ITS project sponsor agencies including Metro internal departments are required to complete the Los Angeles County Regional ITS Architecture Consistency Certification Form (Attachment B) and to self-certify that their project's ITS elements in whole or in part are consistent with the Los Angeles County Regional ITS Architecture.

Attached is the RIITS self-certification form. This form must be completed and submitted to Metro for each Local Return funded ITS project or project which includes an ITS element. To learn more about RIITS, please visit www.riits.net. For a complete copy of the Los Angeles Countywide ITS Policy and Procedures, you may go directly to http://RIITS.net/ReglITSDocs.html and choose “Los Angeles Countywide ITS Policy and Procedures Document.”
LOS ANGELES COUNTY REGIONAL ITS ARCHITECTURE CONSISTENCY

SELF-CERTIFICATION FORM

This form should be completed and executed for all ITS projects or projects with ITS elements except routine maintenance and operations, traffic signal controller replacement, purchase of bus or rolling stock, expansion or enhancement of an existing operating system. The form should be sent to Metro Countywide Planning and Development (CP&D) for any planned ITS projects or proposed funding involving Local, State or Federal funds programmed or administered through the Metro at the time of submittal of project application.

1. Name of Sponsoring Agency:

2. Contact Name:

3. Contact Phone:

4. Contact Email:

5. Project Description:

6. Identify the ITS elements being implemented and the relevant National Architecture User Services(s), see Attachment A.
7. Outline of the concept of operations for the project:


8. Identify participating agencies roles and responsibilities:


By signing and self-certifying this form, the agency commits itself to follow the ITS requirements listed below during project design and implementation. Please be advised that your project may be subject to further review and documentation by FHWA or FTA during project design and implementation phases:

- Perform a lifecycle analysis for the ITS project elements and incorporate these costs into the Operations and Maintenance plan as part of the system engineering process,

- Maintain and operate the system according to the recommendations of the Operations and Maintenance plan upon project completion,

- Use the systems engineering process and document the system engineering steps, and

- Use the Los Angeles County Regional ITS Architecture interface standards if required and conform to the regional configuration management process.

Signature:

______________________________  ______________________
Agency Representative            Date

Please return the original Project Self Certification Form to Metro Department of CP&D, Attention, Ms. Carol Inge, Deputy Executive Officer, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, One Gateway Plaza, MS 99-22-1, Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952
ELIGIBLE RECREATION TRANSIT SERVICE AREA

Recreational transit area eligible for full Proposition A & C funding

Recreational transit area available for Proposition A & C funding on a proportional share basis
LOCAL RETURN FORMS

**Summary:**

**Project Code:** All projects must have Project Codes (see column on right). This code is critical in Form submittal as it is used in the LR database system.

**Sequence Number:** Sequence Numbers distinguish between the different projects being implemented. Indicate the sequence number of the project that is the order of submittal for the project (i.e., oldest approved to most recent approval).

**Form A** should be submitted whenever a Jurisdiction is requesting the approval of a new project or if there is a budget or scope change of more than 25 percent in an ongoing transit or paratransit project (as defined in the Proposition A and Proposition C Guidelines).

**Form B** requires Jurisdictions to give an update of already approved, ongoing and carryover Prop A and Prop C LR projects. Since new projects require additional information, please include all new projects on Form A only. (Note: Jurisdictions are required to call out all administration charges to Direct Administration in order to verify compliance of 20 percent maximum limit).

**Form C** requires Jurisdictions to report the annual expenditures for both Prop A and Prop C LR for the previous fiscal year. (Note: Jurisdictions are also required to submit an accounting of recreational transit trips, destinations and costs, if applicable).

**PROJECT CODES**

**PROP A AND PROP C LR JOINT CODES:**

110 Fixed Route Service
120 Paratransit Service - General Public Dial-a-Ride
130 Paratransit Service - Elderly & Disabled (E&D)
140 Recreational Transit Service (incl. special event)
150 Bus Stop Improvement (BSI) Program
160 Bus Stop Improvement - Capital
170 Bus Stop Improvement - Maintenance
180 Capital - Vehicle & Misc. Equipment (fare box)
190 Capital - Vehicle Modification Program
200 Capital - Vehicle Purchase Program
210 Transportation Systems Management (TSM)
220 Transit Security - On-Board & Bus Stop
230 Transit Security - Station/Park-and-Ride Lot
240 Fare Subsidy (Taxi)
250 Fare Subsidy (User-Side Subsidy)
270 Transportation Planning (Prop A eligible and Prop C eligible)
280 Transit Marketing
290 Park-and-Ride Lot Program
300 Transit Facility Transportation Enhancements
310 Transit Centers Program
320 Metro Rail Capital
350 Right-of-Way Improvements
360 Commuter Rail (Operations)
370 Commuter Rail (Capital)
380 Capital Reserve
390 Rail Transit Enhancements
480 Direct Administration
500 Other (Specify)

**Exclusive Uses of Prop A LR Funds:**

400 Signal Synchronization
405 Fund Exchange
410 Transportation Demand Management

**Exclusive Uses of Prop C LR Funds:**

400 Signal Synchronization & Traffic Management
410 Transportation Demand Management
420 Congestion Management Program (CMP)
430 Bikeways & Pedestrian Improvements
440 Street Repair and Maintenance (e.g., slurry seal)
450 Street Improvement Projects (e.g., widenings)
460 Street TSM Projects (e.g., signalization)
470 Pavement Management Systems (PMS)
Form A - Project Description Form
(This form may be submitted any time during the fiscal year)

--Instructions--

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Telephone No.</td>
<td>Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Mail Address</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Title**

**Project Code:**

Sequence Number:  

Type:  

- Capital
- Operating
- New
- Replaced

Est Start Date:  

Est Completion Date:  

**Project Description and Justification**

**Project Revenues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source(s)</th>
<th>Proposition A Amount</th>
<th>Proposition C Amount</th>
<th>Other Amount</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Return</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accessibility Features (For Bus Stop Improvement Projects only):**

- Curb Cut
- Bus Pad
- Installation Sidewalk
- Removal of sidewalk barrier

For Bikeways and Pedestrian Improvements, Street Repair and Maintenance or Street Improvement projects (project codes 430, 440 or 450), please check to indicate a Pavement Management System (PMS) Self Certification Form (See Appendix V) has been submitted to Metro.

For Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) projects, or projects which include an ITS element, please check box to indicate a Self Certification Form (See Appendix V) has been completed and submitted to Metro.

Authorized Signature:  

Title:  

Date:  

Click here to access form.
Form A - Project Description Form

(This form may be submitted any time during the fiscal year)

Instructions:

Summary:
Form A should be submitted whenever a Jurisdiction is requesting the approval of a new project or if there is a budget or scope change of more than 25 percent in an ongoing transit or paratransit project (as defined in the Prop A and Prop C Guidelines).

Key Terms:
- Local Jurisdiction: Indicate your City or Agency.
- Fiscal Year: Indicate the fiscal year (July 1 - June 30th) for which Prop A or Prop C LR funds will be used.
- Project Description and Justification: Provide a brief project description (include any necessary details) to help Metro staff determine project scope and eligibility.
- Project Revenues: Under the appropriate fund sources, indicate the revenues expected to fund the project.
- Accessibility Features: Check box applicable for Bus Stop Improvement Projects only.
- Street Maintenance Improvement or Bikeway Projects: Check the box to indicate that a Pavement Management System (PMS) is in place and being used (see Appendix III).
- Intelligent Transportation Systems projects: Please check the box if this project is or has an ITS project element to indicate that an ITS self-certification (see Appendix VII) for has been submitted to Metro.
- Authorized Signature: Form A may be printed, signed and dated by authorized Local Jurisdiction; and sent to Metro by mail or fax, or e-mailed as described in Step 5.

Excel Operations:
Step 1 - Confirm computer is set to run macros
Open Microsoft Excel application
From the menu, select:
- Tools
- Macros
- Security
- Set it at Medium
- Press OK
Close Excel application

Step 2 Open Form A
Visit Metro's Web Site at www.metro.net
- Go to Projects/Programs
- Click on Local Return
- Click on Form A to open
Click yes to open the document containing Macros

Step 3 - Enter Form A Information
Once Form A is opened,
- Select correct agency (click on small arrow to scroll agency names)
- Enter contact name, telephone number, and e-mail address
- Enter project information on Form A

Step 4 - Save document under MY DOCUMENTS
Once information is entered, on Form A, save document in My Documents
- Save Document as Form A City of .......

Step 5 - Forward Form A to Metro
Open Outlook (or other e-mail browser)
On e-mail include:
- Contact information including name, title, telephone number, and jurisdiction
- Brief description of the e-mail (transmittal)
- Attach Form A to the e-mail message

Important Changes
- All forms require that the entire value of project be entered, no longer will values be stated in $ thousands.
- DO NOT alter forms. If for any reason there is a difference in Project Code, Sequence Number, or Project Title, contact Metro to resolve any discrepancies.
- Enter value for every project. If project is finalized, enter COMPLETE. DO NOT enter a dollar value.
Form B – Annual Project Update Form
(This form must be submitted by August 1st of each year)

--Instructions--

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Program

Form B
ANNUAL PROJECT UPDATE FORM
(Must be submitted by August 1st of each year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Telephone No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Sequence Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Status*</th>
<th>Proposition A</th>
<th>Proposition C</th>
<th>Est. Project Revenue</th>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>Total Project Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Project Status: OG=On going operating projects; CD=Caryover credit projects

Click here to access form.
Form B – Annual Project Update Form
(This form must be submitted by August 1st of each year)

--Instructions--

Summary:
Form B requires Jurisdictions to give an update of already approved, ongoing and carryover Prop A and Prop C LR projects. Since new projects require additional information, please include all new projects on Form A only. (Note: Jurisdictions are required to call out all administration charges to Direct Administration in order to verify compliance of 20 percent maximum limit).

Key Terms:
- **Local Jurisdiction**: Indicate your City or Agency.
- **Fiscal Year**: Indicate the fiscal year (July 1 - June 30th) for which Prop A or Prop C LR funds will be used.
- **Project Code**: Enter Project Codes (see column on right). This code is critical in Form submittal as it is used in the LR database system.
- **Sequence Number**: Sequence Numbers distinguish between the different projects being implemented. Indicate the sequence number of the project which is the order of submittal for the project (i.e., oldest approved to most recent approval).
- **Project Title**: Provide Project Title as indicated on the Form A or previous Form B submittal.
- **Project Status**: Check box applicable – Completed, On-going or Carryover.
- **Project Revenues**: Under the appropriate fund sources, indicate the itemized revenues expected to fund the project.
- **Authorized Signature**: Form B may be printed, signed and dated by authorized Local Jurisdiction, and sent to Metro by mail or fax, or e-mailed as described in Step 5.

Excel Operations:

**Step 1 – Confirm computer is set to run macros**
Open Microsoft Excel application
From the menu, select:
- **Tools**
- **Macros**
- **Security**
- **Set it at Medium**
- **Press OK**
Close Excel application

**Step 2 Open Form B**
Visit Metro’s Web Site at www.metro.net
- **Go to Projects/Programs**
- **Click on Local Return**
- **Click on Form B to open**
Click yes to open the document containing Macros

**Step 3 – Enter Form B Information**
Once Form B is opened,
- Select correct agency (click on small arrow to scroll agency names)
- Enter contact name, telephone number, and e-mail address
- Enter appropriate values for each project

**Step 4 – Save document under MY DOCUMENTS**
Once the values of each project have been entered, save document into My Documents
- Save Document as Form B City of

**Step 5 – Forward Form B to Metro**
Open Outlook (or other e-mail brdwor)
On e-mail include:
- Contact information including name, title, telephone number, and Jurisdiction
- Brief description of the e-mail (transmittal)
- Attach Form B to the e-mail message

Important Changes

- All forms require that the entire value of project be entered, no longer will values be stated in $ thousands.
- DO NOT alter forms. If for any reason there is a difference in Project Code, Sequence Number, or Project Title, contact Metro to resolve any discrepancies.
- DO NOT add or remove project on Form B, please contact Metro regarding any changes.
- Enter value for every project. If project is finalized, enter COMPLETE. DO NOT enter a dollar value.
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Form C – Annual Expenditure Report Form
(This form must be submitted by October 15th of each year)

**Instructions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Telephone No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Sequence Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Metro Approved Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year 2005 Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Specify):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Click here to access form.
Form C – Annual Expenditure Report Form
(This form must be submitted by October 15th of each year)

--Instructions--

Summary:

Form C requires Jurisdictions to report the annual expenditures for both Prop A and Prop C LR for the previous fiscal year. (Note: Jurisdictions are also required to submit an accounting of recreational transit trips, destinations and costs, if applicable).

Key Terms:

- **Local Jurisdiction**: Indicate your City or Agency.
- **Fiscal Year**: Indicate the fiscal year (July 1 - June 30th) for which Prop A or Prop C LR funds will be used.
- **Project Title**: Provide Project Title as indicated on the Form A or previous Form B submittal.
- **Project Status**: Check box applicable – Completed, On-going or Carryover.
- **Project Revenues**: Under the appropriate fund sources, indicate the itemized revenues expected to fund the project.
- **Authorized Signature**: Form C may be printed, signed and dated by authorized Local Jurisdiction, and sent to Metro by mail or fax, or e-mailed as described in Step 5.

Excel Operations:

**Step 1 – Confirm computer is set to run macros**
Open Microsoft Excel application
From the menu, select:
- **Tools**
- **Macros**
- **Security**
- **Set it at Medium**
- **Press OK**
Close Excel application

**Step 2 Open Form C**
Visit Metro’s Web Site at www.metro.net
- Go to Projects/Programs
- Click on Local Return
- Click on Form C to open
Click yes to open the document containing Macros

**Step 3 – Enter Form C Information**
Once Form C is opened,
- Select correct agency (click on small arrow to scroll agency names)
- Enter contact name, telephone number, and e-mail address
- Enter appropriate values for each project

**Step 4 – Save document under MY DOCUMENTS**
Once the values of each project have been entered; save document into My Documents
- Save Document as Form C.City of……...

**Step 5 – Forward Form C to Metro**
Open Outlook (or other e-mail server)
On e-mail include:
- Contact information such as name, title, telephone number, and Jurisdiction
- Brief description of the e-mail (transmittal)
- Attach Form C on the e-mail message

Important Change Important Changes

- All forms require that the entire value of project be entered, no longer will values be stated in $ thousands.
- Enter value for every project. If project is finalized, enter COMPLETE. DO NOT enter a dollar value
GLOSSARY OF TERMS
USED IN LOCAL RETURN GUIDELINES

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 1990
A civil rights law passed by Congress in 1990 that makes it illegal to discriminate against people with disabilities in employment, services provided by state and local governments, public and private transportation, public accommodations and telecommunications.

Advanced Traveler Information Systems (ATIS)
ATIS technologies provide travelers and transportation professionals with the information they need to make decisions, from daily individual travel decisions to larger scale decisions that affect the entire system, such as those concerning incident management.

Air Quality Management District (AQMD)
Administrative districts organized in California to control air pollution. Generally, AQMDs and their national parallel encompass multiple jurisdictions and closely follow the definition of Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Areas and Metropolitan Statistical Areas.

Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS)
ATCS uses sensors to interpret characteristics of traffic approaching a traffic signal, and using mathematical and predictive algorithms, adapts the signal timing accordingly, optimizing its performance.

Advanced Traffic Management Systems (ATMS)
ATMS technologies apply surveillance and control strategies to improve traffic flow on highways and arterials.

Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL)
The installation of devices on a fleet of vehicles (e.g., buses, trucks, or taxis) to enable the fleet manager to determine the level of congestion in the road network. AVL is also used to enable the fleet to function more efficiently by pinpointing the location of vehicles in real time.

Bicyclists Rights
According to CVC21200 Bicyclists have all the rights and responsibilities of vehicle drivers.

Bikeway Definitions

Class I Bikeway - Off road paved bike path
Exclusive bi-directional path designated for bicycles or as multi-use path shared with pedestrians (if pedestrian path is not adjacent).

Class II Bikeway - On-road striped bike lane

Class III Bikeway - On-road bike route (signage only)
Streets designated as preferred routes through high demand corridors, used to provide continuity to other bicycle facilities (usually II bikeways), or provide routes to transit or other destinations where the streets are too narrow for bike lanes. Usually bike routes have some added preferential bike treatments that offers advantages over alternative routes.
Bus turn-out
A branch from or widening of a road that permits buses to stop, without obstructing traffic, while laying over or while passengers board and alight. It is designed to allow easy reentry of the bus into the traffic stream.

California Streets and Highways Code
This is the legal code regulating the roads and highways of the State of California. The code sets forth the administration and funding of the highway system, the relationship of the state government to the county and local governments in regards to streets and roads, administration of tolls collected by the state, and various acts dealing with streets and highways passed by the state legislature.

Capital Reserve
With Metro Board approval and signed Capital Reserve Agreement, funds may be set aside for Capital projects to provide reserve funds for a period of time over the three year timely use provision.

Carry-over Project
A project that was not completed and which takes two or more year to finish. The construction of a transit center or a citywide bus shelter installation project may be multi-year projects.

Congestion Management Program (CMP)
A state mandated program linked to Proposition 111 (1990) that requires each county to prepare a plan to address traffic congestion on regional streets and freeways. Elements of the CMP include designation of a regional highway system with level of service (LOS) standards, a local trip reduction ordinance, capital improvement program, land use impact analysis, and transit performance standards. If LOS standards are not maintained, deficiency plans must be prepared and implemented.

Changeable Message Signs (CMS)
Electronic road and transit station signs used to display information that can be updated, such as warnings of road incidents, hazardous weather conditions, or estimated arrival times of transit vehicles. Used in ATIS and ATMS. Also called Variable Message Signs (VMS).

Councils of Governments (COG)
Regional planning bodies that exist throughout the United States. A typical council is defined to serve an area of several counties, and they address issues such as regional planning, water use, pollution control, and transportation. The Council membership is drawn from the county, city, and other government bodies within its area.

Commuter Rail
Railroad local and regional passenger train operations between a central city, its suburbs and/or another central city. It may be either locomotive-hauled or self-propelled, and is characterized by multi-trip tickets, specific station-to-station fares, railroad employment practices and usually only one or two stations in the central business district. Also known as "suburban rail."

Curb Cut
A small ramp between the sidewalk and curb that facilitates passage by wheelchairs, strollers, etc. between the sidewalk and street intersection.

Commercial Vehicle Operations (CVO)
ITS program to apply advanced technologies to commercial vehicle operations, including commercial vehicle electronic clearance; automated roadside safety inspection; electronic purchase of credentials; automated mileage and fuel reporting and auditing; safety status monitoring; communication between drivers, dispatchers, and intermodal transportation providers; and immediate notification of incidents and descriptions of hazardous materials involved.

**Demand Responsive**
Non-fixed-route service utilizing vans or buses with passengers boarding and alighting at pre-arranged times at any location within the system's service area. Also called "Dial-a-Ride."

**Dial-a-Ride**
A shared-ride public transportation service for senior citizens age 65 and older, people with disabilities and people who meet American Disabilities Act (ADA) eligibility.

**Direct Administration**
Those fully burdened salaries and overhead, office supplies and equipment directly associated with administering LR operating and capital projects.

**Electronic Payment Systems**
Systems that collect payments using an electronic transponder. Payment types include fees for transit fares, taxis, parking, and tolls. Electronic payment systems can also gather real-time transit information on travel demand for better planning and scheduling of services.

**Farebox revenue**
Money, including fares and transfers, zone and park and ride receipts, paid by transit passengers, also known as "passenger revenue."

**Financial and Compliance Audit**
The review and examination of the jurisdictions' books and records to verify compliance with existing statutes governing the Local Return Funds. Such review and examination include verification of adherence to the generally accepted accounting principles, review of internal control system and evaluation of compliance with the Local Return Guidelines. The Financial and Compliance Audit shall be conducted by an independent auditor and in accordance with the Government Auditing Standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

**Fiscal year**
A twelve-month period to which the annual budget applies and at the end of which a governmental unit determines its financial position and the results of its operations. This twelve-month period varies from the calendar year. In the California, State Government system, the fiscal year starts July 1 and ends the following June 30. In the Federal system, the fiscal year starts October 1 and ends the following September 30.

**Fixed Route**
Service provided on a repetitive, fixed-schedule basis along a specific route with vehicles stopping to pick up and deliver passengers to specific locations; each fixed-route trip serves the same origins and destinations, unlike demand-responsive and taxicabs.

**Flexible Destination**
A type of demand-responsive service which takes on passengers according to a fixed route, and drops passengers off at alternative destinations within a defined service area.
Formula Funds
Funds distributed or apportioned to qualifying recipients using formulas which are based on statistics (such as operating performance or route characteristics) and established by law or by funding agency-adopted policies.

Fund Exchange
Funds traded to another Local Jurisdiction or Agency for an agreed amount. Funds returned may be from General, State, Federal funds or other agreed upon method of exchange between the agencies. Eligible under Proposition A only.

Giving
Local Jurisdictions can give Prop C funds to another Jurisdiction for a transit related project as long as Metro approves, and no exchange or gift of any kind is received in return.

Headsign
A destination sign above the front (and sometimes side) window of a bus or train.

Information Exchange Network (IEN)
The Los Angeles County IEN can exchange real-time TCS data from intersections in each of the county's several traffic forums and enables all forums, the county, and partner cities to access the information.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)
This program is an initiative of the United States Department of Transportation to add information technology to surface transportation infrastructure and vehicles. It aims to manage vehicles, roads, and routes to improve efficiency, safety and reduce vehicle wear, transportation times and fuel costs. ITS Architecture relates to the overarching framework that allows individual ITS services and technologies to work together, share information, and yield synergistic benefits.

Loaning
Local Jurisdictions may arrange a mutually acceptable temporary transfer or loan from one Jurisdiction to another. Refer to Metro’s Administrative Process for additional information.

Local Jurisdiction
City or Agency that is the applicant for the project to be funded with Proposition A or Proposition C Local Return (LR).

Maintenance
Maintenance refers to minor work to prevent further deterioration, such as, slurry seal, or pothole repair

Maintenance of Effort
This requirement provides for the continuation of funding commitments by local jurisdictions on roadways used by public transit while supplementing these improvements with Proposition C Local Return funds. Local Return funds cannot be used to replace any pre-existing roadway funding but only to augment what is currently being utilized by local jurisdictions. In the past, local jurisdictions have had to report to the State Controller those funds spent on streets and roads in order to be in compliance with the California Streets and Highways Code.

Metro
The Metropolitan Transportation Authority. Metro staff manages the administration of the program. Metro refers to the administrative staff.

Metro Art
The Metro department responsible for incorporating art enhancements into Metro projects, including rail stations, bus stops, construction sites, streetscapes and other public oriented improvements.

Metro Board
The Metropolitan Transportation Authority has an established member list of Board of Directors and Executives as appointed by the Board. The Metro Board makes decisions on funding allocations, Guidelines, Capital Reserves and possible appeals.

Metro Rail
Rail service operated by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)

Metro Long Range Transportation Plans
In April 2001, the Metro Board adopted the Long Range Transportation Plan. This plan is a 25-year blueprint for transportation planning in Los Angeles County through the year 2025. The Long Range Transportation Plan assesses future population increases projected for the county and what such increases will mean for future mobility needs. The plan recommends what can be done within anticipated revenues, as well as what could be done if additional revenues become available.

Metro Short Range Transportation Plans
The 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan focuses on the phasing of transportation improvements through 2009 that will help put together the pieces of our mobility puzzle. The Plan relies on performance-based modeling to identify the best solution for each mobility challenge. In total, $19.3 billion is needed to fund this Plan's transportation priorities through 2009. These include the costs of operating the current system and funding new transportation solutions.

National ITS Architecture
A systems framework to guide the planning and deployment of ITS infrastructure. The national ITS architecture is a blueprint for the coordinated development of ITS technologies in the U.S. The architecture defines the functions that must be performed, the subsystems that provide these functions, and the information that must be exchanged to support the defined User Services. The National ITS Architecture was released as a final document in June 1996.

National Transit Database (NTD)
A reporting system administered by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) that uses uniform categories to record mass transportation financial and operating information through a uniform system of accounts on an annual basis.

Paratransit
Auxiliary public transportation available to elderly or disabled passengers or patrons in areas, which are underserved by conventional transit. Paratransit is generally operated using smaller vehicles, with flexible schedules and routes.

Park-and-Ride
An access mode to transit in which patrons drive private vehicles or ride bicycles to a transit station, bus or rail stop or carpool or vanpool waiting area and park their vehicles in the area provided for the purpose. They then ride the transit system or take the carpool/vanpool to their destinations. (TRB) 2
involve the use of a motorized personal vehicle in conjunction with transit. Park-and-ride facilities include a parking lot or portion of a lot near transit stops, allowing transit users to park their personal vehicles for a short period of time and make convenient transfers to the transit system.

**Pavement Condition Index (PCI)**
A value for a pavement segment representing its condition. The Pavement Condition Index (PCI) is a numerical rating of the pavement condition that ranges from 0 to 100, with 0 being the worst possible condition and 100 being the best possible condition.

**Pavement Management System (PMS)**
A systematic process that provides, analyzes, and summarizes pavement information for use in selecting and implementing cost-effective pavement construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance programs and projects. A PMS involves the identification of optimum strategies at various Pavement Condition Index (PCI) levels and maintains pavements at an adequate PCI Threshold (level of serviceability). These include, but are not limited to, systematic procedures for scheduling maintenance and rehabilitation activities based on optimization of benefits and minimization of costs.

**Project Code**
Project Codes distinguish the type of projects being implemented.

**Reconstruction**
Activities that extend the serviceable life by at least 10 years, and involve reworking or removal and replacement of all or part of the engineered layers in the pavement structure. Removal and replacement of all asphalt and concrete layers and often the base and sub-base layers, in combination with remediation of the sub-grade and drainage, and possible geometric changes. Due to its high cost, reconstruction is rarely done solely on the basis of pavement condition. Other circumstances such as obsolete geometrics, capacity improvement needs, and/or alignment changes, are often involved in the decision to reconstruct a pavement.

**Recreational Transit**
City-sponsored trips to recreational or cultural destinations within defined geographic area. Charter buses are frequently used and trips must be advertised to the general public. Service is generally contracted out to a private sector operator.

**Rehabilitation**
Activities that extend the serviceable life by at least 10 years, and add structural capacity to the pavement.

**Reimbursement**
LR funds may be advanced for other grant funds as long as the project itself is eligible under LR Guidelines. The grant funds must be reimbursed to the LR fund.

**Resurfacing**
Activities that extend the serviceable life by at least 10 years and change the surface characteristics of the pavement. Resurfacing generally consists of placing additional asphalt concrete over a structurally sound highway or bridge that needs treatment to extend its useful life.
Revenue Vehicle Miles
The miles a vehicle travels while in revenue service. Vehicle revenue miles exclude travel to and from storage facilities, training operators prior to revenue service, road tests and deadhead travel, as well as school bus and charter services.

Ride matching programs
Programs that provide nearest major intersection-matching services to commuters who wish to establish a car- or van-pool.

Right of Way
Land; a public or private area that allows for passage of people or goods, including, but not limited to, freeways, streets, bicycle paths, alleys, trails and walkways. A public right-of-way is dedicated or deeded to the public entity for use under the control of a public agency.

Regional Integration of Intelligent Transportation Systems (RIITS)
This system supports information exchange between freeway, traffic, transit and emergency service agencies to improve management of the Los Angeles County transportation system.

Ramp Metering Station (RMS)
Traffic-responsive regulation of vehicle entry to a freeway, typically via sensor controlled freeway ramp stoplights.

Sequence Code
Sequence Codes distinguish between the different projects being implemented.

Shuttle
A public or private vehicle that travels back and forth over a particular route, especially a short route or one that provides connections between transportation systems, employment centers, etc.

State Controller
The Controller is the state’s chief financial officer and is elected by a vote of the people every four years. The duties of the State Controller are prescribed by the Constitution with additional powers and functions set by statute. The primary function of the State Controller is to provide sound fiscal control over both receipt and disbursement of public funds, to report periodically on the financial operations of both state and local governments and to make certain that money due the state is collected in a fair, equitable and effective manner. The office also enforces collection of delinquent gas, truck and insurance taxes.

Traffic Control Systems (TCS)
Advanced systems that adjust the amount of “green time” for each street and coordinate operation between each signal to maximize traffic flow and minimize delay. Adjustments are based on real-time changes in demand.

Traffic/Transportation/Transit Management Center (TMC)
Traffic/Transportation/Transit Management Center (interchangeable)

Transfer Center
A fixed location where passengers interchange from one route or transit vehicle to another.

Transit revenues
Revenues generated from public transportation (bus, rail or other conveyance for public).

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)
A program designed to maximize the people-moving capability of the transportation system by increasing the number of people in each vehicle or by influencing the time of, or need to, travel. To accomplish these sorts of changes, TDM programs must rely on incentives or disincentives to make the shifts in behavior attractive. The term TDM encompasses both the alternatives to driving alone and the techniques or supporting strategies that encourage the use of these modes.

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
A prioritized program of transportation projects to be implemented in appropriate stages over several years (3 to 5 years). The projects are recommended from those in the transportation systems management element and the long-range element of the planning process. This program is required as a condition for a locality to receive federal transit and highway grants.

Transportation Management Associations (TMAs)
An urbanized area with a population more than 200,000 (as determined by the most recent decennial census) or other area when TMA designation is requested by the Governor and the MPO (or affected local officials), and officially designated by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration. TMA designation applies to the entire metropolitan planning area(s). (23CFR500).

Transportation Enhancements (TE)
A funding program of the USDOT Federal Highway Administration that offers communities the opportunity to expand transportation choices. Activities such as safe bicycle and pedestrian facilities, scenic routes, beautification, and other investments increase opportunities for recreation, accessibility, and safety for everyone beyond traditional highway programs.

Transportation Systems Management (TSM)
Transportation Systems Management is the cooperative development and implementation of strategies to maximize the safe movement of people and goods by managing an integrated multimodal transportation system. The effective management of the system will enable the traveling public more efficient use of the existing transportation facilities. Elements of TSM include incident management programs, traveler information systems, traffic signal systems upgrades, intermodal freight planning, surveillance control systems, demand management techniques, and commercial vehicle operations.

Traffic Signal Priority (TSP)
It gives preferential treatment to one type of system user over other users and allows signal controllers to service competing needs in the order of relative importance.

User Services
Services available to travelers on an ITS-equipped transportation system, as set forth by ITS America. The 30 services are arranged in 7 categories, as follows: travel and transportation management, travel demand management, public transportation operations, electronic payment, commercial vehicle operations, emergency management, and advanced vehicle control and safety systems.

User-side Subsidies
This refers to funds set aside to offer discounts to public transit users. Such subsidies are approved by local jurisdictions councils or boards and are optional. A city, for example, pays full price for a monthly bus or rail pass but will sell it to a transit user (city resident) for a lower (subsidized) rate. Each city defines who is eligible for subsidies based on demand and budgetary constraints.
Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
The number of miles traveled within a specific geographic location by vehicles for a period of one year. VMT is calculated either by using two odometer readings or, in the absence of one of the odometer readings, by regression estimate.
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Website: http://www.fta.dot.gov/31_ENG_Printable.htm

Federal Highway Administration (ITS glossary )
Website: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/glossary/glossary_listing.cfm

Website: www.kitsaptransit.org/home/ktjargon.html

State of North Carolina Department of Transportation
Website: http://www.ncdot.org/transit/transitnet/Glossary/

US Department of Transportation glossary
Website: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/trterms.htm

Other website sources

http://sco.ca.gov
http://www.belmont.gov/SubContent.asp?CatId=240000622
http://www.dieselnet.com/gl-a.html
http://www.tempo.gov/tim/DialARide.htm
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Attachment 5

Draft Bicycle Transportation Strategic Policies
The vision for the Strategic Plan is to provide regional leadership in making bicycling an integral part of travel choices in the region, integrating bicycle planning and facilities in transportation projects, and promoting the linkages between bicycling and the region. Additional resources will be required to meet all of these goals. It is important to identify new revenue sources and activities. This document, many of the strategies suggested in the Policy Document and beyond the current scope of Metro's bicycle planning, implements the vision for promoting more bicycle transportation use in the region. Due to the long-reaching, visionary nature of implementing the vision for promoting more bicycle transportation use in the region, this document includes a comprehensive vision, policies, strategies, actions, and performance indicators that are the Metro Bicycle Policy Document, and recommends access improvements in selected locations.

The regional transportation planning agencies for Los Angeles County, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) has prepared a Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan (BTSP) to be used as a guide for local jurisdictions in identifying regional bicycle transportation projects. The BTSP identifies bicycle transportation projects and summarizes the benefits of bicycle investments. This document examines strategies that, if implemented, would increase the use of bicycling. Bicycle use helps reduce the number of trips made by automobile, increases personal mobility, reduces traffic, and park and congestion, decreases energy use, makes public transit more viable, and improves air quality and health.

There is tremendous untapped potential for bicycle use in trips to work, to transit, for short trips, and for recreation.
For each policy objective, strategies, actions and performance indicators have been developed. The key performance indicators in each section provide the framework to evaluate progress toward these goals.

Policy Objectives

V. Bicycle Education & Safety: Increase and Promote Bicycle Education and Safety Programs

VI. Bicycle Promotion: Provide Leadership in Promoting Regional Bicycle Transportation Objectives

VII. Bicycle To Work: Promote and Improve Employer Bicycle Incentive Programs

VIII. Bike-to-Transit: Improve Bicycle Users Access to Transit Systems

IX. Bicycle Parking: Improve Bicycle Parking and End-of-Trip Bicycle Facilities Across the County

X. Bicycle Planning & Funding: Provide Leadership in Regional Bicycle Planning and Funding Strategies

The Metro policy objectives are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>ACTION STEPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To meet Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan of increasing bicycle ridership</td>
<td>Provide visionary leadership in planning and funding projects and programs that improve access and mobility by achieving the goal of Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To regularly update the bicycle strategic planning document (e)</td>
<td>Coordinate with other transportation modal stakeholders and regional government agencies and regional transportation planning organizations. (d) Continuously improve bicycle facilities and infrastructure. (c) Encourage residents to support bicycle use and facilities. (b) Promote the use of bicycle amenities and facilities. (a) Develop bicycle transportation strategic plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To incorporate bicycle accommodation in roadway improvements. (a)</td>
<td>Encourage residents to support bicycle use and facilities. (c) Promote the use of bicycle amenities and facilities. (b) Promote the use of bicycle transportation strategic plan. (a) Develop bicycle transportation strategic plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Butterfly and bicycle accommodation in roadway improvements. (e)</td>
<td>Continue to encourage multi-modal projects in Metro CFP. (d) Encourage additional or parallel projects for improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities. (c) Train project managers to encourage bicycle and pedestrian facilities. (b) Encourage additional or parallel projects for improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities. (a) Develop bicycle transportation strategic plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To improve bicycle facilities. (f)</td>
<td>Continuously improve bicycle facilities and infrastructure. (e) Encourage residents to support bicycle use and facilities. (d) Promote the use of bicycle amenities and facilities. (b) Promote the use of bicycle transportation strategic plan. (a) Develop bicycle transportation strategic plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Butterfly and bicycle accommodation in roadway improvements. (a)</td>
<td>Encourage residents to support bicycle use and facilities. (c) Promote the use of bicycle amenities and facilities. (b) Promote the use of bicycle transportation strategic plan. (a) Develop bicycle transportation strategic plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To improve bicycle facilities. (f)</td>
<td>Continuously improve bicycle facilities and infrastructure. (e) Encourage residents to support bicycle use and facilities. (d) Promote the use of bicycle amenities and facilities. (b) Promote the use of bicycle transportation strategic plan. (a) Develop bicycle transportation strategic plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Butterfly and bicycle accommodation in roadway improvements. (a)</td>
<td>Encourage residents to support bicycle use and facilities. (c) Promote the use of bicycle amenities and facilities. (b) Promote the use of bicycle transportation strategic plan. (a) Develop bicycle transportation strategic plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

- Increase bicycle ridership
- Improve bicycle facilities and infrastructure
- Enhance bicycle transportation strategic plan
- Promote the use of bicycle amenities and facilities
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. **Workshops**  
   - Design & Publicize Call for Funding  
   - Conduct one workshop per year (or biennial)  
   - In each region, include the most promising ideas for projects  
   - Encourage local officials to complete and adopt Bicycle Plans that meet Call's criteria  |  
| 2. **Webpage**  
   - Publish annual funding list for bike-related projects on Metro  
   - Publish Call for regional transportation projects  
   - Integrate bicycle improvements around regional transportation centers  |  
| 3. **Bras**  
   - Significance projects and programs  
   - Apply for Planning  
   - Seek additional funding opportunities for regional transportation  |  
| 4. **To research new sources of funding**  
   - Identify new funding sources (e.g., federal, state, local)  |  

**Goals, Objectives, Strategies, and Action Steps**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>ACTION STEPS</th>
<th>KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective II</td>
<td>Improve security of bicycle parking at Metro stations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Ensure secure bicycle parking facilities at regional transit hubs and other high-demand locations. 
- Ensure secure bicycle parking facilities at local intersections. 
- Ensure secure bicycle parking facilities at other locations. |
| 1. To expand the number of high-quality end-of-trip facilities. | 
- (c) Prepare map of the Metro bicycle parking plan to reflect additional bicycle parking facilities. |
| | 2. To expand and improve the bicycle parking facilities. | 
- (a) Develop a bicycle parking strategy for bicycle parking systems and member systems. 
- (b) Evaluate emerging technologies for improved security controls. 
- (c) Consider other options at stations with limited space. |
| | | 
- (a) Initiate a secure bicycle parking system that allows for both key- and card-based access. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS</th>
<th>ACTION STEPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Provide a bilingual customer service and bilingual signage at the station.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implement a comprehensive parking management system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reduce bike thefts by installing secure bike racks at station entrances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Encourage cycle parking facilities in new developments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STRATEGY:
- To implement bike parking facilities in new developments and existing commercial areas.
- To encourage cycle parking facilities in mixed-use developments.
- To develop design guidelines for bike parking and other.
- To encourage cycling-friendly design guidelines for bike parking and other.
- Parking by adding bilingual signage to road signs.
- Parking facilities in new developments and existing commercial areas.
- Encourage cycle parking facilities in mixed-use developments.

IMPLEMENTATION:
- Prepare a brochure on bicycle parking and provide a bilingual customer service.
- Develop design guidelines for bike parking and other.
- Parking facilities in new developments and existing commercial areas.
- Encourage cycle parking facilities in mixed-use developments.

COBS: Objectives, Strategies, and Action Steps
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Strategies</th>
<th>Action Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free Services to Develop Consensus and Build Support</td>
<td>1. To improve bicycle access to transit system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Coordinate with Rail Operations to plan existing and future bike facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Coordinate with bike clubs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Encourage development of bike lanes and bike lanes only by bike groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Work with Metro staff and Metro staff to develop incentives for next call for proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Develop incentives for next call for proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Encourage local jurisdictions to seek linking to implementation of new transit facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Encourage local jurisdictions to seek linking to implementation of new transit facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Encourage local jurisdictions to seek linking to implementation of new transit facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Work with bike groups, bike lanes and bike lanes only by bike clubs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Work with bike groups, bike lanes and bike lanes only by bike clubs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) Work with bike groups, bike lanes and bike lanes only by bike clubs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective III**

**Policy**

**Key Performance Indicators**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Action Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective IV**

**Policy**

- Bike to Work: Improve, Promote, and Implement Employer Bicycle Incentives

- Continue to work toward the Year 3 goals and initiatives outlined above for the bike to work program.
- Develop a bike parking strategy and plan.
- Work with employers to provide information about bike parking needs and incentives.
- Provide information to employers about incentives that would increase bicycle use.
- Work with employers to promote bike commuting programs.
- Work with employers to promote bike commuting incentives.
- Publish progress stories about employers who have implemented bike commuting programs.
- Work with employers to promote bike commuting incentives.
- Publish progress stories about employers who have implemented bike commuting programs.
- Work with employers to promote bike commuting incentives.
- Publish progress stories about employers who have implemented bike commuting programs.
- Work with employers to promote bike commuting incentives.
- Publish progress stories about employers who have implemented bike commuting programs.
- Work with employers to promote bike commuting incentives.
- Publish progress stories about employers who have implemented bike commuting programs.
- Work with employers to promote bike commuting incentives.
- Publish progress stories about employers who have implemented bike commuting programs.
| Key Performance Indicators | Action Steps | Objective V Policy  
|-----------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
|                            |              | Big Bike Promotions: Provide leadership, funding, and resources for the marketing of bicycling as a healthy and healthy means of transportation. |"objectives, strategies, and action steps."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>ACTION STEPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. To research opportunities for bicycle safety programs and to promote youth and adult education and training</td>
<td>Support local agency efforts on bicycle education and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Incorporate bicycle safety into training courses for local officials</td>
<td>(a) Contract with a bicycle professional and sponsor periodic educational classes on bicycle safety in targeted locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Seek additional funds for annual programs</td>
<td>(b) Develop and fund programs that make helmets, lights and reflective clothing available in low-income communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Promote bicycle safety at rail stations</td>
<td>(c) Develop educational materials to promote bicycle safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Use publications, websites, media to promote bicycle safety</td>
<td>(d) Use publications, websites, media to promote bicycle safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To research opportunities in California, the Office of Southern California (AQCA) Law Enforcement, the Office of Traffic Safety and Law Enforcement in the Automobile Club of Southern California (AQCA)</td>
<td>Investigate partnerships with the Automobile Club of Southern California (AQCA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Metro bike policy document contains the following terms defined as follows:

- Class I Bikeway (a bike lane) - A striped lane for one-way bike travel on a street or highway.
- Class II Bikeway (a bike boulevard) - A sidewalk, sidepath or pedestrian path, designated by signs only.
- Class III Bikeway (a bike route) - A corridor shared by bicycles and motor vehicles or pedestrians.
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STP-L Fund Exchange PowerPoint
January 4, 2006

Technical Advisory Committee

Interstate-5/Hasley Canyon Interchange Project

Funds

Program – Local Funds for Non-Federal

Exchange of Surface Transportation

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Recommended Exchange of STP-L Funds

- Metro proposes to exchange up to $20.6 M of Surface Transportation Program – Local (STP-L) funds for non-federal funds
  - County of LA I-5/Hasley Canyon Project would receive Federal STP – L funds
  - County would repay Metro with non-federal funds
- Smallest cities with STP-L Balances would be offered non-federal funds in exchange for their STP-L funds
  - Metro will require a 2% administrative fee to administer the exchange
A. Approve an exchange of Federal Surface Transportation Program-Local (STP-L) funds for unrestricted, non-Federal Funds with the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works (LACDPW) up to $20.6 Million for the Interstate 5/Hazley Canyon Interchange.

B. Authorize use of such unrestricted, non-Federal Funds received from the LACDPW to be placed in an Interest-Bearing Account for project(s).

C. Authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to negotiate and charge and with a two percent (2%) administrative fee that Metro would pass-through allocations to local agencies as unrestricted funds.

Angelenos and Metro for the funds approved in action A.
Very difficult for small cities to process STP-L funds

- STP-L funds subject to numerous federal requirements
- Parking
- Transit capital
- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- Transportation enhancement activities and control measures
- Safety improvements and hazard elimination

- STP-L funds are very flexible, eligible uses are:
  - $29.8M apportioned to cities and County of LA by population
  - Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991
  - STP-L Program established after Federal Intermodal Surface Background: Surface Transportation Program (STP-L)
Scope of work to be determined by cities, not Metro

Transportation purpose must be served by grant

Funds administered like a local grant

Unlikely to be available for cities with more than 90,000 population

Progressively larger cities will receive offers as funds become available based on population

Non-federal funds offered will be extended to smallest cities

Available, then distribute to smallest cities

Metro proposes to compile funds until approximately $7 M is

In I-5/Haysley Canyon expenditures to Metro

County proposes to relinquish reimbursement up to $20.6 M

Fund Exchange
administer the exchange

Existing staff will be utilized by Metro to

FY 2006 Budget

• There is no impact to the current Metro

Financial Impacts