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
   Information
   - Robert Hildebrand
   - Joyce Rooney
   - Haripal Vir
   - Mark Yamamoto

3. Consent Calendar
   - Approval of Minutes
     - Attachment 3: Minutes of December 1, 2004
   Action

4. Chairperson's Report
   - Attachment 4: 90 Day Rolling Agenda
     - 5 min
   Information
   - Renee Berlin

5. Legislative Update
   - Federal
   - State
   - 10 min
   Information
   - Raffi Hamparian
   - Michael Turner

6. I-710 Major Corridor Study
   - Attachment 5: Streets & Freeways Action
   - Attachment 6: Study Overview
   - 10 min
   Concurrence
   - Ernest Morales/David Levinsohn - PB

Metropolitan Transportation Authority
7. Local Return Guidelines Update
   Information
   (Patricia Chen)
   5 min

8. Long Range Transportation Plan/CMP Nexus Study
   Update
   (Doug Kim/Heather Hills)
   5 min

9. California Transportation Commission December Meeting Recap
   Information
   (Mary Lou Williams)
   5 min

10. New Business

11. Adjournment

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

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 2, 2005 at 9:30 am in the
Union Station Room.
Attachment 1

Subcommittee December 2004 Agendas

Bus Operations Subcommittee

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

TDM/Air Quality Subcommittee
Agenda

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Special Meeting

Gateway Plaza Conference Room—3rd Floor

1. Call to Order
   1 minute

   Action
   Bob Hildebrand

2. Approval of Minutes—Attachment 1
   1 minute

   Action
   BOS

3. Chair’s Report
   5 minutes

   Information
   Bob Hildebrand

4. FY 2006 Appropriations of Section 5307
   15% Discretionary Capital Funds and 1% Transit Enhancement Funds
   • Criteria
   • Priorities

   Discussion and Possible Action
   BOS

5. New Business

   Discussion
   BOS

6. Adjournment

Please call Desirée Portillo-Rabinov at 213-922-3039 if you have questions regarding the agenda or meeting. The next BOS meeting will be held January 18th, 2005 at 9:30am in the Windsor Conference Room, 15th Floor, Gateway Building.

Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Metro
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE

Los Angeles Room — 11th Floor

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes – October 28, 2004
(to be handed out at meeting)

3. Appoint TDM Representative for LTSS

4. Section 5310 Funding – Request for Volunteers

5. Approve UFS Funding Plan for Inclusion in FTIP
(to be handed out at meeting)

6. ASI Program and Board Update
(to be handed out at meeting)

7. NTD Reporting Update

8. Legislative Update

9. New Business

10. Adjournment

Action
Joyce Rooney

Action
Joyce Rooney

Action
Joyce Rooney

Action
Joyce Rooney/Larry Torres, MTA

Action
Joyce Rooney/Steve Henley, MTA

Discussion
Gary Hewitt, MTA

Discussion
Jay Fuhrman, MTA

Information
Mike Turner, MTA

Information
Joyce Rooney

Action
Joyce Rooney
Streets and Freeways

No Meeting in December
TDM/AQ

No Meeting in December
Attachment 2

Subcommittee Actions
Disposition of December Subcommittee Actions

BOS:
December 14th Meeting

1. November 16 minutes approved as submitted.

2. BOS amended the principles and priorities for the FY 2006 appropriations of Section 5307 15% Discretionary Capital Funds and 1% Transit Enhancement Funds by a majority vote as follows:
   a) Amended principle 1 to read "No one agency is eligible to claim more than 50% of the available funding unless the BOS, by majority, (50% +1) vote, agrees to fund one agency beyond the limit based on project(s) merit.
   b) Buses for service expansion was added to the list of primary priorities.

The above BOS Actions pertain to the principles below:

Section 5307 15% Discretionary Capital and 1% Transit Enhancement Funds is through a competitive process and the following principles were used:

1. No one agency is eligible to claim more than 50% of the available funding.
2. Encourage multi-agency procurements.
3. Encourage overmatching on projects.
4. BOS shall set its priorities on an annual basis.
5. If an agency receives funding from another source for the same project, the agency must return equal funds to the "pot" for reallocation (no double dipping).
6. If an agency sold or traded any transit specific funds for non—transit funds resulting in an overall loss of transit funds to the region in the last two fiscal years, that agency would be ineligible to apply for these Federal transit dollars.
7. If an agency is not a current FTA grantee, the agency will not be eligible to apply for those Federal transit dollars.
8. The agency will not be eligible to apply for these Federal transit dollars if the agency has outstanding or lapsing RTAA project CMAQ funds, unless the 15% / 1% project is ineligible for the RTAA CMAQ funds. This does not apply to agencies which have CMAQ funds in obligated grants, programmed in the TIP, or in a TIP project already submitted to the LACMTA.
9. The agency will not be eligible to apply for these Federal transit dollars if the agency has outstanding or lapsing 15% and 1% funds. This does not apply to agencies which have these funds in obligated grants, programmed in the TIP, or in a TIP project already submitted to LACMTA.
Disposition of December Subcommittee Actions (BOS Cont.)

The following priorities for the Section 5307 – 15% Discretionary Capital Funds were used to determine how projects are evaluated:

**Primary Priorities:**
- Bus Operation, Maintenance, & Administration Facility – New or Replacing existing facility of at least 50 years old.
- Structural rehabilitation or expansion of existing facility in order to extend the life expectancy at least another 25 years.
- Replacement of existing buses that are at least 12 years old or have exceeded their life expectancy; and
- Mechanical rehabilitation of existing buses in order to extend the life of the bus for at least another 6 years.

**Other Priorities:**
- Buses for service expansion, Transit Center, and Others. However, if projects submitted in any category are not deemed worthwhile, they may not be funded.

**LTSS:**
**December 2nd Meeting**

- Appointed Thaddeus McCormack from the City of Santa Fe Springs to be the LTSS representative on the TDM subcommittee.

- Appointed Gina Thomas from LACDPW and Susan Chow, City of Whittier to be on the 5310 Evaluation Committee.

- Discussed but did not take action on the UFS Funding Plan item

**Streets and Freeways:**
No meeting in December

**TDM/AQ:**
No meeting in December
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 9:40 a.m. Randy Lamm (MTA) took roll and declared a quorum was present.

2. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees

BOS (Bob Hildebrand)
- Met on November 16th;
- Received reports on:
  - Status of programmed RTAA/CMAQ funds in the FTIP, MTA staff to report back in January;
  - 10 Year Financial Forecast;
  - Multi-County Goods Movement Action plan;
  - ASI program and Countywide paratransit services dealing with ASI's budget issues, court settlement, triennial review, and operating parameters for the upcoming year;
  - Federal and State Legislative update;
- Action:
  - Passed a motion to give a discount to holders of the EZ-Transit Pass;
- There will be a special BOS meeting on December 14, 2004 to review criteria for applying for the FTA Section 5307 15% Discretionary and 1% Enhancement funds.

LTSS (Joyce Rooney)
- Did not meet in November;
- The next meeting will be December 2, 2004. The agenda includes an action item to recommend that UFS funding for all LTSS recipients be included in the FTIP.
Streets and Freeways (Haripal Vir)
- Met on November 18th;
- Received reports on:
  - Countywide Arterial ITS Architecture and Mapping Project;
  - Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan;
  - Caltrans Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Tracking System
    which is mandatory for federally funded projects;
  - Bikes on Trains;
- Action
  - Voted to support the recommendations of the MTA I-710 Major
    Corridor Study Advisory Committee regarding the Locally Preferred
    Strategies, which includes 10 general purpose lanes, and four separate
    truck lanes, reduced property takes, and reduced emissions from
    improved truck operating speeds;
  - Election of officers will occur in January. Mr. Vir reported that he is not
    running for another term as chair;
- The December meeting is cancelled;
- Next meeting will be January 20.

TDM/Air Quality (Mark Yamarone)
- Met on November 16th;
- Action
  - Approved Bylaw revisions;
- Received report on the Caltrans Statewide HOV Parking Study;
- Next meeting will be January 18th.

3. Consent Calendar (Renee Berlin)
The following corrections were made to the consent calendar. For the November 3rd
TAC Minutes under BOS report the following in bold was added (page 11 of the
December 1st agenda package):

BOS passed a motion to authorize a county program to give
a discount to holders of the EZ-Pass.

The next meeting will be on November 16, November 23.

Pat DeChellis (Los Angeles County Public Works) asked who would run the County
Discount program – MTA and the County, -- what part of the County. Mr.
Hildebrand said yes – both the MTA and the County of Los Angeles Public Works
Department (for the unincorporated parts of the county) are involved.

The LTSS motion on Page 67 of the December 1, 2004 TAC Agenda Package:
At the LTSS meeting on Thursday, October 28, 2004, LTSS approved a motion to allocate recommend allocation of $225,000 from the LTSS $5 million in (CMAQ 2004) funds which had previously been set aside for UFS implementation (card readers).

The Consent Calendar with the above corrections was approved on a motion by Haripal Vir (City of Los Angeles) and seconded by Bob Hildebrand (BOS).

4. Chairperson’s Report (Renee Berlin) (Handouts)
   - The MTA Board did not meet in November. The November/December meeting will be held on December 13th at 9:30 a.m.
   - On Thursday, December 9th, the MTA and its Mobility 21 partners will be hosting a SMART Growth Zoning Codes Workshop at the Pasadena Conference Center. The Conference runs from 9 a.m.-3:30 p.m.; with registration starting at 8:30 a.m. The cost is $45. Registration information is available at www.lgc.org.
   - Sponsors with FY 2005 Call for Projects funding – (project fund swaps and new projects), the MOUs/LOAs need to be executed by December 31st to meet MTA’s Lapsing policy.
   - MTA staff is working on a TIP amendment to move Regional TEA funds with no obligations into the STIP and STIP TEA projects that received Regional TEA obligations in error out of the STIP. It is expected the amendment will be submitted this month for notice at the February CTC meeting, with action at their meeting in March or April. MTA is working with Caltrans to allow concurrent allocation requests so that when the STIP amendment is approved, funds can be obligated concurrently.
   - On November 2nd Patsaourus Plaza reopened to traffic.
   - Beginning December 1st, the MTA monthly and EZ-Pass can be ordered online. To ensure delivery by the 1st of the following month, orders must be received by the 15th of the current month.
   - Caltrans is offering a five course series on the Federal Aid Development process. This course will be offered in January 2005.
   - The Senate and House passed the conference vote for the 2005 Appropriations bill – HR 4818 – the Omnibus Appropriations bill will fund highways, transit and Amtrak projects for the balance of the federal fiscal year.
   - Ms. Berlin requested that any League representatives that are present, please let their COG Executive Directors know that they need to nominate members and alternates to the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee. The Arroyo-Verdugo Cities and the South Bay Cities are the only Subregions to nominate representatives for League appointment to the expanded Streets and Freeways Subcommittee. The goal is to have the new Streets and Freeways subcommittee fully appointed in January.
5. Legislative Update (Marisa Yeager and Michael Turner, MTA Government Relations) (Handouts)

State Update
See agenda item # 6. 2005-06 Transportation Budget Strategy Summit

Federal Update
Marisa Yeager reported that both the House and Senate versions of TEA-21 Reauthorization will be reintroduced when Congress reconvenes in January. She expected that most of the language will be consistent with what has already been worked out. However, with new Congressional members, some of the project requests will be changing. Ms. Yeager suggested that if any TAC members have not already heard about projects for which they are concerned, they should check with the sponsoring Congressperson to make sure the original request remains in the language. She stated that action will happening quickly after the start of the new year. The current continuing resolution for TEA-21 still expires at the end of May 2005. Ms. Yeager said that Norman Minetta is still the DOT Secretary. It is unclear whether the President will replace him. Secretary Minetta is from California.

She reported that the FY 2005 Omnibus Appropriations Bill for $388 billion was approved. Some congressional members project funding was reduced due to their support for additional Amtrak funding. Ms. Yeager reported that she was working with MTA representatives in Washington D.C. to develop an accurate list of Los Angeles County projects that received appropriations. As soon as it’s available, she will provide TAC members a copy. Among the projects recommended was $60 million for the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension, $2 million for bus and bus facilities, and the remaining balance for the Red Line MOS-3 - North Hollywood.

Ms. Berlin asked if the President would be doing a line item veto because he wants to remove some “pork” from the legislation. Ms. Yeager said that is just hearsay; she has not heard anything definitive. Mr. Hildebrand asked if there are “earmarks” in the Appropriations bill. Ms. Yeager said, yes there are earmarks. She would get TAC members the list.

Ms. Yeager announced that the next Mobility-21 Coalition meeting will be in the San Gabriel Valley at the Industry Hills, Pacific Palms Conference and Resort on December 14th from 10 - 11:30 a.m. The focus will be on Goods Movement.

6. 2005-06 Transportation Budget Strategy Summit (Michael Turner, MTA)

Michael Turner announced that the FY 2006 State budget will still be dealing with a deficit in the $6-10 billion range. This time the State has fewer pots from which to raid money to solve its overall problem. There have been a series of deals with education, local government via Proposition 1A. The Proposition 42 funds are left as the largest, most vulnerable pot available to solve what over State budget problems
exist. Even though the proposed budget is projected to be lower than in the past, the Proposition 42 funds are still at risk.

A group of Transportation stakeholders became concerned and also started to hear from the State Department of Finance (DOF) that the State budget probably could not be balanced without suspending Proposition 42. Transportation officials from the Counties of Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, the California Business Roundtable, California Chamber of Commerce and others convened a summit in Sacramento to focus attention on addressing this problem for the coming year. There was outreach to the business community because this money is needed to provide the infrastructure to run the economy and their voices need to be heard. The first task they are working on is to make the point that the Proposition 42 funds are needed for transportation and have that reflected in the Governor's first budget proposal, which is due January 10, 2005. The Alliance met with the Governor’s Los Angeles staff representative on November 30th. The Governor recently went on a trade mission to Japan and one of the messages he received was that Japanese Industry representatives are frustrated because they can not process their goods through the Ports. The point is that the message is getting across that investments in transportation need to be made. However, there is still the problem with the $7 billion deficit and there is only so many ways to fix it. The Alliance is aiming to try to avoid a suspension of Proposition 42, which is going to be very difficult. Other options include considering compromises such as stabilizing Proposition 42 for the long run and do something about the State’s ability to raid it every year – along the lines of the local government fix. There will be a press conference on December 7th in Sacramento for Statewide interests. There are plans to organize a press conference in Los Angeles on December 14th, and there will be others in the Bay Area and around the State. A list of impacted projects statewide will be presented at these press conferences. Mr. Turner said that advocacy materials are being produced and that he can make them available to those who want copies.

The Legislative Analyst Office made a projection of a $6 billion plus deficit, and included are repayments to transportation that are due from the General Fund. The State could say they are forgiving those loans and not repay them. This would make the deficit look lower on paper, but would be a serious problem for transportation. Steve Lantz (SCRRA) asked if there is a backup plan if those loans are not repaid to transportation, such as let the state forgive the loans, but do not take any more money. Mr. Turner said it would depend on what kind of allocations are made available. There are negotiations with the Indian tribes that were not part of the first set of compacts proposed in AB 687. There has been some discussion that those revenues could be used to repay the loans in a manner similar to AB 687. If a plan could be implemented that added a portion of the Proposition 42 money, some Tribal Gaming revenue and included a permanent Proposition 42 fix, that might be an acceptable deal. Ms. Berlin asked what was the response from the Governor's Office on the November 30th meeting. Mr. Turner said they responded that hard decisions will need to be made in these difficult financial times. They are looking for ideas and solutions. The first part of the problem has been told in the media that commerce is being held up due to the boats waiting to dock at the ports to offload their freight.
However, the second half of the story has not been told – that the Surface Transportation infrastructure needs to be improved to efficiently move the freight from the ports to destinations nationwide, and that removing those bottlenecks will allow more revenue to flow into the State coffers, which will reduce the deficit.

7. TDM/AQ Bylaw Changes (Mark Yamarone, TDM/AQ)
Mr. Yamarone reported that at their November 16th meeting, the TDM/AQ Subcommittee approved revisions to their bylaws, which are attached on Page 71 of the TAC Agenda Package. He was requesting TAC concurrence with the bylaw revisions. Mr. Yamarone briefly summarized the revisions. The changes reduced SCAG membership from two representatives to one, eliminated the TMA/TMO representative because that organization no longer exists; added the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, and changed the BOS and LTSS representatives to Ex Officio positions. This reduced the number needed for a quorum to 6 representatives. A motion to concur with the TDM/AQ Bylaw revisions was made by Pat DeChellis, and seconded by Joyce Rooney (LTSS). The motion was approved.

8. Congestion Management Program (Brad McAllester, MTA)
Mr. McAllester provided a status report on the Nexus Study. A consultant – Cambridge Systematics has been hired and the MTA-Consultant team is just about ready to start the outreach process with the COGs and the cities. The time schedule for this study is being revised to slow it down. There will be a status report to the Board in June. Outreach efforts will continue, so that there is a good indication of the level of comfort the cities have with the concept of a Mitigation fee. It is expected that during the 12 month period after June, work will continue on the Nexus Study. At this point, it is expected that the Nexus Study will be completed in FY 2006. Mr. McAllester commented that MTA understands this is a very sensitive issue to cities and this is a feasibility concept to see if the Mitigation fee has merit. For MTA, the Mitigation fee has merit in a couple of ways. It did come out of discussion on the Congestion Management Program (CMP) and given the current growth issues and financial challenges, it seems like now is the right time to explore implementing a Congestion Mitigation fee. Some other counties in Southern California are also discussing proposals for their own fees. Mr. McAllester reported that Riverside County has implemented a Mitigation fee, San Bernardino is in the process of implementing one, San Diego and Kern County are also exploring the concept. Local and sub-regional support will be needed to implement the fee. MTA is not interested in holding the money; there will be local control in the fee’s implementation. The MTA will be working with cities that have implemented their own local fee program and making sure that those projects that are already part of a local fee program are credited.

Mr. McAllester also reported that the MTA Board has asked staff to update the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) over the next 12 months. There may be some opportunity to blend the LRTP analysis with the Mitigation fee concept. Usually part of the LRTP process is to ask the subregions to identify some of their priorities which
will provide an opportunity as to how a Mitigation fee could help leverage local, state and federal funds for some of these priorities. MTA is at the starting point for updating the LRTP. Mr. McAllester introduced Doug Kim, Director of the Long Range Plan, and Robert Calix, Planning Manager. They will be the lead staff on the Nexus Study. Ms. Berlin asked about the CMP Debits and Credits. Mr. McAllester said that they are suspended. When staff reports to the Board in June, they may have a recommendation on whether an interim Deficiency plan is needed. Kit Bagnell (Los Angeles County Public Works) asked if the information is still being collected for the current year. Mr. McAllester said that MTA is still collecting the growth information, but not asking for the credit information. Sumi Gant (City of Long Beach) asked if MTA would be requesting input on just the Impact fees or the Impact fees vs. Debits and Credits. Mr. McAllester responded that it ultimately comes down to that question. In addition, the Mitigation fee has merit for other objectives beyond the CMP and MTA wants to lead a discussion to see if there is agreement that the Mitigation fee makes sense. If in the end, the feasibility study does not conclude that a Mitigation fee is feasible, then the question of how to address the CMP still will have to be addressed. One of the things that staff will be analyzing early on in the process is how long can the CMP be suspended and what will be put in place if the Mitigation fee is not supported.

9. Metro Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan (Lynn Goldsmith, MTA)
Ms. Goldsmith provided an overview of the scope of work and schedule for the Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan (BTSP). Its purpose is to expand the use of non-automobile options, and to improve bicycle to transit connections. The last Countywide Bicycle Plan was adopted in 1994. Other goals are to maximize funding opportunities, identify incentives, allow cities in the County that do not have a Bicycle Plan to adopt a document contained in this Plan to use as their own, and thereby qualify for funding through the Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA), “Safe Routes to School” and any other state or federal grants that might be available.

This plan is not going to identify corridors for bike paths like in the last plan. Instead this plan will focus on bike – transit connections. The benefits will be increased bicycle use, increased air quality benefits, health benefits, and will reduce “the last mile challenge”. A quarter of a mile to a transit station is walkable, but anything greater is not and a bicycle is a good quick way to close the gap. A concern is demand for parking at stations, and encouraging bikes will free up some spaces. It also reduces some barriers to transit. This is not going to be the typical Bicycle Master Plan. Instead this is going to be a regional – strategic look at the need for Bicycle infrastructure. This will give direction to local plans. It is the local plans which implement projects.

Ms. Goldsmith explained that there will be two volumes. The first volume will be the Strategic plan and will include policies and identify Bicycle Transit hubs. Of the hubs identified, eight to twelve will have Access plans developed. These Access plans will examine how difficult it is to approach those locations by bike. Issues that will be looked at include: street conditions, intersection conditions, bicycle parking, signage,
etc. As time goes on and more funding becomes available, more hubs will have Access plans developed. The BTSP will include a tool kit that local cities can use to analyze hubs in their area so that they can develop a good Call for Projects application or BTA application. There is still a Regional Class I Bike Path plan, and this effort will look at identifying gaps on the Class I system. Volume II will have a countywide inventory of existing bicycle facilities – paths, lanes, routes, parking. Subregional maps will be completed. This will fulfill the requirement for applying for funds from the BTA account. This information will also be used to develop a Countywide Bicycle map.

The schedule for the BTSP is as follows:

- Consultant procured in August 2004
- BTA Document to be complete in August 2005
- The BTSP will be taken to the Board in January 2006
- Held the first Working Group meeting in August 2004 (a rep from each city in the county was invited). Meetings are held every other month.
- Other Working Group meetings are scheduled for February 2005, April, June and August

The purpose of the Working Group meetings is to review and comment on the proposed policies, Bicycle Transit hub locations, Access plans, and draft documents. There will be Subregional Workshops. The first round will be in January 2005. Tim Papandreou (MTA) will be coordinating the workshops. A meeting will be held with the City of Los Angeles City Council deputies on January 10, 2005. The next meeting will be with the San Gabriel Valley COG on January 13, 2005. Ms. Goldsmith requested that League of City TAC members work with their respective COGs to schedule outreach meetings. Every Area Team is going to be talking to their subregions about the BTSP and working with the subregions to schedule meetings.

The second round of meetings will be in May and June. The plan progress will be presented and initial analysis. These meetings will be a way to determine whether cities are especially interested in implementing a project at one of their Bicycle Transit hubs, and being a partner with MTA to develop the first eight to twelve Bike-Transit Access Plans. Ms. Goldsmith emphasized that this effort will not just result in a plan, it will also result in implementation of projects.

Policies will be developed focusing on the following areas:

- Regional Bike Planning and Funding strategies
- Bike Transit Hub access
- Bike parking
- Bikes on Rail and Bus
- Employee Bike incentives
- Bike Transportation marketing
- Education and Safety
- Design
Ms. Goldsmith explained that Bike Transit hubs will be located in areas of very high transit use and lots of origins and destinations; where there is existing rail, Rapid Bus, BRT, bus, etc. She also displayed a map showing potential Transit hubs. Mr. Yamarone asked if these would be consistent with the Metro Connections Transit Hub concept. Ms. Goldsmith said that when they developed the map, they started with the Metro Connections Hub locations. Carolyn Flowers (MTA) asked if Nancy Michali (MTA) had a copy of the Bike Transit Hub map. Ms. Goldsmith said Ms. Michali does have it, but that they show many more Bike Transit hubs than the Metro Connection hubs because the BTSP effort covers a wider area. Ms. Flowers asked for clarification—that the list of hubs for the bike plan covers the same hubs as Ms. Michali’s Metro Connections plan, but it also has more hubs beyond those shown in the Metro Connections plan. Ms. Goldsmith said yes.

A main goal of the BTSP is to incorporate bike use and the promotion of using bikes on trips in conjunction with transit. Most bike trips are about 3 miles and that works well with connecting to transit. The results from a previous outreach effort funded with a Caltrans grant and in conjunction with the Bicycle Coalition show that there are a significant number of cyclists that ride because they don’t have a car, and are not normally counted or participate in bike planning.

Ms. Flowers commented that MTA Board Director LaBonge would like MTA Rail Operations to modify rail cars to accommodate bikes. Ms. Goldsmith responded that MTA has changed the bikes on rail and bus rules to expand hours for bikes. There is unlimited access for bikes on the Metro Red Line from Wilshire/Vermont to North Hollywood any time, either direction. From Wilshire/Vermont to Union Station, the restrictions are no bikes during peak hours. On the Metro Gold, Blue and Green Lines, bikers can ride the reverse of the morning commute anytime, but they are restricted from riding 2 hours in the morning and 2 hours in the evening during the peak hours. Ms. Flowers added that Board member LaBonge requested MTA Rail Operations remove some seats on one or more cars per train to accommodate bikes. Ms. Goldsmith said that the BTSP effort will be looking at that in conjunction with Rail Operations. Steve Lantz asked if the BTSP would be developing strategies that applied to Metrolink. Ms. Goldsmith said probably not because bikes are allowed on Metrolink all the time. She said they want to include bicycle parking at Metrolink stations and Metrolink stations will be identified as bike-transit hubs.

10. New Business
None

11. Adjournment
The December 1, 2004 TAC meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m. The next TAC meeting will be held on January 5th 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. Steve Finnegan / Marisa Perez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (BOS)</td>
<td>1. Robert Hildebrand/Brynn Kernaghan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Andre Colaiace/David Reyno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>1. Raja Mitwasi / Alberto Angelini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rose Casey / Kirk Ceresa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVE ON ADA</td>
<td>1. John Whitbread/Mitch Pomerantz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1. Sami Gant/Ed Nizzi</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>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>1. Dave Coward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Herwick/David Cowardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. James Bagnell/Scott Schalcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Patrick V. DeChellis/Oliver Galang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES</td>
<td>1. ___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td>Greg Hermann/Cathi Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities COG</td>
<td>2. ___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desi Alvarez/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgines Malibu Conejo COG</td>
<td>3. ___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Thorsen/Tom Gdala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td>4. ___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Bozigian/Stephen Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
<td>5. ___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Rix/David Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td>6. ___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steven Huang/Victor Rollinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side Cities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Feinberg/Art Ida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE (LTSS)</td>
<td>1. Jano Baghdarian/Martin Gombert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Joyce Kooney/Kara Boulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (MTA)</td>
<td>1. Ronce Berlin/Randy Lamm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Countywide Planning &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carolyn Flowers/Andrea Burnside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTA Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY (SCARRA Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>Steve Lantz/Joanna Capelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SCAQMD Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>Eyvonne Self/Kathryn Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>Michael Gainor/Rich Macias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>LaDonna DiCamillo/Ron Guss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/AIR QUALITY SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>Mark Yamamoto/Phil Aker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Newman/Brooke Geer Person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 4, 2004

Federal-Aid Project Development: A Five-Course Series

Dear «Title». «LastName»:

We are pleased to inform you that the spring 2005 classes will be held in District 7 as given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>PARKING</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I – Getting your Federal-aid Project Started</td>
<td>Conference Room B, 7th Floor Junipero Serra Bldg., 320 W. 4th St., Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Nearby Public Fee Parking</td>
<td>Thursday, January 06, 2005</td>
<td>8 A.M. – 5 P.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II – Federal Procedural Requirements For Environmental Analysis (NEPA)</td>
<td>Conference Room B, 7th Floor Junipero Serra Bldg., 320 W. 4th St., Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Nearby Public Fee Parking</td>
<td>Wednesday, January 12, 2005</td>
<td>8 A.M. – 5 P.M.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
| III – Procedures For Right-Way Acquisition | Conference Room B, 7th Floor Junipero Serra Bldg., 320 W. 4th St., Los Angeles, CA | Nearby Public Fee Parking | Thursday, January 20, 2005 | 8 A.M. – 5 P.M. |

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
| IV - Federal-aid Project Development From Design To Construction | Conference Room B, 7th Floor Junipero Serra Bldg., 320 W. 4th St., Los Angeles, CA | Nearby Public Fee Parking | Tuesday, January 25, 2005 | 8 A.M. – 5 A.M. |
| | | | | |
| V - Federal Rules For Contract Administration And Project Completion | Conference Room B, 7th Floor Junipero Serra Bldg., 320 W. 4th St., Los Angeles, CA | Nearby Public Fee Parking | Wednesday, January 26, 2005 | 8 A.M. – 5 P.M. |

Registration starts at 7:30 a.m. and class starts at 8 a.m. There are no fees for these classes.

Course I provides an overview of key requirements and responsibilities to be carried out by local agencies using federal funds for project delivery and is strongly recommended as a precursor for courses EV-08, PD-09, PD-10, and PD-11.

Topics include:

- Overview of LAPM contents
- Helpful Caltrans and RTPA resources
- Steps required to deliver projects using federal funds
- Roles and responsibilities of state, local, and federal agencies in project delivery
- Field review requirements
- Environmental requirements
- Project authorizations and agreements
- Consultant selection
- STIP procedures
- Reimbursement and invoices

Course II focuses on the rules that must be followed to comply with requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), with some comparisons with California's Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Completion of PD-08 GETTING YOUR FEDERAL-AID PROJECT STARTED is a recommended for this course.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
Topics include:

- Overview of NEPA
- Determining when NEPA applies to a project
- Types of documentation required
- Preparing the project description
- Interagency coordination
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- Completing the PES form
- Related laws and environmental requirements
- Tips on preparing EAs and EIS/EIRs

Course III provides an overview of procedures local agencies must follow to acquire real property for transportation projects, including recent changes in rules and critical tasks. Focus is on ROW and Utility Facilities Chapters of the LAPM. Completion of PD-08 GETTING YOUR FEDERAL-AID PROJECT STARTED is a recommended for this course.

Topics include:

- Roles and responsibilities of local agencies under federal and California laws
- Stewardship agreements
- Impact of Caltrans “Re-engineering” on local tasks
- Helpful resources role of FHWA
- Required documentation and certificates
- Meaning of “just compensation”

Course IV continues discussion of step-by-step procedures for project development, picking up where Course I leaves off. Focus is on chapters 11, 12, and 15 of the LAPM, including how to balance increased local responsibilities with increased procedural flexibility. Completion of PD-08 GETTING YOUR FEDERAL-AID PROJECT STARTED is a recommended for this course.

Topics include:

- Federal requirements for construction
- Plans, specifications, and estimates
- Design standards and exceptions
- Advertising and procurement criteria
- Required contract provisions
- PS&E certification
- Contractor selection and award
- Helpful checklists

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
Course V focuses on procedures to ensure accountability and regulatory compliance during the actual construction phase, including discussion of the engineer-inspector’s responsibility to identify deviations from project specifications. Completion of PD-08 GETTING YOUR FEDERAL-AID PROJECT STARTED is recommended for this course.

Topics include:
- Resident engineer’s checklist
- Labor compliance and EEO
- Hazardous materials disposal
- Change orders and claims
- Work zone safety
- Subcontracting
- Record keeping and documentation

For individuals with disabilities, we will provide assisted services such as sign language interpreting, real-time captioning, note takers, reading and writing assistance or training/meeting materials in Braille, large prints, audiocassette, or computer disk. To obtain such services or to obtain a copy in alternative format, please call or write a minimum of 10 days prior to the event to request for reasonable modifications:

Contact Person
Assaad Fayad
Office of Local Programs and Alameda Corridors
700 N. Alameda Street
Los Angeles, California 90012
Tel (213) 620-6498

For those with hearing impairment, you may contact us at (916) 654-3846 TTY. You may use CRS: 1-800-735-2929 if no TTY at your location.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
If the request is for document in Braille, please provide a minimum notice of 30 days prior to class to ensure receiving it in a timely manner.

If you have any questions, please contact Assaad Fayad:

Phone (213) 620-6498  
FAX  (213) 620-6583  
EMAIL Assaad_Fayad@dot.ca.gov

Sincerely,

KIRK CESSNA, Chief  
Office of Local Assistance and  
Alameda Corridors
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90 Day Rolling Agenda
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: ROGER SNOBLE
SUBJECT: ROLLING 90-DAY AGENDA ITEMS FOR JANUARY 2005 – MARCH 2005

Attached is the 90-Day Rolling Agenda look ahead of items that I will be focusing on in the coming months. The listing will be updated and distributed to you on a monthly basis. Since this is a forecasting tool, some items may be deferred to a later month for my further review and analysis.

The following items scheduled for the January 2005 Committee/Board cycle that may be of interest to you are:

- Receive and file report on the naming of the Metro Orange Line stations.
- Approve the MTA FY05 Financial Standards.
- Amend policy to permit advertising on Metro Rapid vehicles.
- Approve the FY05 Budget update.
- Adopt the updated Transit Service policy.
- Approve the I-710 major Corridor study report.
- Metro Orange line – Approve modified Initial study to the revised Final EIR for the Canoga station, north parking lot.
- Approve the Expo final EIR adoption.

Attachments:
A. 90-Day Listing by Month
B. 90-Day Listing by Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Approval Type</th>
<th>Approver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>BRD</td>
<td>Receive report from the Independent Citizens’ Advisory and Oversight Committee regarding the Propositions A &amp; C FY 2002 Audit</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>BRD</td>
<td>SAFE Feasibility of Sponsoring with a Cell Phone Vendor</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>BRD</td>
<td>SAFE Callbox Maintenance Program</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>Orange Line station names</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>MITCHELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Procurement Policy Manual Changes</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>BRUMBAUGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Receive oral update on Federal Affairs</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>KIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Approve the MTA FY05 Financial Standards</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>MATSUMOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Adopt the Updated Investment Policy</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>OTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Authorization to enter into agreement with Pasadena Gold Line Authority</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>RAYMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Metro Rapid Advertising</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>RAYMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Authorize the CEO to execute a 10-yr revenue contract w/ Transit Television Network to install, operate, maintain &amp; sell advertising on an Operations Passenger Information System (OPIS)</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>RAYMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>FY05 1st Quarter Financial Performance</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>BRUMBAUGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>Monthly Budget Update</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>BRUMBAUGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>FY05 Budget Update</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>BRUMBAUGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Receive report on Metro Operations Bus Accident Reduction Program</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Monthly Metro Operations Performance Report</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Receive report on Bike Racks on Buses</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Access Services Quarterly Update</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Update on UFS Project</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>DCEO Presentation</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Annual review of Transit Service Policy</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Metro Red Line Segment 1 Remote Terminal Units Upgrade Procurement</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Increase Life of Project Budget for Division 1 Expansion Project</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Receive Status Update of Bicycle Strategic Plan Process</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>I-710 Major Corridor Study Report</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Wilshire/Western Joint Development Agreement</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Orange Line - Canoga Station, North Parking Lot (contingent on approval of Revised Final EIR - Rapid Bus Alternatives Analysis)</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Draft Los Angeles County ITS Policies &amp; Procedures</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Vermont/Santa Monica Metro Red Line Station Joint Development ENA</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Taylor Yards Joint Development Proposals</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Expo Final EIR Adoption</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>La Brea Community Linkages - Station Area Plan for the Mid-City/Expo Transit Corridor</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Signer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>EN070- Increase amount of contract value for Contract EN070 to provide continued support for environmental compliance services for various major and other capital projects.</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>THORPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Receive oral update on Federal Affairs</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>KIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>New Resident and Fulfillment Program</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>RAYMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Posting and Maintenance of Promotional and Wayfinding Signage</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>RAYMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Rideshare Services Contract</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>RAYMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>Monthly Budget Update</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>BRUMBAUGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>Amendment to PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP's Contract No. PS04511001 for Financial Audit of MTA and Component Units</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>BRUMBAUGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Receive quarterly update on exploring new opportunities to reduce air quality emissions from Metrolink operations</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Receive report on study of Freeway Service Patrol and SAFE call boxes</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Receive 6 Month progress report on the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Division 9 Transportation Building Project</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Receive report on plan to deal with Roadway Challenges on Wilshire between Crenshaw &amp; La Brea</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Award Contract for Transmission Overhaul Kits</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Award contract for the procurement of Metro Blue Line grade crossing materials</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Approve the Sale of Division 12</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>OTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Receive report to the Board Regarding Director Molina's Motion for Increased Metrolink Track Inspection</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Find that 88 jurisdictions are in conformance with the Congestion Management Program (CMP) for Los Angeles County, and determine that the City of Industry remains in non-conformance</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Agenda Item</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Approver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Hollywood/Vine revised Terms</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>De La Loza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Soundwall Program</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>De La Loza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Regional Integration of ITS Network</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>De La Loza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/05</td>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>Authorize the disposition of surplus property to the City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>OTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Authorize CEO to fund 5th year of Contract PS-2020-1051, with Dr. Dan Eisen</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>OTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>instein and PS-2020-1055, with Dr. Geoffrey Martin for geotechnical &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tunneling consulting as members of the Tunnel Advisory Panel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/05</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>Monthly Budget Update</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>Brumbaugh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 90-Day Rolling Agenda Forecast
**January 2005 - March 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Board Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>BRD</td>
<td>Receive report from the Independent Citizens' Advisory and Oversight Committee regarding the Propositions A &amp; C FY 2002 Audit</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>BRD</td>
<td>SAFE Feasibility of Sponsoring with a Cell Phone Vendor</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>BRD</td>
<td>SAFE Callbox Maintenance Program</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>CATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Approver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>Orange Line station names</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>RAYMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>EN070- Increase amount of contract value for Contract EN070 to provide continued support for environmental compliance services for various major and other capital projects.</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>THORPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/05</td>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>Authorize the disposition of surplus property to the City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>OTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Approval Type</td>
<td>Approver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Procurement Policy Manual Changes</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>MITCHELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Receive oral update on Federal Affairs</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>KIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Approve the MTA FY05 Financial Standards</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>BRUMBAUGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Adopt the Updated Investment Policy</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>MATSUMOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Authorization to enter into agreement with Pasadena Gold Line Authority</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>OTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Metro Rapid Advertising</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>RAYMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Authorize the CEO to execute a 10-yr revenue contract w/ Transit Television Network to install, operate, maintain &amp; sell advertising on an Operations Passenger Information System (OPIS)</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>RAYMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Receive oral update on Federal Affairs</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>KIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>New Resident and Fulfillment Program</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>RAYMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Posting and Maintenance of Promotional and Wayfinding Signage</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>RAYMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Rideshare Services Contract</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>RAYMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/05</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Authorize CEO to fund 5th year of Contract PS-2020-1051, with Dr. Dan Eisenstein and PS-2020-1055, with Dr. Geoffrey Martin for geotechnical &amp; tunneling consulting as members of the Tunnel Advisory Panel</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>OTT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 90-Day Rolling Agenda Forecast
### January 2005 - March 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Approver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>FY05 1st Quarter Financial Performance</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>BRUMBAUGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>Monthly Budget Update</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>BRUMBAUGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>FY05 Budget Update</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>BRUMBAUGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>Monthly Budget Update</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>BRUMBAUGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>Amendment to PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP's Contract No. PS04511001 for Financial Audit of MTA and Component Units</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>BRUMBAUGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/05</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>Monthly Budget Update</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>BRUMBAUGH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Receive report on Metro Operations Bus Accident Reduction Program</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Monthly Metro Operations Performance Report</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Receive report on Bike Racks on Buses</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Access Services Quarterly Update</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Update on UFS Project</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>DCEO Presentation</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Annual review of Transit Service Policy</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Metro Red Line Segment 1 Remote Terminal Units Upgrade Procurement</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Increase Life of Project Budget for Division 1 Expansion Project</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Receive quarterly update on exploring new opportunities to reduce air quality emissions from Metrolink operations</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Receive report on study of Freeway Service Patrol and SAFE call boxes</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Receive 6 Month progress report on the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Division 9 Transportation Building Project</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Receive report on plan to deal with Roadway Challenges on Wilshire between Crenshaw &amp; La Brea</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Award Contract for Transmission Overhaul Kits</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Award contract for the procurement of Metro Blue Line grade crossing materials</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Approve the Sale of Division 12</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 90-Day Rolling Agenda Forecast
#### January 2005 - March 2005

**Sort by Committee, then Month**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Issue Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Approver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Receive Status Update of Bicycle Strategic Plan Process</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>I-710 Major Corridor Study Report</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Wilshire/Western Joint Development Agreement</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Orange Line - Canoga Station, North Parking Lot (contingent on approval of Revised Final EIR - Rapid Bus Alternatives Analysis)</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Draft Los Angeles County ITS Policies &amp; Procedures</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Vermont/Santa Monica Metro Red Line Station Joint Development ENA</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Taylor Yards Joint Development Proposals</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Expo Final EIR Adoption</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>La Brea Community Linkages - Station Area Plan for the Mid-City/Expo Transit Corridor</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Receive report to the Board Regarding Director Molina's Motion for Increased Metrolink Track Inspection</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Find that 88 jurisdictions are in conformance with the Congestion Management Program (CMP) for Los Angeles County, and determine that the City of Industry remains in non-conformance</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Hollywood/Vine revised Terms</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Soundwall Program</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Regional Integration of ITS Network</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>DE LA LOZA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 5

I-710 Major Corridor Study
Streets & Freeways Action
Support the study recommendations that include a locally preferred strategy (LPS). The LPS substantially reduces property takes by utilizing utility right-of-way (requires design standard exceptions from Caltrans and FHWA); improves safety by separating trucks from automobiles with 10 general purpose lanes and a 4 lane truck-way (from the ports to Hobart Yard in Vernon). Infrastructure improvements are conditioned on achieving air quality goals and addressing environmental justice, safety, noise, congestion and mobility, community enhancements, health, jobs and economic development.

Footnote:
Subsequent to the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee Action, the I-710 MCS Oversight Policy Committee approved the LPS, but did not support the recommendation that the corridor meet air quality goals before infrastructure improvements are implemented.
Attachment 6

I-710 Major Corridor Study Overview
STUDY OVERVIEW
I-710 MAJOR CORRIDOR STUDY

Presented to:

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JANUARY 5, 2005
STUDY OVERVIEW
I-710 MAJOR CORRIDOR STUDY

Purpose of I-710 Study

The I-710 Major Corridor Study was initiated in January 2001 to analyze the traffic congestion, safety, and mobility problems along the I-710 travel corridor and to develop transportation solutions to address these problems as well as some of the quality of life concerns experienced in the I-710 Corridor.

Study Organization

Daily project management and oversight of the study was provided by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority in partnership with three other principal agencies: Caltrans, Gateway Cities COG, and SCAG. In addition, a policy oversight committee was established for the I-710 Study. The I-710 Oversight Policy Committee is comprised of elected officials from 14 participating cities and the County of Los Angeles; executive managers or senior staff from three of the principal partners (MTA, Caltrans, and SCAG); and appointed representatives from the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles.

Study History

During the first 24 months of the study, existing and future conditions in the I-710 Corridor were assessed, a Purpose and Need Statement was developed, and several different transportation alternatives were analyzed. By April of 2003, five alternatives had been evaluated in detail and information on their benefits, costs, and impacts were made available to the public:

- Alternative A: No Build Alternative (also called the "No Project" Alternative)
- Alternative B: Transportation Systems Management / Travel Demand Management Alternative
- Alternative C: Medium General Purpose / Medium Truck Alternative
- Alternative D: High General Purpose / High HOV Alternative
- Alternative E: High Truck Alternative

Three of the five alternatives were build alternatives that would either involve significant expansion of the I-710 freeway or would require the construction of new travel lanes next to I-710. The public did not support any of the build alternatives due to concerns about the large amount of property acquisitions and relocation impacts, environment and health issues, environmental justice, and perceived shortcomings in the public outreach for the I-710 Study.

Revised Study Direction

In response to the community concerns and opposition to the build alternatives, the MTA Board passed a motion on May 22, 2003 to revise the direction of the I-710 Study. Through this motion, the MTA Board directed staff to continue to work with the affected communities and other stakeholders to develop a Hybrid Strategy that would be acceptable to them, while meeting the purpose and need for transportation improvements in the I-710 Study Area. This Hybrid Strategy would have both operational and policy elements, as well as selected physical
infrastructure improvements. The MTA Board also directed staff to "...form advisory groups in key areas along the Corridor where current design alternatives require the acquisition of large amounts of private property." As a result, the scope of the I-710 Study was substantially reconfigured to drop or reduce several technical tasks in deference to a greatly expanded public outreach effort to develop consensus for a preferred package of transportation improvements and strategies for the I-710 Corridor.

At its May 28, 2003 meeting, the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee (OPC), also cognizant of community concerns regarding the Final Set of Alternatives, adopted a set of Guiding Principles that further elaborated on the MTA motion and provided guidance to the development of a Hybrid Strategy for the I-710 Corridor. At this same meeting, the I-710 OPC created two tiers of Community Advisory Committees to advise them on the development of the Hybrid Strategy: Tier 1 and Tier 2 Community Advisory Committees.

**Tier 1 – Community Level Committee Structure**

Tier 1 Community Advisory Committees (CACs) were formed for each of the cities that border the I-710 Freeway. These CACs primarily focused on key issues that affected their communities including: health, environment and quality of life issues, safety and mobility issues, as well as economic development and land use issues.

To assist with the formation and coordination of these Tier 1 CACs, MTA retained a consultant, Moore, Iacofano, Goltsman, Inc. (MIG), to facilitate meetings of these committees. The Gateway Cities COG also retained an engineer (Jerry Wood, Consultant) to assist the Tier 1 CACs in the development of their recommendations for improvements to the I-710 Freeway and the transportation system in the surrounding study area.

Tier 1 Community Advisory Committees were established for the following communities: Carson, Compton, Lynwood, Bell Gardens, Commerce, East Los Angeles, and South Gate.

Rather than form a Tier 1 CAC, the City of Long Beach formed an I-710 Oversight Committee comprised of the three city council members whose districts border the I-710 freeway. The City of Long Beach also retained its own facilitation and engineering consultants to support its separate community outreach and consultation process, leading to the development and adoption by the Long Beach City Council of their portion of the Hybrid Strategy.

**Tier 2 – Corridor Level Committee Structure**

The Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee (CAC) was formed to provide community representation via a broad based corridor-wide body. The initial membership consisted of:

- The Chair of each Tier 1 CAC
- For each community that does not have a Tier 1 CAC, a member appointed by the City Council or County Supervisor
- No more than 15 members appointed by the OPC to provide representation from the environmental community, business, labor, institutions, and academia
- The Chair of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
- The Chair of the Gateway Cities COG Enhancement Committee
In order to empower the Tier 2 CAC to engage additional perspectives or interests that it deems important, the OPC delegated to the Tier 2 CAC the authority to appoint, by two-thirds vote, up to ten additional members. As a result, the Tier 2 CAC voted to add one additional member.

Employing Moore, Iacofano, Goltsman, Inc. as a resource, the Tier 2 CAC structured itself and its work based on key issue areas that were identified by the Tier 1 Community Advisory Committees. These issue areas included:

- Health
- Jobs and Economic Development
- Safety
- Noise
- Congestion and Mobility
- Community Enhancements
- Design Concepts
- Environmental Justice
- Organization and Process

**Draft Hybrid Design Concept**

The Gateway Cities COG engineer worked with the Tier 1 Community Advisory Committees to help develop a hybrid design concept. Each of the Tier 1 CACs met numerous times and developed a list of issues, concerns, and recommendations. After reviewing these lists, preliminary design concepts for respective segments of I-710 were developed and presented to each Tier 1 CAC for review and comment. Through this feedback, adjustments and refinements to the hybrid design concept were made.

The purpose of the Draft Hybrid Design Concept was to provide infrastructure improvements to I-710 focused on improving safety; addressing heavy duty truck demand as well as general purpose traffic, improving reliability of travel times; and separating autos and trucks to the greatest extent possible while limiting right-of-way impacts. In general terms, the Draft Hybrid Design Concept is comprised of 10 general-purpose traffic lanes, 4 exclusive truck lanes, and interchange improvements from Ocean Boulevard in Long Beach to the intermodal railroad yards in Commerce/Vernon. [Note that the community consultation process to reach consensus on the Hybrid Design Concept is still underway with Commerce and East Los Angeles and therefore proposed improvements to I-710 between the Atlantic/Bandini interchange and SR-60 are yet to be defined.]

Caltrans standards were considered during the development of the Draft Hybrid Design Concept. However, the standards could not be met at all locations and Caltrans/FHWA approval of design exceptions will be needed to implement the geometric design as currently proposed. If the design exceptions are not acceptable to Caltrans/FHWA, then the geometric designs at certain locations will have to be restudied and the design modified. Any changes will be reviewed with the local community before being finalized.
Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee Recommendations

The charge of the Tier 2 Committee was to review key local issues and opportunities identified by the Tier 1 Community Advisory Committees, consider issues of local and regional importance from a corridor-wide perspective, and provide recommendations to the Oversight Policy Committee on a comprehensive transportation solution for the I-710 Corridor.

Several of the Tier 2 meetings were devoted to the preparation of a report, documenting the Committee’s findings and recommendations: Major Opportunity/Strategy Recommendations and Conditions, August 2004. Great care was taken to develop precise wording to convey the convictions and intent of the overall group.

Three overarching principles defined the priorities of the Tier 2 Committee and reflected the consensus that emerged during their deliberations:

1. This is a corridor – considerations go beyond the freeway and infrastructure.
2. Health is the overriding consideration.
3. Every action should be viewed as an opportunity for repair and improvement of the current situation.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Recommendations

The TAC made no further changes to the Draft Hybrid Design Concept with the understanding that the segment of the I-710 Corridor between the BNSF/UP railroad yards in Vernon/Commerce and SR-60 is still under study and that findings from this focused study effort, including any new freeway-to-freeway ramp connections between I-710 and I-5, will need to be integrated with the overall I-710 Hybrid Design Concept prior to initiating environmental studies on I-710. The TAC also recommended that all of the proposed improvements in Alternative B, a truck inspection station, and improvements to key arterial roadways in the I-710 Study Area be incorporated to form a Hybrid Strategy.

I-710 Oversight Policy Committee Actions

The OPC met on November 18, 2004 and adopted the Locally Preferred Strategy for the I-710 Major Corridor Study. The OPC approved the draft hybrid design concept and the related supporting elements as the Locally Preferred Strategy:

- Hybrid Design Concept, which consists of ten (10) mixed flow lanes, specified interchange improvements, and four (4) truck lanes between the intermodal rail-yards in Vernon/Commerce and Ocean Boulevard in Long Beach (see Figure 1).
- Alternative B – Transportation System Management/Transportation Demand Management Improvements
- Improvement to arterial highways within the I-710 Corridor
- Construction of truck inspection facilities to be integrated with the selected overall design concept
Figure 1

I-710 Major Corridor Study
Hybrid Design Concept

- 10 General Purpose Lanes
- 4-Lane Truckway
- Interchange Improvements
- Direct Truck Ramps

Legend

- Add One Mixed Flow Lane (Each Direction)
- Add Two Mixed Flow Lanes (Each Direction)
- Exclusive Truck Facility
- Interchange Improvement
- New Interchange
- Eliminate Interchange
- Truck Ramps
- Truck Ingress/Egress

Preliminary Concepts, Subject to Change

Source: Jerry Wood, Consultant, in association with MMA, Inc. and Nolan Consulting, Inc., April 2004
The OPC, as part of the Locally Preferred Strategy decision, also committed to an additional "mini" study of the segment of the Corridor between Atlantic/Bandini and SR-60 to determine an acceptable design concept and scope for that segment of the Corridor. In addition, they adopted four recommendations providing direction and guidance on the future phases of project development and on companion actions.

1. Request the Gateway Cities Council of Governments to return with suggested steps for initiating the development and implementation of a corridor level air quality action plan to include not only technical but also funding, institutional structure and legislative strategies as well as an approach to holding public agencies with jurisdiction in the Corridor accountable for progress in meeting air quality and public health objectives in the Corridor and Region.

2. Forward the Tier 2 report in its entirety to be accepted as pre-scoping guidance to the preparation of the EIR/EIS.

3. Request the Gateway Cities Council of Governments to identify and pursue appropriate avenues to implement those Tier 2 recommendations that prove to exceed the scope of any I-710 transportation improvement project and report back to the community.

4. Request MTA and COG staff to suggest a process and structure for continuing community participation throughout the environmental analysis.

Based on the OPC Action of November 18, 2004, the Locally Preferred Strategy will be forwarded to the MTA Board for its consideration and possible action.

**Issues for Further Consideration**

While consensus for a Locally Preferred Strategy was reached among study decision-makers, it was with the understanding that a number of issues of concern that were raised during the study process would be revisited during the environmental review, preliminary engineering, final design, and construction phases of the proposal. For the most part, these are issues that were beyond the scope and authority of the I-710 planning study. Some are matters about which design assumptions had to be made for study purposes and yet about which considerable controversy remains. Others have to do with phasing of the overall project and ensuring that it supports the overall health and quality of life issues in the I-710 Study Area. These issues represent critical concerns of several of the local representatives, the community advisory group members, and the public, and will become part of future discussions as the various aspects of the project move into the next phases.

- Air Quality Action Plan
- Public Involvement Plan for EIS/EIR Phase
- Mini-Corridor Study
- Freeway Design Issues
- Definition of Arterial Street Improvements
- Determination of Truck Inspection Facility(ies)
- Phasing of Improvements