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
   - Andre Colaiace
   - Joyce Rooney
   - Ed Norris
   - Mark Yamarone

3. Consent Calendar
   - Approval of Minutes
     - Attachment 3: Minutes of January 4, 2006
   - Local Return Guidelines
     - Attachment 4: Local Return Guidelines Revisions

   Action/Concurrence

4. Chairperson's Report
   - Pedestrian Workshop
     - 10 min

   Information
   - Renee Berlin
   - Robin Blair

5. Legislative Update
   - Federal
   - State
     - 10 min

   Information
   - Raffi Hamparian
   - Michael Turner

6. Governors Bond Initiative
     - 10 min

   Information
   - Michael Turner

7. Transit Access Pass (TAP) Procurement Status
   - Attachment 5: Project Update
     - 10 min

   Information
   - Jane Matsumoto
8. TAP – Funding for Ongoing Administrative Costs
   Attachment 6: TAP Services Funding
   10 min

9. CMP Conformance Finding
   Attachment 7: 2005 CMP Conformance
   5 min

10. 2006 STIP
    10 min

11. New Business

12. 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 March 1, 2006 at 9:30 am in the Union Station Room.
Attachment 1

Subcommittee January 2006 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

Gateway Plaza Conference Room — 3rd Floor

1. Call to Order
   1 minute
   Action
   Andre Colaiace

2. Approval of Minutes
   November 15, 2005 Minutes
   1 minute
   Action
   BOS

3. Chair's Report
   5 minutes
   Information
   Andre Colaiace

4. SAFETEA-LU Funding Marks
   10 minutes
   Information
   Steve Henley

5. SAFETEA-LU FTA
   20 Minutes
   Information
   Ray Tellias

6. Funding Marks Update
   10 minutes
   Information
   Rufus Cayetano

7. Prop A & C Guidelines
   15 Minutes
   Action
   Patricia Chen

8. Legislative Update
   5 minutes
   Information
   Raffi Hamparian

9. New Business
   - CMAQ Guidelines
   - Tea 21 Fact Sheet
   - FY2006 Appropriations of Section 5307
   - East LA Training Program

10. Adjournment

Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Information Items:
90-day Rolling Agenda
5307 85% Fund Balances
5307 15% Discretionary Fund Balances
CMAQ Fund Balances
TE 1% Fund Balances
Summary of Invoices — FY06
2005 Subsidy Tracking Matrix
2005 Document Requirement Status
Summary of EZ Pass Invoices — FY06
TDA/STA Claim Summary for FY06
Regional Pass Sales

BOS Agenda Packages can be accessed online at:
http://www.metro.net/about_us/committees/bos.htm

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 Tuesday, February 21, 2006 at 9:30 am in the Windsor Conference Room, 15th Floor of the Gateway Building.
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE

Union Station Room -- 3rd Floor

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes -- December 1, 2005
   (Attachment #1)

3. Approve Local Return Guidelines
   (Attachment #2)

4. ASI/UFS Update

5. Draft Sub-regional Paratransit Fundmarks for FY '07

6. LTSS Membership Vacancies

7. Election of Officers (February 2006)

8. City of Huntington Park Transportation Programs

9. Legislative/Transportation Bond Update

10. New Business

11. Adjournment

Action
Joyce Rooney

Action
Joyce Rooney

Action
Joyce Rooney

Information
Matthew Avacena, ASI

Information
Susan Richan, Metro

Discussion
Joyce Rooney

Discussion
Joyce Rooney

Terisa Henriquez
Oldtimer's Foundation

Information
Mike Turner, Metro

Information
Joyce Rooney

Action
Joyce Rooney
Thursday, January 19, 2006 9:30 A.M.

Agenda

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

Windsor Conference Room, 15th Floor

1. Call to Order
   1 min

2. Approval of the December 8, 2005 Minutes
   Attachment 1: Draft Minutes/Sign-in Sheet
   1 min

3. Chairperson Report
   10 min

4. Metro Report
   • December 2005 CTC Report
     15 min

5. Caltrans Report
   • Safe Routes to School Program
   • Inactive Project List
     30 min

6. Arterial Master Plan
   20 min

7. Hasley Canyon STP-I. Swap
   Attachment 2: Interstate 5/Hasley Canyon Fund Exchange Board Report
   10 min

8. Metro Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan (BTSP)
   Attachment 3: Metro BTSP Policies (DRAFT)
   20 min

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
   20 min

10. New Business  
    5 min

11. Adjournment  
    1 min

Update/Possible Action  
   (Patricia Chen)

Discussion (Subcommittee)

Action (Subcommittee)

The next meeting of the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee will be held on February 16, 2006, at 9:30 AM in the Windsor Conference Room, 15th Floor. Please contact Renee Berlin at (213) 922-3035 or Ryan Ross at (213) 922-1079 should you have any questions or comments regarding this or future agendas.
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Location of Meeting

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Call to Order/Roll Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Approval of Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minutes of July 20, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chairman’s Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prop A and C Local Return Guidelines – Proposed Revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Metro Kiosks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>New Business and Next Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please call Rufina Juarez at (213) 922-7405 or e-mail her at “juarezr@metro.net” if you have any questions concerning the agenda or would like to add an item.
Attachment 2

Subcommittee Actions
Disposition of January Subcommittee Actions

BOS:

The following were action items for our BOS, Tuesday, January 17, 2006 meeting:

- November 15, 2006 minutes were passed with amendments.
- Motion made Bob Hildebrand regarding the Prop A & C Guidelines traffic signal eligibility and seconded by David Feinberg.
  
  Original language:
  Installation of traffic signals which are not part of a larger transit project are not eligible, except as detailed in this section. Maintenance and replacement of traffic signals are not eligible.

  Installation of new traffic signals will be reviewed and considered on a case-by-case basis to evaluate the transit benefit of the project. The following information may be requested and evaluated, depending on the type of traffic signal project:
  - Number of transit boardings at the affected transit stop or station
  - Predominance of transit patrons as a proportion of pedestrian volume
  - Predominance of transit vehicles as a proportion of vehicle flow
  - Letter from affected transit operator requesting and justifying traffic signal installation or modification
  - Proximity of proposed signal to transit stop or station

  Based on the review, all or a proportion of the project costs may be eligible for Local Return Funds.

  Amendment:
  Amendment of 15 minutes headways with more frequent transit service qualifying on given routes.
  Discussion: David Feinberg stated that smaller cities would be penalized. Other comments were that Local jurisdictions should have the right to use their Prop C Local Returns and to make the decision of the frequency. The County Department of Public Works would prefer MTA staff recommended language.

  10 favor / 1 against / 1 abstention: Motion carried. There will be a vote via e-mail by Thursday, January 26, 2006 on the changes and the amendment. Two ballots will be issued. The package will be sent out by Thursday.

LTSS:
Not Available

Streets and Freeways:
January 19, 2006 Meeting
Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

The Streets and Freeways Subcommittee passed a motion to approve the revision to the Proposition C Local Return Guidelines with regard to stand-alone traffic signals at locations with bus stops that meet Caltrans pedestrian warrants with the recommendation that the language allowing the installation of new stand-alone traffic signals be modified (modifications in strike-out and BOLD) to reflect the following:

(This section to be added under Proposition C only)
Installation of traffic signals which are not part of a larger transit project are not eligible, except as detailed in this section. Maintenance and replacement of traffic signals are not eligible.

Installation of new traffic signals and modification of existing signals will be reviewed and considered on a case-by-case basis to evaluate the transit benefit of the project. The following information may be requested and evaluated, depending on the type of traffic signal project:

- Number of transit boardings at the affected transit stop or station
- Predominance of Proportion of transit patrons as a proportion of pedestrian volume
- Predominance of Proportion of transit vehicles as a proportion of vehicle flow
- Letter from affected transit operator requesting or supporting and justifying traffic signal installation or modification
- Proximity of proposed signal to transit stop or station
- Proximity of proposed signal to adjacent controlled intersections

Based on the review, all or a proportion of the project costs may be eligible for Local Return funds.

The motion was put forth by Mike Uyeno (City of Los Angeles) and seconded by Bahman Janka (San Gabriel Valley COG). The motion passed, and seconded by Ed Norris (City of Long Beach). Mike Uyeno and Maged El-Rabaa abstained.

TDM/AQ:
January 18, 2006 Meeting
The TDM/AQ Subcommittee unanimously approved the staff recommendation regarding the use of Prop. C for Traffic Signals serving transit stops as outlined in Patricia Chen’s memo to the TDM/AQ Subcommittee dated January 13, 2006.
Attachment 3

Draft January 4, 2006 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 9:40 a.m. Randy Lamm (Metro) took roll and declared a quorum was present.

2. Agenda Reports By Standing Committees

BOS (David Reyno)
- No meeting in December;
- Next meeting is January 17th;

LTSS (Joyce Rooney)
- No meeting since the last TAC meeting;
- Next meeting is January 26th;

Streets and Freeways (Ed Norris)
- Met on December 8th;
- Received reports on:
  - Inactive projects from Caltrans;
- Action:
  - Approved the Metro Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan (BTSP) policies with the following conditions being added: 1) Metro use triple bicycle racks on buses when replacing existing racks or purchasing new racks; 2) Metro permit driver discretion when allowing bicycles on buses when space is available; and 3) expand the definition of “Metro Bicycle Commuter Clubs” to include employers;
  - Approved Propositions A and C Local Return Guidelines under three separate motions: 1) Metro revise the Local Return Guidelines to define “heavily used by transit”; 2)
Stand-alone traffic signals at bus stop locations that meet Caltrans requirements for Pedestrians Warrants be eligible for Propositions A and C under the Local Return Guidelines; and 3) Metro include the maintenance, operation and upgrades of existing streetlights along bus routes to ensure rider safety for those commuting to and from bus stops:

- Deferred report on:
  - Arterial Master Plan;
- Next meeting will be held on January 19th.

TDM/AQ (Mark Yamarone)
- No meeting in December;
- The next meeting will be held on January 18th.

3. Consent Calendar (Renee Berlin)
Moved by Mr. Yamarone (TDM/AQ), seconded by Ms. Rooney (LTSS), motion to approve the Consent Calendar and minutes. The motion carried.

4. Chairperson’s Report (Renee Berlin) Handout
- At the December TAC meeting, Charles Bergson (City of Compton) was supposed to present a status report on the TMOC and Retrofit of the City’s traffic signal system that was funded through the Call for Projects. Mr. Bergson made a status presentation to Streets and Freeways on December 8th. He reported that the City expected to be under a new contract with a traffic engineering firm by the end of December, 2005 and plans to be undertaking design in Summer 2006. Construction is expected to commence in Fall 2006, with project completion by Spring 2007;
- First quarter FY 06 combined Propositions A and C and TDA sales tax revenues were 10.8% higher than budgeted and 10.9% over the first quarter FY 05;
- Estimated Metro Orange Line weekday boardings were 16,360, three times the expectations;
- On December 13th, Metro entered into a Joint Development agreement for a 22-story condominium and retail complex at the Wilshire/Western Metro station; Groundbreaking is scheduled for early 2006, with completion scheduled for Spring 2008;
- At the December Metro Board meeting, the Peer Review panel delivered its final report, stating that it is possible to safely tunnel and operate a subway under Wilshire Blvd. Recommendations included the use of a slurry shield tunneling machine, tunnel liners and the locating of stations to minimize exposure to tar sands and gas concentrations;
- Dick Brumbaugh, Metro’s CFO, has retired;
- Captain Stephen Webb will be the new primary TAC representative for the California Highway Patrol;
- As part of the Chairperson’s Report, Robin Blair and James Rojas (Metro) made a presentation on an upcoming federal/state-sponsored pedestrian workshop. Mr. Blair stated that the workshop will focus on successful designs and practices throughout the United States that have improved the pedestrian environment. The workshop is scheduled for March 6th and 7th, with a technical session for engineers on March 8th. All
events will occur at Metro. He will keep TAC members informed as the workshop is solidified.

December 15th Board Meeting

Approved:
- Final EIR/EIS for the Mid-City/Expo Line;
- $68.7 million advance to Alameda Corridor East (ACE) Construction Authority from Phase 2 to Phase 1 as part of Metro’s commitment to fund 17% of project cost. If Metro monies are the only source of available funds for Phase 2 design and the project is ready, then ACE should be able to use those funds;
- The following nominees for membership on the Westside Central Service Sector Governance Council:
  - Glenn Rosten – replacing Stephanie Negriff
  - Peter Capone-Newton – reappointment
- The following nominees for membership on the South Bay Service Sector Governance Council:
  - Terisa Price – reappointment
  - Curren Price – reappointment
  - Margaret Hudson – reappointment
  - Devon Deming – replacing Howard Sachar

Approved on Consent:
- Two year fixed price contract with MFA/Jones and Stokes for project approval/environmental document for SR-2 terminus;
- Federal and State legislative program;
- Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP);

Received:
- Report on Wilshire Blvd. BRT project scope, budget and implementation timeframes. Authorized the CEO to negotiate and execute a change order with URS to support development of the engineering design and scopes of services for early implementation items.

5. Legislative Update (Marissa Yeager, Metro)

Federal Update
Ms. Yeager reported that with the passage of SAFETEA-LU, the Job Access and Reverse Commute program (JARC) is now a formula program. Congress completed work on the Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development Bill for $137.6 billion, including $65.9 billion in discretionary appropriations, a 4% increase from FY 05. Congress also allowed the release of $36 billion from the Highway Trust Fund, a 5% increase from FY 05, to pay for construction and repairs on the Interstate Highway system and other roads. Transit programs were funded at $8.6 billion, a 12.3% increase from FY 05. Some cuts are expected when Congress reconvenes on January 31st.
The last session of Congress failed to rewrite the Clean Air Act or to prepare a Technical Corrections bill for SAFETEA-LU. It is unclear whether or not a Technical Corrections bill will be passed by the next Congress due to an expected $40 billion spending cut. The distribution of Homeland Security grants are currently being scrutinized, and any change in distribution should benefit high-risk areas such as Los Angeles.

Brynn Kernaghan (BOS) asked if JARC funds would flow through Metro.
Ms. Yeager replied that the Regional Programming Department is currently reviewing that issue.
Marianne Kim (Auto Club) asked how much money would be available through JARC.
Ms. Yeager replied that the amount is not yet known.

State Update
The State legislature resumed session today (January 4th). The Governor’s State of the State speech will be on January 5th. The State budget is scheduled to be released on January 10th. The Governor and legislative leadership have announced that transportation and infrastructure will be the highest priorities for the 2006 session. Senator Pro-Tem Don Perata has proposed SB-1024, a bond proposal for approximately $14 billion. Metro is concerned that the bond does not provide enough guarantees to ensure that a proportional amount of funds will be allocated to Los Angeles. The Administration continues to hold meetings on the development of the Goods Movement Action Plan.

Paul Maselbas (County of Los Angeles) asked if Metro had been asked to provide a list of unmet needs or suggested projects for the bond issues.
Ms. Yeager replied that she did not know, but would find out and forward the information to Ms. Berlin.

Ms. Yeager announced that Kimberly Yu, Government Relations Officer, is no longer with Metro. She is now the Planning and Budget Director for Los Angeles City Councilman Jose Huizar.

6. Local Return Guidelines (Patricia Chen, Metro)
Ms. Berlin stated that the Streets Freeways Subcommittee had previously taken action on this item with three caveats. Ms. Berlin suggested that TAC members consider this when taking action on this item.

Ms. Chen referred the TAC members to the matrix on page 33 of the agenda packet. Ms. Chen stated that the matrix was separated into two sub-groupings: policy revisions and technical revisions. Major policy revisions included the following:
Local Return as a match to grant funds – The proposed revision includes a blanket statement that allows Local Return funds to be used as a match for other grant programs, as long as the project is eligible for Local Return funds;
Recreational Transit Service – The proposed revision requires that Recreational Transit trips be advertised to the public. Mark Bozigian (North Los Angeles County) asked if the level of advertising is identified. Ms. Chen responded that the document includes examples, such as flyers, newspaper and internet advertising, but does not set a spending threshold;
Bus Stop Improvements – The proposed revision allows bus stop improvements up to 25 feet from the bus stop signpost, as opposed to the current eight foot limit;
Planning – The proposed revision allows funds to be used for planning and coordination costs, including project advocacy, provided that the projects are Local Return-eligible.

Major technical revisions included the following:
Recreational Transit Service – Allow trips into Kern County in order to ensure equity for the North County;
Signal Synchronization – Allow Local Return funds to be used for signal timing provided that it is done in coordination with all affected local jurisdictions in the corridor. A second revision would allow Proposition C funds to be used for operating costs of the data sharing systems;
Service Coordination Process – Broaden language to include all transit operators, not just Metro.

Ms. Chen also outlined three motions approved by the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee, none of which are being recommended by Metro staff. The motions are as follows:
Stand-alone traffic signals at bus stop locations that meet Caltrans requirements for Pedestrian Warrants be eligible for Local Return funds. Ms. Chen stated that the current language allows funds to be used for traffic signals only in conjunction with larger projects that are focused on a transit benefit. Ms. Chen stated that the Local Return Program was intended to go above and beyond the spending of the local jurisdiction to create new transit opportunities, and that the current language protects that principle;
Maintenance and upgrade of existing streetlights along bus routes be eligible for Local Return funds. Ms. Chen stated that Metro staff believes that streetlights are the responsibility of local jurisdictions and that Local Return funds should be used for specifically transit-related projects;
Clearly define the term “heavily used by transit.” Ms. Chen stated that the term is difficult to define for the region as a whole because it can mean very different things to different-sized jurisdictions. Metro staff would prefer to keep the term not so specific.

Marianne Kim commented that the problem with such a flexible definition of “heavily used by transit” is that the meaning of the term changes every time Metro staff changes. Ms. Berlin replied that any attempt to restrict the number of buses has met with significant resistance from local jurisdictions. Mr. Bozigian stated that flexibility benefits the local jurisdictions.

Mr. Yamarone stated that the TDM/AQ Subcommittee also passed a motion recommending that Local Return funds be used for stand-alone traffic signals. Mr. Yamarone used the example of Santa Clarita, where several traffic signals were installed solely to promote pedestrian access to transit. Ms. Chen replied that it is difficult to justify the use of Local Return funds for such a project when a large percentage of the beneficiaries would likely be non-transit riding pedestrians and non-bus vehicular traffic.

Mr. Yamarone stated that there are cases in which traffic signals have been installed solely to promote access to transit and that such projects should be eligible for Local Return funds. Mr. Norris asked why features such as safety lighting were considered bus stop amenities while traffic signals were not.
Ms. Kernaghan stated that if funds became available for traffic signals, then cities open themselves to litigation if the signals are not installed for all bus stops. Mr. Norris replied that it was for that reason that the Streets and Freeways motion specified that bus stop locations meet Caltrans Pedestrian Warrants in order to be eligible. Ms. Chen replied that the Pedestrian Warrants are not sufficient because areas such as schools and business districts would have large numbers of pedestrians, but not necessarily transit riders.

Mr. Bozigian commented that Metro staff should be able to accommodate the traffic signal projects that primarily benefit transit. Ms. Berlin stated Propositions A and C were passed primarily to improve mobility, not necessarily pedestrian access. Ms. Chen stated that the current guidelines are administratively feasible and allow funds to be used for their original purpose. Ms. Berlin added that other proposed revisions, such as those allowing Local Return funds to be used for advocacy and expanded bus stop improvements, free up local jurisdiction funds to be used for projects such as traffic signals. Mr. Bozigian stated that this particular traffic signal issue should be examined independently of the other revisions to relax the guidelines and determine whether or not stand alone signals qualify for Local Return funds. Ms. Chen stated that the major concern is that traffic signal projects would consume the Local Return funds allocation especially for some smaller cities, leaving nothing left for transit. Mr. Bozigian replied that, while that scenario was possible, it was the decision of that local jurisdiction if their highest priority was traffic signals. Ms. Rooney stated that local jurisdictions will always find money for traffic signals, but not necessarily for transit, so it is important not to divert money away from transit. Mr. Yamamoto stated that argument could be applied to many of the revisions such as advocacy. Ms. Kernaghan reiterated that some guidelines need to be in place to protect Propositions A and C funds for transit, which was the original purpose of the ordinances.

Ms. Kernaghan stated that the BOS Subcommittee did not get an opportunity to discuss this issue and would need to do so before it approved any of the motions made by the other Subcommittees. Ms. Rooney stated that LTSS would have the same position. Jim Thorsen (Las Virgenes/Malibu COG) suggested that these issues be pushed off until the next revision of the guidelines, due to the fact that no one had yet evaluated the financial impacts of these proposals. Mr. Thorsen also asked when the guidelines had last been revised. Ms. Chen stated that the guidelines were last revised six years ago. Mr. Norris asked if the comments from the Subcommittees would be reflected in the Board Report. Ms. Chen replied that they would. Ms. Berlin asked that the TAC recommendation be included as well. Carolyn Flowers (Metro Operations) made the following motion:

TAC approve Propositions A and C Local Return Guidelines as recommended with the condition that over the next 12-18 months, staff work with TAC and its Subcommittees on the eligibility issue of stand-alone traffic signals serving transit stops and meeting Caltrans Pedestrian Warrants. Staff to report to TAC in six months on the status of the issue.

Mr. Thorsen seconded the motion.

Mr. Bozigian stated that the issue would not be addressed if given a period of 12-18 months. He suggested that it be dealt with before TAC made a recommendation. Mr. Thorsen asked if language could be added to these guidelines that would allow projects to be evaluated on an individual basis.
Mr. Maselbas stated that the funds are open for local discretion and that it should be up to the local agencies as to how they want the funds spent within the guidelines. Ms. Berlin replied that Propositions A and C were approved to enhance mobility. Mr. Maselbas disagreed, stating that the ordinance was intended to facilitate and encourage use of transit. Ms. Chen stated that the ordinance was intended to pay for transit. Ms. Berlin stated that going against the intent of the Propositions by funding non-transit projects could also be a legal issue. Mr. Maselbas asked if Metro's legal counsel had been consulted on this issue. Ms. Chen stated that they had, and that legal counsel was very concerned about both the traffic signals and the streetlights.

Mr. Bozigian asked if it would be possible for Metro staff to look at this issue over the next six months for a possible amendment. Ms. Chen replied that she was not sure how much new information could be obtained in that time period. Mr. Bozigian reiterated Mr. Thorsen's idea of a restrictive policy that would only allow projects beneficial to transit.

Ms. Berlin stated that a motion was on the table and needed to be acted upon before anything else could be done. Mr. Bozigian proposed an amendment to the motion to change the time period from 12-18 to six months. Ms. Flowers stated that she would entertain the amendment to change the time period to six months. The motion carried as follows:

*TAC approve the revised Propositions A and C Local Return Guidelines as recommended with the condition that over the next six months, staff work with TAC and its Subcommittees on the eligibility issue of stand-alone traffic signals serving transit stops and meeting Caltrans Pedestrian Warrants. Staff to report to TAC in six months on the status of the issue.*

7. Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan Policies (Lynne Goldsmith, Metro)

Ms. Goldsmith briefly reviewed the Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan, developed over the last year with input from working group and stakeholder meetings. She informed the TAC that the Metro Board will take action on the Plan at their February meeting. The focus of the plan is improved access to transit by bicycle users. The plan identifies six objectives: bicycle planning and funding, bicycle parking, bike to transit, bike to work, bicycle promotion and bicycle education and safety. The Bicycle Transportation Strategic Policies are located in Attachment 5 of the agenda packet, page 108.

Ms. Flowers stated Metro Operations' opposition to several of the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee's changes to the Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan (see Item 2: Agenda Reports by Standing Committees). Metro Operations is opposed to the recommendation that triple bicycle racks be used on Metro buses and the recommendation that driver discretion be allowed in permitting bicycles on buses when space is available. The first objection is that the policies apply only to Metro, rather than to all of Los Angeles County's transit providers. Also, the plan does not identify any feasibility or engineering studies that have been conducted to determine whether or not the Streets and Freeways recommendation on triple racks is feasible and safe. In addition, the policies do not address issues that Metro is confronted with due to the Consent Decree.
Ms. Kernaghan commented that Long Beach Transit’s switch from double to triple bicycle racks initially caused an increase in bus accidents because the triple racks stick out farther from the bus. She stated that it would be preferable to study the impacts of triple racks rather than simply mandate them. Ms. Flowers stated that she would like to see a study conducted to determine the adverse financial impact of these recommendations in comparison to service improvements. Ms. Flowers then clarified that she did not have an issue with the draft policies presented by Mr. Goldsmith, but with the recommendations from the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee. Ms. Flowers motioned that the draft policies be accepted as currently recommended by Metro staff. Ms. Rooney seconded the motion. The motion carried.

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 (Kaileh Honish, Metro)
Ms. Honish referred TAC members to page 122 of the TAC agenda packet. Under this proposal, Metro would exchange with the County of Los Angeles up to $20.6 million of Surface Transportation Program-Local (STP-L) funds for non-federal funds. The County of LA I-5/Hasley Canyon Project would receive Federal STP-L funds and would repay Metro with unrestricted non-federal funds from Developer Impact fees. Cities with STP-L balances would be offered the non-federal funds in exchange for their STP-L funds. Funds will be offered to cities from smallest to largest until all funds have been taken. In exchange for this service, Metro would require a 2% administrative fee. Agencies would be under no obligation to participate in the exchange, but it is expected that many agencies will participate in order to avoid cumbersome federal processing requirements that sometimes result in lapsed funding.

Ms. Berlin asked if this program could have any negative impact on a smaller city that wanted to use its STP-L funds instead of the unrestricted funds. Ms. Honish replied that there would be no negative impact because cities would not be obligated to exchange their STP-L funds for unrestricted funds. Ms. Berlin commented that this proposal came out of Metro’s System Preservation Study, which recommended a brokering program with smaller cities that would make STP-L funds more usable. Mr. Thorsen asked if cities would have to wait until the County’s project was complete before they could receive these unrestricted funds. Ms. Honish replied no. Mr. Maselbas clarified that the funds from the County would not be unrestricted, but are to be used for the same types of transportation projects for which STP-L funds are eligible.

Ms. Honish clarified that this program would only apply to current balances and that cities could not “spend ahead” using the non-federal funds. Mr. Maselbas stated that the primary reason for this program was to spend down the Federal Aid fund balance in the region, increasing the chances for additional allocations of federal funds.

Robert Newman (TDM A/Q) asked if the program would slow progress on the I-5/Hasley Canyon project. Mr. Maselbas responded that it should not have an impact on project delivery.
Ms. Rooney made a motion to approve the recommendations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Newman. The motion carried.

9. SAFETEA-LU – State Implementation Bill (Ashad Hamideh, Metro)
Mr. Hamideh stated that he would be discussing two issues regarding State implementation of SAFETEA-LU: Equity Bonus and the Highway Safety Improvement Program. Both of these are new in the SAFETEA-LU legislation. The Equity Bonus program replaces the TEA-21 Minimum Guarantee program and establishes a minimum rate of return based on Highway Trust Fund contributions. This rate of return increases from 90.5% in FY 05 and 06 to 91.5% in FY 07 and 92% in FY 08 and 09. This will result in increased funding for California. The Equity Bonus program has two components: one part goes to the State only, and is to be spent as STP. The second component, called programmatic distribution is divided between six core programs: National Highway System, CMAQ, Interstate Maintenance, Bridge, Surface Transportation and Highway Safety Improvement. Due to this increase in funding, rural areas are requesting an increase in their share from $9 million to $20 million. Among the options being discussed, which will need a change in state law, to increase the rural shares are the following: for the regions and the SHOPP change the distribution of the Equity Bonus to give 10% to the rural areas, 30% to the SHOPP and 60% to the regions using the RSTP distribution.

The Highway Safety Improvement program, formerly a 10% set-aside program from STP is now a separate program. In FY 06, this amounts to about $130 million for California, including funding for the Safe Routes to School Program. One of the issues which needs to be addressed in the State Implementation Bill is that all states must adopt a Strategic Highway Safety Plan by FY 07 in order to avoid funds being frozen at FY 07 apportionments. Another issue is the way that California currently splits highway safety funds: one-third to the State, one third to local agencies and one third to Safe Routes to Schools (SRS). Since there is now dedicated funding for SRS, any change in the funding allocation to SRS would require state legislation. Because no such changes have yet been presented to the Legislature, the state will follow existing state law in FY 06 and would initiate a call for projects for this purpose.

Mr. Hamideh requested input from TAC members on the recommendations for the implementation of the Highway Safety Improvement program (including SRS).

Ms. Berlin asked if something in writing could be provided to TAC members. Mr. Hamideh replied that he would provide a fact sheet for the Highway Safety Improvement program.

10. CTC Update (Tim Papandreou, Metro)
Mr. Papandreou reported that the CTC met in December in Sacramento. At the November meeting, the CTC approved the Metro Orange Line Letter of No Prejudice (LONP) which will repay $98 million in local funds that Metro put forward for the project. At the December meeting, the CTC approved the following for Metro:

- $11.4 million in LONPs:
  - $1.8 million for the SR-101/I-405 Auxiliary Lane project
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- $9.6 million for the I-405 HOV lane segment from Waterford Ave. to I-10. This does not include the I-405 Northbound HOV from Sunset Blvd. through the Sepulveda Pass, which is yet to be funded;
- $3.7 million for Planning, Programming and Monitoring for Los Angeles County.
- Approved the final EIR for the Mid-City/Exposition Line. The project will now be eligible to receive state funds. At the February CTC meeting, Metro plans to ask for a $208 million allocation.

Mr. Papandreou also discussed the 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The statewide STIP is about $1.8 billion. The Fund Estimate is not dependable due to the fact that about $1.3 billion of the total represents Public Transportation Account (PTA) funds. The remaining $500 million is State Highway Account (SHA) funds, most of which will be used to maintain the State Highway Operations Protection Program (SHOPP) during the STIP cycle. Virtually no funds will be available to the regional agencies, which are not PTA funds. PTA funds are eligible only for transit related uses and are subject to annual appropriations by the State budget and are therefore at risk. The sources of PTA funds are the Sales Tax on Gasoline and diesel (referred to as regular sources of the PTA) and irregular sources such as proceeds from the Tribal Gaming Bonds that are currently under litigation, but clearing soon. If the Gaming Bonds pass, then there will be a new stream of funds which means the amount of PTA should be more secure.

The regular sources of funds that are relatively guaranteed will go to the SHOPP and for Caltrans budget and rail needs. The funds that are left are less reliable – from Gaming bonds and Prop. 42 spill over, etc – that is set aside for the STIP. So not only is the STIP at risk, but the sources of funds for the STIP are at the highest risk within the PTA funding pot. The next STIP cycle will mostly consist of reprogramming projects from the 2004 STIP. However, there is an issue (Transit versus Highway funds) because the PTA funds that will be used to reprogram the 2004 STIP are not really eligible for the projects being reprogrammed. Metro has asked the CTC to review the PTA guidelines. Specifically, a question was asked if an HOV lane that carries a high proportion of buses would it be eligible for PTA funds. Under the Federal guidelines it would be considered a “fixed guideway” and would be eligible, but under California State guidelines it would not be eligible. The final STIP submittal is due January 30, 2006. There will be hearings on March 9th for Southern California, which will probably be held at the Metro Gateway HQ, and the Board Chair – Mayor Villaraigosa will be asked to speak. There will be one new project added to the STIP submittal, which can take advantage of the PTA funds – the Expo Light Rail Project. The PTA funds are expected to be more secure this year than in future years, so it makes sense to get an allocation for Expo now. This will free up some of the local dollars that are currently programmed on the Expo project and make those funds available to other projects.

The Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) also met in December. A continuing concern is the high balance of unused Obligation Authority. The Self Help Counties Coalition (those counties with dedicated Transportation Sales taxes) met and had a presentation from Jim Earp representing the California Alliance for Jobs. They are campaigning to restore the Prop 42 funding and are advocating for both the Governor’s Bond Initiative and protecting Prop 42 funding. The California Alliance for Jobs is pushing for a requirement that the Bonds not be used to replace Prop 42 funding that they are issued.
in conjunction with reinstating the Prop 42 funding and secured first. This will insure accountability – to protect and dedicate for transportation what the voters passed overwhelmingly and then new bonds to pay for infrastructure. SB 1024 (Perata) includes about $12.5 billion in Transportation projects. Discussions are being held as to whether it is going to be a General Obligation bond or a Revenue bond. Either way, the bonds call user fees – tolls, etc.

Business, Transportation and Housing (BTH) Secretary McPeak gave an update on the Statewide Mobility plan, which is also a part of the Statewide Goods Movement Action Plan. Go California is about how and where to dedicate transportation resources to get the most effective use of these funds. This is to change the process from a parochial laundry list of projects to a more planned and prioritized approach. This will be presented to the Governor very soon. Mr. Papandreou stated that after it is approved he will report to TAC what it means for Los Angeles County in terms of specific projects.

11. 2006 Long Range Transportation Plan (Doug Kim, Metro)
Mr. Kim reported that staff continues its work on the Plan’s development. The Plan will be submitted for consideration to the Metro Board this summer. Meanwhile, a status report will be given to the Board in Spring. This report could include an updated snapshot of the financial forecasts, and options for funding additional projects. Ms. Berlin mentioned that in early December Carol Inge, Interim Chief Planning Officer, transmitted a letter to cities requesting information on land use strategies around potential rail corridors identified during the earlier public outreach. She informed TAC members that responses are due on January 17th.

12. Congestion Mitigation Fee – Nexus Study (Doug Kim, Metro)
Metro is taking a second look at its developer impact fee proposal in order to incorporate input from its consultants. It is anticipated the updated proposal should be more attractive to local governments. The proposal will be released in the near future.

13. New Business
No new business.

14. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m. The next meeting will be held on March 1, 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. <em>Maican</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Beal / Marianne Kim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (BOS)</td>
<td>1. <em>Bryan Kernaghan</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andre Cotliace / Brynn Kernaghan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <em>David Upho</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Reyno / Dana Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL</td>
<td>1. <em>Stephen Webb / Joe Vizcarra</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>1. <em>Raja Mitwasi / Alberto Angelini</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <em>Rose Casey / Kirk Cessna</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVE ON ADA</td>
<td>1. Vacant / Mitch Pomerantz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1. <em>Jane C. / Ed Notri</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>1. <em>James Okazaki / James Lefton</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <em>Haripal Vir / Mike Uyeno</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. <em>Gina Mancha / Ron Ollie</em></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.  Mark Herwick/David Cowardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.  Paul Maseelba/Maged El-Rabaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.  Patrick V. DeChellis/Shari Afshari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td>1.  Greg Herrmann/Cathi Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities COG</td>
<td>2.  Desi Alvarez/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes Malibu Conejo COG</td>
<td>3.  Jim Thosen/Tom Gdala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td>4.  Mark Bozgian/Tom Horne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
<td>5.  David Liu/Dan Rix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td>6.  Steven Huang/Victor Rollinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side Cities</td>
<td>7.  David Feinberg/Art Ida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee/Authority</td>
<td>Member 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE (LTSS)</td>
<td>Jano Baghdanian/Thomas Uwal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (MTA)</td>
<td>Renee Berlin/Randy Lamm Countywide Planning &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY (SCRRA - Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>Steve Lant/Deadra Knox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SCAQMD -- Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>Fyvonne Sells/Kathryn Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG -- Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>Joseph Alcock/Annie Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/AIR QUALITY SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)
### Attendance Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES</th>
<th>AGENCY</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>
<th>January</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Beal/Marianne Kim (A)</td>
<td>AUTO CLUB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></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/Laura Crego (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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 Reynor/Dana Lee (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Capri Steve Wobii/Jo Vizzarra (A)</td>
<td>CHP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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>Raja Minnlu/Alberto Angeles</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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 Casey/Kirk Casano (A)</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Ellen Blackman/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>CITIZEN'S REP ON ADA</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>Sumi Gart/Ed Norris (A)</td>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 Okaizaki/James Lefory (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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 Uyeno (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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>Greg Mancilla/Ron Olive (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 Hark/Willis Cowden (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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>Paul Maselles/Ernest E-Rebias (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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 DePello/Shaun Isher (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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 Hermann/Cathie Cole (A)</td>
<td>ARROYO VERDUGO CITIES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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>Dari Alcayde/Tessa Rapo (A)</td>
<td>GATEWAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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 Thorsen/Tom Gala (A)</td>
<td>LAS VEGAS MALIBU CONCHO A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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 Ro/Will Liu (A)</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL CITIES COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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 Hwang/Vic Rollinger (A)</td>
<td>SOUTH BAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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 Feeney/Artida (A)</td>
<td>WESTSIDE CITIES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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 Berg/Donna Home (A)</td>
<td>NORTH LA. COUNTY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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 seed/Thomas Lewis (A)</td>
<td>LTSS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 Rosner/Barbara Teves (A)</td>
<td>LTSS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Renee Bartin/Randy Lattin (A)</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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>Carolyn Pfeifer/Andrea Bumbride (A)</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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 Landau/David Kins (A)</td>
<td>SCRRA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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>Evonk Oletti/Kathryn Higgins (A)</td>
<td>SCAAMO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 Atwood/Antawn Ming (A)</td>
<td>SCBA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Laura O'Donnell/Ron Guz (A)</td>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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 Yamashita/Phil Abe (A)</td>
<td>TDMQ SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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/Sirocco Genet Penson (A)</td>
<td>TDMQ SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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>
</tbody>
</table>
HAND OUTS
November 17, 2005

To: Streets and Freeway Subcommittee, Metropolitan Transportation Authority

From: CHARLES BERGSON, P.E.
Public Works Director/City Engineer

Re: Traffic Signal Upgrade and TMOC, Status Report
Fedl Proj 21-940, CIP 06-06

The City has solicited proposals from traffic engineering firms for traffic system management services. It is expected that the City will be under contract with a traffic engineering firm for this work by the end of the calendar year.

The first phase of this project will involve conducting an inventory and assessment of the existing traffic signals and preparing a priority list for signal upgrades. This assessment will include a review of the signal system hardware and software and will recommend changes and upgrades to meet the City’s existing and future operational needs. Also, this review will consider and recommend capabilities to meet regional traffic needs and to meet current and future intelligent transportation system (ITS) requirements. This report is due in April 2006.

Design of this project will be undertaking in the summer 2006. Construction is expected to commence during the Fall of 2006 and be completed by Spring 2007.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

CHARLES BERGSON, PE
Public Works Director/City Engineer
City of Compton
Attachment 4

Draft Local Return Guidelines
(This section to be added under Proposition C only)

Installation of traffic signals which are not part of a larger transit project are not eligible, except as detailed in this section. Maintenance and replacement of traffic signals are not eligible.

Installation of new traffic signals will be reviewed and considered on a case by case basis to evaluate the transit benefit of the project. The following information may be requested and evaluated, depending on the type of traffic signal project:

- Number of transit boardings at the affected transit stop or station
- Predominance of transit patrons as a proportion of pedestrian volume
- Predominance of transit vehicles as a proportion of vehicle flow
- Letter from affected transit operator requesting and justifying traffic signal installation or modification
- Proximity of proposed signal to transit stop or station

Based on the review, all or a proportion of the project costs may be eligible for Local Return funds.
Attachment 5

TAP Project Update
branded the TAP card.

County-wide project to establish a universal fare medium - a smart card.

Contract

Municipal operators purchasing similar equipment based on Metro's

Replacement and upgrade of all Metro fare equipment.

The Universal Fare System is both a Metro and Regional System Overview.
Metro System Elements

1. Reporting and data analysis
2. Central Data Collection System (CDCS)
3. Ticket Vending Machines (TVM)
4. Revenue equipment
5. Validating fareboxes for buses and new

System Overview
Metro System Elements...continued

- Multi-function POS (MPOS) for ticket offices
- Locations
- Compact POS Terminals (CPOS) for vendor
- Point of Sale Terminals (POM)

Stand Alone Validators (SAV)
Handheld Validators (for Law Enforcement)

Smart Cards

Metro System Elements...continued
Municipal operator system elements

Regional system elements

- Regional transaction database
- Muni "back-office" systems
- Regional Central Data Collection System (Regional CDCS)
- Some participants purchasing onboard validators
- Muni's fareboxes, POS and revenue equipment same as Metro

Financial services
Vendor management
Customer service
Regional TAP Service Center
- NTP Likely in March 2006
- Contract award in February
- BAFOS being reviewed and scored by Source Selection Panel (includes Muni)

Regional TAP Service Center

- Executed as a contract change order to Metro's UFS contract
- Regional Central Data Collection System (RCCS)
- Muni "Back Office" System

Municipal and Regional Elements also continue to progress
Regional Smart Card In Action
The TAP service center scope of work can be consolidated into three broad service areas:

- Carrier/Participant Services: 75%
- Level of Effort: 15%
- Reporting: 10%
Cardholder and Participant services include:

- Card Issuance
  - Replace car issued
  - Replace if lost or stolen
  - Protect unused card
- Balance Protection
- Autoload
- Card Registration
- Application processing
- TAP website
- 1-800 TAP call center
- Dist. Management
  - Send replacement cards
  - Send via Internet
  - Send via mail
- Dist. Management
- Inventory management
- Vendors
  - Track distribution of cards
  - Track unissued cards
  - Maintain inventory level
- Customer Service
  - Load serial number
  - Set user classification
  - Load security keys
  - Load TAP application
- Available to registered cardholders
  - As requested
  - Periodic
  - Interest
  - on a card
  - Automatically loads value
The TAP Service Center systems facilitate both transit and non-transit financial management.

ACCH stands for Automated Clearing House and represents the data format used to transfer money to the banks. Settlement is the actual movement of funds to participant bank accounts. Clearing is processing all transactions to establish end of day position.
Includes reports such as trend analysis reports, linked trip reporting, and origin and destination.

Reports and Contractor Provided System
Combination of Regional CDCS Nextfare

Reporting will be provided through a

- Ad-hoc queries and reports
- Management Analysis Reports
- Customer Service
- Distribution/Inventory Management
- TAP System Operation
- Card Base Management
- Financial Management

Reports will be provided for the following categories:

- Servers and MTA CDCS
- All TAP usage transaction data uploaded from TAP devices via Participant Garage Data
- Autoload Instructions and Holidays
- All configuration data downloaded for TAP devices through the Regional CDCS including:

Data collection activities include:

The Regional TAP Service Center provider will be responsible for all TAP program data collection and reporting activities.

TAP RFP - Scope of Work
### Participating Agencies
- Access Services Inc.
- Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- LA Express and Local Lines
- Metro Line
- Santa Clarita Transit
- Norman Transit
- Monrovia Bus Lines
- Long Beach Transit
- Transportation Authority of Los Angeles County, Metropolitan
- Los Angeles Department of Transportation
- East L.A. Transit
- Cedar City Municipal Bus Lines
- Antelope Valley Transportation Authority

### Participating Agencies
- Finance Working Group
- Marketing/Customer Service Working Group
- Technical/Operations Working Group

#### Co-chairs: Paula Faust, Jane Maesumoto

### TAP Management Subcommittee
- Advises
- Implements

#### Chair: Monti PCR Executive and Multi-Agency Ad Hoc

### TAP Executive Oversight Committee
- Chair: MTA, MUNIS and Other Agencies are Working Cooperatively to
- Define the Regional System Design and Operating Rules
- MTA, MUNIS and Other Agencies are Working Cooperatively to
- Ensure agency and regional requirements are being met

Leadership will be realized

Ensures the vision of the

Provides project visibility
MTA and Muni's

Business and operating rules need to be agreed upon by the

TAAP RFP - Scope of Work
program in the future

There are various approaches to managing the Regional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Contractually created governance structure.</td>
<td>Metropolitan Area Planning Authority (MAPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Special decision making and participation.</td>
<td>Metropolitan Area Planning Authority (MAPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>No new organization.</td>
<td>Metropolitan Area Planning Authority (MAPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMATA</td>
<td>No new organization.</td>
<td>Metropolitan Area Planning Authority (MAPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Independent legal entity.</td>
<td>Single Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>Created under powers of existing public entities.</td>
<td>Single Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Composed only of public entities.</td>
<td>Single Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owned by a single entity.</td>
<td>Single Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owned agency's decisions.</td>
<td>Single Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Not all participants are shareholders.</td>
<td>Corporation with Majority Shareholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>No majority shareholder.</td>
<td>Corporation with Majority Shareholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shareholders include private transit and public operators.</td>
<td>Corporation with Majority Shareholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private, for-profit corporation.</td>
<td>Corporation with Majority Shareholder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some approaches build a separate entity with its own management and staff. However, others take different approaches based on specific requirements and obligations. The table above outlines the characteristics of different regional transit agencies and how they operate.
Marketing Plan Implementation – 7 Step „Roll Out“ of TAP

- 2nd – 4th Quarter 2007
  - Muni Implementation

- 1st Quarter 2007
  - Limited Retail Outlets

- July – end 2006
  - Focus Group – Metro & Muni

- June – Fall 2006
  - B-TAP and I-TAP cardholders

- March-May 2006
  - Contracted „TAP“ers

- February/March 2006
  - Metro/Muni Staff Recruits

- January/February 2006
  - UF5 Metro Technical Working Group
Coming soon to Los Angeles...
Attachment 6

TAP Service Funding
February 1, 2006

Technical Advisory Committee

TAP Services Funding
Riders

Regional pass - EZ
Allocation to LTSS

Not just fixed route
Seamless travel across the region
Board Vision

TAP is Regional

Reside everywhere
Travel everywhere
Discussed regional funding scenarios w/ CM
group.

- Includes Metro/Muni staff and support
- Transitional – FY07 to FY08
- Full year amount - FY08 or FY09

Annual TAP cost - $10 million (est.)

TAP Funding Proposal
Other Funding Alternatives

- Off the top of Prop C
- Pay Munis' share only from Prop C 40%
- Allocate from Prop C 40%
- Off the top of FAP funds (PA 40%/ TDA/STA)
- Deduct from each operator's fares processed
- Off the top of Prop A, i.e., Local Return
 ordinance

Prop C Admin funding is capped by

LTSS systems also participate in EZ

operators

FAP affects only included and eligible

Disincentive to participate

Affects city transit programs

Why not?
Metro

- Other TAP card applications such as parking, etc.
- Fare increases
- Surcharge
- TAP card fees
- Users

TAP costs in excess of $8.5 million to come from C 40%

Growth over initial „that is transferred to Prop

Munis will „pay“ $1.5 million by reducing the

Metro to pay $7 million

CM Consensus
• FAP
• MOSIP motion

Other funding issues under consideration

Issue to be dealt with in the MTA budget

MuniS, $1.5 million is a programmatic

Metro $7 million is a budgetary issue

No action required at this time

Conclusion
Next steps:

- Transit Fund Allocations - Jun
- Budget approval - May
- MTA budget presented - Apr
- MOSIP motion - Jan/Feb

Metro
Attachment 7

2005 CMP Conformance
January 13, 2006

To:       City Managers
          Congestion Management Program Local Agency Contacts

From:    Douglas Kim
          Director, Long Range Planning

Subject: 2005 CMP Conformance

This is to inform you that Metro is scheduled to hold a public hearing on February 15, 2006 to solicit comments regarding its 2005 Congestion Management Program (CMP) draft local conformance findings. These findings summarize how local governments are complying with the State-mandated CMP and are based on Metro's review of the Local Development Reports (LDRs) and Self-Certifying Resolutions submitted by local jurisdictions. The LDRs contain information on new development activity for June 1, 2004 through May 31, 2005. Following this public hearing, the Metro Board of Directors is scheduled to consider staff recommendations and make local conformance determinations on February 23, 2006.

Attached for your review and comment is a summary of the draft 2005 CMP conformance findings for local governments and a copy of the public hearing notice. A copy of the Metro staff report to the Board of Directors will also be sent to you in early February.

If you have any questions about the 2005 draft CMP conformance findings, please contact Stacy Alameida at 213-922-7414 or by email at alameidas@metro.net. If you would like to submit written comments for consideration at the upcoming public hearing, please send them to:

Stacy Alameida, Transportation Planning Manager
Metro Long Range Planning
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-23-2
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Thank you in advance for your ongoing implementation of the Congestion Management Program.

Attachment  A – List of CMP Conforming and Nonconforming Agencies for 2005
B – Public Hearing Notice on 2005 Conformance Determination of Local Jurisdictions with the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program
### Attachment A

**CONFORMING & NONCONFORMING JURISDICTIONS**

Local Jurisdictions Recommended for a Finding of Conformance with the CMP for 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agoura Hills</th>
<th>Diamond Bar</th>
<th>Lawndale</th>
<th>Rolling Hills Estates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>Lomita</td>
<td>Rosemead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artesia</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>Los Angeles City</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>Gardena</td>
<td>Lynwood</td>
<td>San Marino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Park</td>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>Malibu</td>
<td>Santa Clarita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>Manhattan Beach</td>
<td>Santa Fe Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Gardens</td>
<td>Hawaiian Gardens</td>
<td>Maywood</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellflower</td>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>Montebello</td>
<td>Sierra Madre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td>Hermosa Beach</td>
<td>Monterey Park</td>
<td>Signal Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradbury</td>
<td>Hidden Hills</td>
<td>Norwalk</td>
<td>South Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burbank</td>
<td>Huntington Park</td>
<td>Palmdale</td>
<td>South El Monte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabasas</td>
<td>Inglewood</td>
<td>Palos Verdes Estates</td>
<td>South Pasadena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>Irwindale</td>
<td>Paramount</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerritos</td>
<td>La Canada Flintridge</td>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>Torrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>La Habra Heights</td>
<td>Pico Rivera</td>
<td>Vernon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>La Mirada</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>Walnut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>Rancho Palos Verdes</td>
<td>West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>Redondo Beach</td>
<td>West Hollywood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cudahy</td>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>Rolling Hills</td>
<td>Westlake Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver City</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whittier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Jurisdiction(s) in Non-Conformance with the CMP**

**Industry:** The City has respectfully declined to participate in the 2005 CMP. Pursuant to CMP statute, the California State Controller is now withholding the City's annual State gas tax funds from Section 2105 of the California Streets and Freeways Code. These funds are available to Metro to program regionally significant projects.
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON 2004 - 2005 CONFORMANCE DETERMINATIONS OF LOCAL JURISDICTIONS WITH THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) is holding a public hearing on February 15, 2006 to consider the conformance and non-conformance determinations for the local governments within the county with the requirements of the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP). Conformance with the CMP is required by State statute in order for local jurisdictions to receive gas tax funds authorized by the voters pursuant to Proposition 111. This hearing is held in accordance with the California Government Code (paragraph (a), Section 65089.5), which specifies that prior to making any decision regarding the conformance of local agencies with the adopted CMP, Metro shall hold a noticed public hearing to receive testimony from the affected local agencies and public. All comments received will be compiled and submitted to the Metro Board of Directors for their consideration prior to final determination of each local jurisdiction’s conformance or non-conformance with the CMP. The final determination of the Board of Directors is scheduled for the subsequent meeting on February 23, 2006.

Written comments on this matter will be accepted through February 15, 2006. All comments should be addressed to: Stacy Alameida, Transportation Planning Manager, Long Range Planning, LACMTA, One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-23-2, Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952.

The Public Hearing will be held on:
February 15, 2006
1:00 pm
Board Room - 3rd Floor
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA

To receive a copy of the preliminary findings of Metro staff regarding CMP conformance and non-conformance of the County and cities within the County, or for more information regarding the public hearing, please call Stacy Alameida at (213) 922-7414 or email at alameidas@metro.net.

The Board Room is accessible to persons with disabilities.