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
   Ed Norris
   Mark Yamamoto

3. Consent Calendar
   • Approval of Minutes
     Attachment 3: Minutes of February 2, 2005
   Action

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

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

6. Congestion Management Program Nexus Study
   Attachment 4: Status Report
   20 min
   Information
   (Doug Kim/Chris Wornum, Cambridge Systematics)
7. Long Range Transportation Plan
   Attachment 5: Status Report
   Information
   (Doug Kim/Heather Hills)
   5 min

8. MTA Budget Update
   Attachment 6: Revised FY 05 Budget Amendment
   Information
   (Michelle Caldwell)
   15 min

9. ADA Paratransit Service Update
   Attachment 7: Power Point
   Information
   (Gary Hewitt)
   10 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 April 6, 2005 at 9:30 am in the Union Station Room.
Attachment 1

Subcommittee February 2005 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

Board Overflow 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. LRTP and Nexus Study Update
   10 minutes
   Information
   Heather Hills

5. CMP Transit Monitoring
   10 minutes
   Information
   Heather Hills and Susan Chapman

6. Lapsing UFS funds for LTSS
   10 minutes
   Information
   Joyce Rooney

7. FTA Sec. 5307 15% Discretionary and TE 1%
   Principles and Priorities
   10 minutes
   Information
   Bob Hildebrand

8. CMAQ Lapsing Funds
   10 minutes
   Information
   Bob Hildebrand

9. Triennial Audit Recommendation
   10 minutes
   Information
   Armineh Saint

10. STA Efficiency Test and Funding Marks
    10 minutes
    Information
    Nalini Ahuja
11. TIP Amendment and Submittal Calendar  
   Information  
   Nancy Marroquin  
   10 minutes  

12. State Legislative and Federal Update  
   Information  
   Michael Turner/Marisa Yeager  
   10 minutes  

13. New Business  

14. Adjournment  

Information Items:  
   90-day Rolling Agenda  
   Summary of Invoices — FY05  
   2005 Subsidy Tracking Matrix  
   2004 Document Requirement Status  
   Summary of EZ Pass Invoices — FY04  
   TDA/STA Claim Summary for FY05  

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 March 15, 2005 at 9:30am in the Union Station Room, 3rd Floor, Gateway Building.
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE

Gateway Plaza Room—3rd Floor

1. Call to Order

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

3. Election of New LTSS Officers

4. Metro Connections Update

5. UFS Funding Plan

6. NTD Reporting Update

7. City of Alhambra Transportation Programs

8. Legislative Update

9. New Business

10. Adjournment

Action

Joyce Rooney

Action

Joyce Rooney

Action

Joyce Rooney

Discussion

Nancy Michali, Metro

Discussion

Joyce Rooney

Discussion

Jay Fuhrman, Metro

Presentation

Mary Chavez, City of Alhambra

Information

Mike Turner, Metro

Information

Joyce Rooney

Action

Joyce Rooney
Thursday, February 17, 2005 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
   Action (Ed Norris)

2. Approval of the January 20, 2005 Minutes
   Attachment 1: Draft Minutes
   1 min
   Action (Subcommittee)

3. Chairperson Report
   5 min
   Information (Ed Norris)

4. MTA Report
   10 min
   Information (Jon Grace)

5. STP-L Program
   10 min
   Update (Kalieh Honish)

6. Caltrans Report
   10 min
   Information (Kirk Cessna)

7. Service Agreement with Information Service Providers (ISP) to Receive Real-Time Traffic
   Data from RIITS
   Attachment 2: Board Report
   10 min
   Information (Ray Mackawa)
8. High Occupancy Vehicle Lane Project on Interstate 5 from Route 118 to Route 14 Attachment 3: Board Report
   15 min

   10 min

10. Arterial Master Plan
    10 min

11. Congestion Management Plan – Highway and Arterial Network Monitoring
    10 min

11. New Business
    5 min

12. Adjournment
    1 min

Information (David Wang)

Discussion (David Yale)

Update (Kathleen Mc Cune)

Information (Heather Hills/ Eric Carlson)

Discussion (Subcommittee)

Action (Subcommittee)

The next meeting of the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee will be held on March 17, 2005 at 9:30 AM in the Windsor Conference Room. Please contact Jon Grace at (213) 922-4848 or Ryan Ross at (213) 922-1079 should you have any questions or comments regarding this or future agendas.
TDM/AQ

No Meeting in February

Next Meeting March 16th
Attachment 2

Subcommittee Actions
Disposition of February Subcommittee Actions

BOS:
February 15th Meeting

1. Andrea Burnside of Metro presented a motion to revise the FTA Section 5307 Discretionary and TE 1% Principles and Priorities. There were 9 votes taken on this motion, one for each separate proposed change. (See Attached Motion Results on next page).

2. Marianne Kim of Santa Monica presented a separate motion to remove the service expansion priority established at the December meeting for the FTA Section 5307 Discretionary and TE 1% Principles and Priorities. This motion reverts the language of the Principles section to that found in the “existing language” under the priorities section of the above attached table. This motion was approved by a vote of 9 in favor, 4 opposed (AVTA, Santa Clarita Transit, Foothill Transit, and Norwalk Transit), and 1 abstention (Claremont.)

3. Two motions were presented regarding CMAQ lapsing fund extensions.
   a. A motion was approved to give La Mirada a 6 month extension to fulfill their CMAQ fund obligations.

      This motion was approved with opposition from 3 agencies (Metro, Santa Monica, and Foothill)

   b. A motion was approved to extend Commerce’s extension to fulfill their CMAQ fund obligations from 3 months to 6 months.

      This motion was approved with opposition from 2 agencies (Metro and Santa Monica.)

LTSS:
February 24th Meeting
N/A

Streets and Freeways:
February 17th Meeting
No actions taken

TDM/AQ:
No Meeting
Motion: All opposed except Metro. Motion failed.

Vote Results:

A motion was considered for the formula to apply for those federal transit dollars that the agency will not receive this year. The motion was passed with 12 in favor, 0 opposed. The formula would be unchanged from the existing language. Two separate votes were taken on how the funds will be reallocated.

If an agency is not a current passenger, for those federal transit dollars that would not be allocated in the last two fiscal years, that agency may lose overall funds. Non-passenger agencies in the region may lose specific funds for non-passenger related projects. Up to 10% of the existing language is eligible to be removed.

MVA Capital Allocation:

The motion for an amendment to the formula to apply for those federal transit dollars that the agency will not receive this year passed the 12-0 vote. The motion was carried with the existing language. A motion to Reallocation for the formula to apply for those federal transit dollars that the agency will not receive this year was passed with 12 in favor, 0 opposed.

If an agency is not a current passenger, for those federal transit dollars that would not be allocated in the last two fiscal years, that agency may lose overall funds. Non-passenger agencies in the region may lose specific funds for non-passenger related projects. Up to 10% of the existing language is eligible to be removed.

The agency moved that the BOS further amend the principles adopted in December 2002 as follows:

Motion at BOS 2/15/05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote Results</th>
<th>Proposed New Language</th>
<th>Existing Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed New Language</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed New Language</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed New Language</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed New Language</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed New Language</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed New Language</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed New Language</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed New Language</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed New Language</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Projects</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion was unanimously approved.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Priorities:</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion failed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed New Language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote Results</th>
<th>Principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Existing Language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 3

Draft February 2, 2005 TAC Minutes
Sign-In Sheet
Handouts
Meeting Minutes
Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. Call to Order/Roll Call
Renee Berlin (Chair) called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. Randy Lamm (MTA) took roll and declared a quorum was present.

Introductions were made of the audience members and new TAC member

2. Agenda Reports By Standing Committees
BOS (Andre Coaliace)
- Met on Tuesday, January 18th;
- Discussed the criteria for allocating FTA Section 5307 15% and 1% TEA 5307 funds for the region. BOS is considering whether to include expansion buses as a priority. BOS will request that those in favor of including expansion buses indicate that in their 10-year Capital Plan;
- Received updates on:
  - Signage -- Nancy Michali (MTA) reported that Metro will be trying to make signs clearer for customers around the region;
  - The Long Range Transportation Plan;
  - The Los Angeles County Transit Operator Assistance (LACTOA) Card. BOS will be forming a committee to address issues with the card.
- Access Services, Inc. reported that they need to know when public transit operators increase or decrease service;
- Next meeting February 15th;

LTSS (Jano Baghdanian)
- Appointed Nominating committee for LTSS Officers;
- Approved Operation Shuttle as a private operator (alternate) member to LTSS;
Deferred to a future meeting consideration of bridge funding for Santa Fe Springs Tram;

Received a draft of the FY 06 Sub-regional Paratransit Fund marks;

Received updates on:
  - Universal Fare System (UFS) program - a plan to address the expiration of the UFS Funding for LTSS members
  - National Transit Data Base (NTDB)
  - Metro Connections
  - ADA Paratransit

Next meeting is February 25th;

Streets and Freeways (Kit Bagnel)

- Met on January 20th;
- Held elections of officers, Ed Norris (City of Long Beach) was elected chair; Kit Bagnel (County of Los Angeles) was elected vice-chair;
- A report from Kirk Cessna regarding Caltrans assessment of storm damage;
- An update on the HBRR task force;
- Welcomed new members to the subcommittee;
- Next meeting is February 17th.

TDM/AQ (Mark Yamarone)

- No meeting in January;
- Next meeting is March 16th.

3. Consent Calendar (Renee Berlin)
The Consent Calendar was approved on a motion by Greg Herrmann (League of Cities, Arroyo Verdugo Cities) and seconded by Mark Herwick (County of Los Angeles). Brynn Kernaghan, Mark Bozigian, and Sina Zarifi abstained.

4. Chairperson's Report (Randy Lamm) (Handouts)

- Mr. Lamm welcomed Sina Zarifi, the new TAC representative for the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Mr. Zarifi is replacing Michael Gainor. He also welcomed Jennifer Cohen who is the MTA intern for TAC;

- The deadline to make non-capacity project changes in the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) is March 4, 2005. For capacity enhancing projects, the deadline will be in December, 2005;

Ms. Berlin noted that in order to receive obligations of federal funds, the year in which the funds are reflected in the FTIP must be correct. TAC members are urged to tell their cities to review their FTIP sheets and let MTA know whether corrections
are needed by the March 4th deadline. Herman Chang MTA Regional Programming should be contacted for more information.

Brynn Kernaghan (BOS) suggested that given the difficulties that so many entities have with the TIP, perhaps another meeting with staff from FTA, MTA, and SCAG could be held to discuss the TIP and its processes. Patrick DeChillis (County of Los Angeles) echoed Ms. Kernaghan’s comments and expressed the difficult and confusing experience that his agency has with the TIP. He also agreed that a workshop would be helpful, especially with a regional perspective. Ms. Berlin explained that in the past workshops have been held. However, project sponsors need to make sure that they are updating their TIP sheets in a timely and accurate manner. Mr. DeChillis reminded everyone that sponsors should include all their transportation projects in the FTIP, even if they don’t have federal or state funds because it makes unexpected changes easier to absorb.

Mr. Lamm (MTA) recommended that sponsors should include or update their projects in the TIP well in advance of when Federal obligations or State allocations are needed because the lead time for MTA, SCAG, Caltrans, Federal approval is lengthy. A good rule would be to review and update or add new non-capacity projects at least a year in advance, and capacity enhancing projects may need a two year lead time.

Andre Colaiace (BOS) expressed concern about the process of submitting paperwork, that perhaps it is an antiquated and consequently, disorganized system.

Alberto Angelini (Caltrans) confirmed that his side also wrestles with problems related to funding projects in the right year and the constraint issue, etc.

Mark Bozigan (League of California Cities – North Los Angeles County) concurred that a workshop would be helpful in facilitating the process. He suggested that participants beyond the TAC members be included. He is also in favor of streamlining the process. Ms. Berlin agreed to talk to her counterparts to address the interest of TAC members in having regional or sub-regional workshops.

Mr. DeChillis suggested that MTA post scheduling and deadline information on all projects in the TIP. This would aid MTA in knowing the status of local projects and trigger an alarm if problems are arising.

- Ms. Berlin reminded TAC members that those Call Projects that received a Six Month or One Year extension to June 2005, that the deadline is fast approaching. MTA will be transmitting reminder letters of the June deadline;

- Feb 4th is the deadline to defer FY06 STIP-TEA projects to FY 07 and later. Ms. Berlin mentioned that MTA staff contacted the affected TEA project sponsors;

- March 21st is the deadline to submit allocation or extension requests for FY 05 STIP-TEA funds;

- There are new staffing change at Caltrans:
- Randell H. Iwasaki is the new Chief Deputy Director. He will manage the Statewide Toll Bridge Seismic Retrofit Program (TBSRP);
- Rick Land is the new Chief Engineer;
- Norma Ortega is the new Chief of the Division of Budgets;
- The Joint Development Project at Wilshire/Vermont is making progress. The 449 unit apartment/retail complex is 10% complete, and will include a bus layover zone to accommodate 11 buses.

January 27, 2005 Board Meeting Recap

Approved:
- The following nominees for membership on the Westside/Central Service Sector Governance Council:
  - Carlos Collard: Santa Monica Big Blue Bus;
  - Gregory J. Fisher: Transportation Deputy, Councilwoman Jan Perry, City Of Los Angeles;
- Added by 2/3 vote of the Board --Hahn motion- that the MTA Board direct staff to immediately take the following actions: 1) Conduct an immediate and comprehensive review of all MTA rail lines and determine what, if any, additional safety measures should be put into place to protect rail passengers, automobiles and pedestrians and report back to the MTA Board within 30 days; and 2) reprioritize the MTA Legislative program to advocate for increased funding for transit safety measures including, but not limited to, at grade rail crossing barriers and grade separations.
- Out-of-court settlement, Metro has agreed to pay the Citizens Organized for Smart Transit (COST) a total of $350,000 to cover legal fees incurred during the protracted lawsuit;

Approved under re-consideration:
- Revised EIR for the Orange line was approved; Approving and certifying the Addendum/modified initial study to the final EIR, for the Orange Line for: (a) the construction of an additional park-and-ride lot (north parking lot) on metro-owned property just north of the previously-approved Canoga station and park and ride lot; and, (b) the modification of a small portion of a planned pedestrian path along chandler boulevard;
- Approved as Amended by Directors Molina and Burke: Draft Final Report on the I-710 Major Corridor Study;
- Approved Yaroslavsky Substitute motion on the FY 05 Budget: Proceed with operational cuts immediately and defer all other cuts to February; direct staff to report back to the board with reduction in force associated with capital projects;
- The Board approved a revised motion by Director Fasana: That the Board of Directors direct staff to report back to the board at the next operations and executive management and audit committee meetings on the cost of providing orange line service within the organization versus the cost of contracting out the
operation of the services, maintenance of vehicles, and the maintenance of the
right of way and fixed guide-way;

Approved on Consent:
• Authorize the Chief Executive Officer to: Accept a community based planning
grant from Caltrans for a total of $191,636 to prepare a La Brea Light Rail Station
Area/Community linkages plan; Enter into an agreement with Transportation
And Land Use Collaborative of Southern California (the sub-recipient of the
grant) to prepare a La Brea Light Rail Station area/community linkages plan in
coordination with metro;
• The proposed Los Angeles Countywide Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)
Policy and Procedures.

5. Legislative Update (Raffi Hamparian and Michael Turner, MTA)
Federal Update
Mr. Hamparian reported that February 7th is the deadline for members of Congress
to submit their Reauthorization project requests. There is a 22 question form that
needs to be completed for each project. The Senate deadline is in mid February.
Mike Uyeno (City of Los Angeles) asked if the $299 billion for the Transportation
Reauthorization bill that Tom Delay (R-TX) announced is agreeable to both the White
House and Congress, includes the last year and a half of interim appropriations, or is
it in addition. Gina Mancha (City of Los Angeles) asked if the proposal was for 6
years. Mr. Hamparian answered that the $299 is for six years, but 1.5 years of that
has already been appropriated. Steve Lantz (SCRRA) asked about the schedule for
the Appropriations process. Mr. Hamparian said that tonight President Bush makes
his State of the Union remarks, followed by the release of his proposed budget on
February 7th. Congress will respond by passing a non-binding budget resolution, and
then allocations will be made to the ten Appropriations subcommittees. It is at that
point that the amount of federal transportation money will be known. With respect
to Amtrak, there was a wire story two days ago in which it was rumored that funding
for Amtrak will be zeroed out. Last year, the President requested $900 million, but
Amtrak ultimately received $1.2 billion.

Mr. Hamparian reported that there were several committee assignment changes.
Congressman Ernest Istook (R-OK) lost his position as Chairman of the House
Subcommittee on Transportation, Treasury and Independent Agencies. This is a
result of incoming chairman of the full House Committee on Appropriations Jerry
Lewis (R-CA) and House leaders reducing the number of Appropriations
subcommittees from 13 to 10. A new Chairman for the subcommittee is expected to
be announced shortly. The Transportation Subcommittee will be expanded in its
jurisdiction. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) will be included. The new
name will be Transportation, Treasury and HUD Appropriations Subcommittee. A
Congressman rumored to be interested in the Chairmanship and has the seniority is
James Walsh (R-NY). He is a supporter of Amtrak. Senator Shelby (R-AL) faces the
prospect of losing his chairmanship. His seniority is lower than Kit Bond (R-MO),
whose current committee is being dispersed. Senator Bond would have first
opportunity at the Senate Transportation Treasury Subcommittee. This all depends on the Senate Appropriations Leader Thad Cochran (R-MS) agreeing to the changes being proposed by Tom Delay.

Senator Barbara Boxer (D-CA) has sponsored a Grade Separation bill (S.197) that asks for Grade Separation studies, which will allow emergency responders to have access to affected roadways. It will also provide a mechanism to make grants for grade separations. It provides a mechanism for authorization, but does not provide appropriations of funding. David LeStrang will be a liaison between California and the House Committee on Appropriations, specifically to address California’s concerns. He will work directly with the Governors Office.

**State Update**

Michael Turner reported that there will be a meeting February 7th in Sacramento on Proposition 42. The focus will be on the strategy to prevent future raids on this funding source. The Governor’s budget proposes a two-year suspension of Proposition 42. Another option is transition to allocations, by accepting a suspension this year, partial allocations next year and full allocations the following year. There have been discussions on holding a press conference both in Sacramento and in Southern California. A Senate Budget Subcommittee hearing will be held on February 10th in Long Beach.

The Legislature will be holding hearings around the state. The other major budget issue is the Indian Gaming Bonds. The issuance of bonds has been held up due to two lawsuits. The State is getting the revenue, but cannot issue the bonds due to the lawsuits. As a result, funds cannot be allocated to transportation in the way originally planned. The State could allocate the revenues to the Transportation account as the money is received. That would mean instead of $800 million to $1 billion upfront, the transportation account would get $100 million every year.

The Secretary of Business Transportation and Housing (BT&H) held discussions last week on Goods Movement issues. There was a big turnout and the Governor has been talking about making an announcement on a Goods Movement Plan in the near future. The Secretary has said they will come back in 45 days to reconvene the group to hold further discussions. In the mean time, there will be presentations posted on the Secretary’s web page.

Mr. Turner reported that there have been three committee hearings – the Joint Legislative Body Committee and two Senate Transportation and Housing Committees on the Bay Bridge Issue. These hearings consisted of which consisted of Bay Area lawmakers receiving testimony from people who only support the bridge. There are two key reports. One from the State Auditor that criticizes Caltrans for not having an appropriate project management system in place; the other is from the Legislative Analysts Office, which discusses how to pay for the cost overruns. Mr. Turner said the issue being raised is that even if Caltrans did have the audit system in place, the cost overruns would still have happened. The only benefit of the audit system would have been that the Legislature would have known about the cost...
overruns sooner and could possibly have done something earlier. Mr. Turner stated that the funding scenario of increasing the toll to $4 would go a long way to pay for the Bridge with out using the rest of the State’s money. There would still need to be some State funds made available, but it would not be that significant. Increasing the toll to $5 would completely pay for the cost increase of the Bay Bridge. This would be the same as the current toll on the Golden Gate Bridge. The new bridge in France has a $7 toll. It is important for Legislators to hear from everyone. It is not just an MTA issue. Mr. Turner encouraged TAC members to send cards and letters to the legislators as it’s a $3 billion problem.

Pat DeChelliis commented that the CTC is starting work on the 2005 Fund Estimate for the next STIP Cycle. There is a several billion-dollar shortfall because of the loss of Proposition 42, and adding the $3 billion for the bridge, means that $5 billion worth of projects will need to be deferred far into the future. The STIP is only programmed for $5 or $6 billion. This means there will not be any other projects done in the State other than the Bay Bridge. At best, there will be no new projects added, but some of the existing projects will get their funding. The worst-case scenario is a $2 or $3 billion shortfall, but this does not take into account the $3 billion short fall for the Bridge. If the STIP is used to cover the Bay bridge shortfall, then no currently programmed STIP projects will receive allocations in the 2006 STIP.

6. State Budget Update (Gloria Anderson, MTA)
Ms. Anderson reported that Governor Schwarzenegger’s proposed budget calls for the suspension of Proposition 42 for at least FY 2005-06. It is suspected that it will be suspended again the following fiscal year as well. Previous loans will be combined with the current loans and repaid over 15 years, divided equally without interest. The repayment period will extend through 2021. The Governor has also proposed a measure to protect Proposition 42 starting in FY 08. The spill over was not credited to the Public Transportation Account (PTA), but will go to the General fund. However, there is a proposed State Transit Assistance (STA) budget of $137 million.

Currently Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation (EEM) funding in the budget is proposed at zero. In a previous year when the amount proposed was zero, the adopted budget contained $5 million for this grant program. Lobbying efforts to restore EEM are unknown at this time, but for the time being assume that EEM funding will be zero. Ms. Beurlin added that the CTC will adopt the fund estimate in July. This will influence potential funding for a Call for Projects in FY 07. Mr. DeChelliis added that ideally the Fund Estimate will be available earlier so that it can be used as a marketing tool for the November ballot measure to show the necessity of Proposition 42.

7. CTC Meeting Recap (Mary Lou Williams) (Handout)
Ms. Williams reported that the 2006 Fund Estimate is due in July. In 2004, $5.4 billion was reprogrammed in the STIP and there will probably be a 2-tier estimate.
one a more pessimistic estimate with billions of dollars in the negative, and the
second, more optimistic by maintaining existing funding, but providing no increase.
The continuing fiscal crisis will require that $102 million in STIP projects and $900
million in SHOPP projects originally programmed in FY 2004-05 STIP will be
pushed to the FY 2005-06 year.

Ms. Williams distributed a worksheet provided by the CTC listing allocation priority
categories. The worksheet illustrated criteria for receiving part of the sustainable allocation of the $900 million. One of the criteria is that if a project is in the STIP or
SHOPP in FY04-05, it must be ready to vote by the May 26th Commission meeting to
receive the funds. Additionally, SHOPP projects must be in categories higher than
pavement rehabilitation to receive allocations. The emergency damage caused by the
rain is going to alter what can be allocated from the list. The storm damage amount
is currently estimated at $45 million, but is likely to rise. The TEA projects contained
in the STIP are receiving allocations as they are funded from Federal Funds from a
different source. Ms. Williams informed TAC that there is no priority within the
categories.

Ms. Williams stated that at the January CTC meeting one revenue neutral STIP
amendment was approved that identified previous AB3090 arrangements including:

- $44 million on the I-5 from the Orange County line to Route 605
- $8.3 million for the I-5/Route 14 HOV Connector

The MTA received a $3.8 million allocation for an AB3090 cash reimbursement,
which is a pay back for the FY 02-03 Project Planning and Monitoring fund source.

Ms. Berlin announced that there is no CTC meeting in June. Therefore, if anyone is
seeking an allocation or an extension it must be agendized for action at the CTC’s
May 26th meeting. The appropriate documents must be submitted by the March 4th
deadline for the May 26th CTC meeting.

Mr. DeChellis asked what current estimate is for storm damage. Further, how much
is reimbursable under the FHWA ER program and how much is for emergency
operations. Kirk Cessna (Caltrans, Local Programs) replied that the current figures
for storm damage were not available to accurately answer his questions. However,
the most recent estimate is $85 million.

8. MTA Budget Update (Terry Matsumoto -- MTA for Michelle Caldwell)
Mr. Matsumoto reported that staff requested the Board to amend the FY 05 Budget
because fare revenues have fallen short of projections and increases in CNG, workers
comp and PL/PD expenses. The cause of the revenue shortfall is believed to be an
overestimate of the positive impact of day passes. As a result of the revenue shortfall,
a large number of capital projects are being deferred since they would not have been
approved if the revenue forecast had been more accurate. He referred TAC
members to the attachment in the agenda package - Item 28, the January report to the
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Board. Since the cost increases are in areas beyond management's control, the transfer of reserve balances is recommended to offset these items.

Mr. Matsumoto reported that the Board approved a substitute motion by Director Yaroslavsky to proceed with operational cuts immediately and defer the fund transfers to February; and to report back with a reduction in force associated with capital projects. Haripal Vir (City of Los Angeles) asked what is the amount of the total revenue. Mr. Matsumoto explained that the budget had originally planned on $280 million, but has revised the revenue projection down to $260 million. At the 5-month mark, revenues were $9 million short. Steve Lantz (SCERRA) asked what is the expected 12-month shortfall. Mr. Matsumoto anticipates a total shortfall of $20 million for the year.

9. Congestion Management Program (Doug Kim/Heather Hills, MTA)

Conformity Finding
Ms. Hills reported that this month the Board will be acting upon the annual CMP Conformity findings. In summary, the 2004 CMP Conformity report found all jurisdictions in compliance, except for the City of Industry. Mr. Bozigian asked why Industry is continuously out of conformity. Ms. Hills explained that Industry only receives an annual Gas Tax Subvention of $4,500. Mr. DeChellis asked if TAC should take an action on this item. Ms. Berlin responded that the item is on the agenda for possible action. TAC members decided that there was no need to take an action on this. Ms. Hills announced that September 1st is still the deadline for all cities to submit their Self Certification Resolutions.

Nexus Study
Doug Kim reported that a report will be going to the Board in June 2005, which will demonstrate a framework for how a Developer fee would work countywide. It is anticipated that this report will respond to questions as to how the fee will work in Los Angeles County. The Board report will also address the following: how MTA, working with cities, would work to distribute funds, the general growth forecasts for the next 30 years and identify a range of potential revenues over the next 25 years, if all 89 Los Angeles County jurisdictions concur with the idea of the Impact fee. The report will also identify local unfunded project priorities that have been identified by cities as their primary needs. The goal is to have an idea as to how a Developer fee could work in each jurisdiction. Staff will be meeting with the sub-regions and cities to pitch the idea and ascertain how this could work in each city. Outreach meetings have already been scheduled.

Steve Finnegan (Automobile Club of California) asked if there have been briefings with Board members and what feedback has staff been receiving. Mr. Kim explained that briefings are currently taking place, with most feedback being that the Board wants to consider the fee. As a first step, staff was instructed to conduct a feasibility analysis and in June, see if cities have expressed interest.
Mr. Bozigi.an asked that city and stakeholder concerns be specifically addressed as an integral part of the report. Mr. Bozigi.an commented that the major issues are being glossed over and therefore, not being addressed. He also requested that TAC receive this report well in advance (at least a month) prior to Board action, so that TAC will be afforded ample time to review and provide comments. Further, Mr. Bozigi.an wanted to be sure that the report address how the fee would impact the construction industry and job growth. Mr. Kim assured Mr. Bozigi.an that they are aware of some of the concerns that cities and developers have about how this fee might work, especially in cities where there is already a Developer fee in place. MTA staff intends to address the socio-economic impacts of the fee as well and intends to lay out some solutions for how to address the challenges.

Robert Newman (TDM/AQ) asked if the Administrative costs have been added as a percentage of the fees. Mr. Kim explained that they would be looking at the Administrative costs at the June meeting. Typically these programs call for 5 percent to be set aside for Administrative costs. If there is further interest on behalf of cities, they will continue exploring and discussing how the administration of the program could work from top down and set some parameters for use of the revenue.

10. Long Range Transportation Plan (Doug Kim/Heather Hills, MTA)
Heather Hills reported that the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) is currently being updated. It was last updated four years ago in 2001 and is planned for release in one year. This month the Board will receive the list of projects contained in the 2030 Baseline. The baseline projects are defined as those previously approved by the Board in the 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan (SRTP) and as amended by the September 2004 Board action for the funding acceleration plan. The Baseline gives a picture of what Los Angeles County will look like in 2030 with the latest SCAG population forecasts and without the construction of any new projects beyond what has already been committed to by MTA. Ms. Berlin added that MTA staff is also working on the financial baseline to ensure that financially, the baseline projects are feasible. Following that will be consideration of the Constrained portion of the LRTP, and then the Strategic element. Based on previous discussions of State and Federal funding it is assumed that there will be no new funding available. As a result, it may be determined that some project schedules will need to be pushed out. Doug Kim added that it is hoped there will be some unprogrammed money. At this point, there are no real surprises in the Baseline report. When it is finalized it will be e-mailed to TAC members.

Mr. Uyeno asked if sometimes things change in the baseline, and could consequently impact the report. Ms. Hills explained that the 2030 baseline is taken directly from the September 2004 amendment of the SRTP which is the acceleration plan. Mr. Uyeno also asked about the language being used to cover Local System Preservation given that last time there was a question about the accuracy of that description-at what point in this process will that be included. Ms. Berlin responded that currently there are internal discussions regarding System Preservation. Ms. Berlin added that MTA is developing a method to normalize the estimated System Preservation needs.
countywide. Currently the cities are using a variety of pavement management systems and rating scales. The plan is to have something by August to explain the needs in a countywide context. Mr. Bozigian commented that the issue is more philosophical, and that the importance of System Preservation needs to be elevated.

This is a subject that TAC members requested to receive monthly reports on in the future.

11. Caltrans Report (Kirk Cessna, Caltrans)
Mr. Cessna reported that he had previously transmitted an email to local jurisdictions asking for damage estimates for both emergency opening and permanent restoration projects in the region. There is a 60 day deadline, which is February 28th, from the disaster event to submit damage estimates. The storms began on December 28, 2004.

Mr. Cessna requested that TAC members notify their cities that if their staff are doing emergency opening work, please take pictures prior to starting the work to demonstrate the need, and to remain eligible for FHWA reimbursement for the damage. Photos should always be taken unless there is a safety issue preventing the photo from being obtained.

He also emphasized that Potholes are not considered emergency work and will not be covered. However, erosion and damage to pavement of shoulders and embankments are covered.

During the December/January storms there was federal administrative support for declaration of an emergency, prior to the President’s declaration. A State of Emergency can be declared before the President’s declaration. Governor Schwarzenegger declared emergencies in eight local counties.

The Emergency Relief Guidebook and other information is available on-line and was distributed at the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee meeting. For other information, please contact Mr. Cessna.

Mr. Cessna informed TAC members that lately Caltrans has not been receiving complete Awards packages and in some instances, not receiving them at all. Mr. Cessna requested that TAC members remind their agencies to send along Contract Award packages when completed. If not received it could delay reimbursement from Caltrans. Similarly, there are many outstanding Program Supplement Agreements. Caltrans will not pay reimbursements unless they receive them.

The Bicycle Transportation Account grant applications were due yesterday. Mr. Cessna reported that he has only received one for the entire district. He realizes that many agencies do not have Bicycle Master Plans. However some do and he encouraged those that do to apply. The District needs to give headquarters their recommendations for funding within a month. There is $8 million available
statewide. Approximately, $1 to 2 million can be expected in the region based on population.

Caltrans has moved. The new Local Assistance number is (213) 897-0784. The new address is: 100 South Main Street, Suite 100. Mail is not being forwarded quickly from the old address; please take note and utilize new address.

12. New Business
Ms. Berlin reported that the 90 day rolling agenda was not available for today's meeting. It will be emailed to TAC members as soon as it is available. She reminded TAC members that a special meeting will be held in May for the Call for Projects Deobligation Appeals and to discuss lapsing.

Mr. Yamarone asked when MOUs would be available for those projects whose funding was undeferred. Ms. Berlin responded that the funding plan with "color of money" assignments is being developed. She will contact Regional Programming staff to obtain a schedule.

Mr. Lantz reported that following the Metrolink tragedy of last week, ridership has returned to 100% of pre-accident levels. SCRRRA will be working with Commuter Rail systems operators throughout the nation to develop standards for Commuter Rail Cab Cars to make them stronger and more crashworthy. In the meantime, persons are not allowed to ride in the vestibule in front of the stairs when the cab car is in the forward position of the train. If you ride trains, please pass the word that for safety to please sit behind the stairs.

Mr. Lantz further reported that the fatality count is currently at 11. However, there are still several individuals in critical condition. This accident was very technical and a "perfect storm" of circumstances coming together at the same time. Because this incident is considered a criminal act and is considered a crime scene, he is not at liberty to discuss additional details of the accident. The police and NTSB will release further information.

13. Adjournment
Mr. Lantz requested that the meeting be adjourned in the memory of those who perished in the accident. Ms. Berlin adjourned the meeting in memory of those who perished in the accident. The next meeting will be March 2nd 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/ Vacant</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>CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL</td>
<td>1. Capt. Susan Coults/Lt. Joe Vizcarra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>1. Raja Mitwasi/Alberto Angelini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rose Casey/Kirk Cessna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVE ON ADA</td>
<td>1. John Whitbread/Mitch Pomerantz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1. Sum Gant/Ed Norris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>1. James Okazaki/James Lefton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Haripal Ty/Mike Uyeno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Gila Mancha/Ron Olive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Mark Herwick/David Cowardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. James Bagnoli/Scott Schaffa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Patrick V. DeChellis/Oliver Galang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities COG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes Malibu Conejo COG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side Cities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Greg Hermann/Carl Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Desi Alvarez/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Jim Thorsen/Tom Gdala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Mark Bozigian/Stephen Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Dan Rix/David Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Steven Huang/Victor Rollinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>7. David Feinberg/Art Ida</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE (LTSS) | 1. Jafro Baghdanian/Martin Gombert  
2. ___________________  
   Joyce Rooney/Kara Bouton |
| METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (MTA) | 1. Renee Berlin/Randy Lamm  
   Countywide Planning & Development  
2. Carolyn/Andrea Burnside  
   MTA Operations |
| SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY (SCERRA - Ex-Officio) | 1. ___________________  
   Steve Lantz/Diana Capelle |
| SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SCAQMD – Ex-Officio) | 1. ___________________  
   Eyvonne Sells/Kathryn Higgins |
| SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG – Ex-Officio) | 1. ___________________  
   Michael Gainor/Rich Macias |
| GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio) | ___________________  
   LaDonna DiCamillo/Ron Guss |
| TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/ AIR QUALITY SUBCOMMITTEE | 1. ___________________  
   Mark Yamane/Phil Aker  
2. ___________________  
   Robert Newman/Brooke Geer Person |
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</tr>
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<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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HAND OUTS
Mr. Will Kempton, Director
California Department of Transportation
1120 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Attention: Federal Resources Office, Room 3500
For Mr. Fardad Falakfarsa, Chief

Dear Mr. Kempton:

SUBJECT: Emergency Relief (CA05-1) Notice Of Intent

This letter is to acknowledge receipt of your Notice of Intent, dated January 18, 2005, which requested Emergency Relief (ER) funds, authorized under Sections 120 and 125 of Title 23, U.S. Code, to repair damages to Federal-aid highways resulting from the recent storm damage. We further acknowledge two Governor Proclamations covering multiple counties. The first addresses a state of emergency within the counties of Riverside, Santa Barbara, Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino, Orange and San Diego resulting from storms that commenced on December 28, 2004. The second Governor Proclamation addresses winter storm damage for Ventura County resulting from severe rainstorms that commenced on January 6, 2005.

From preliminary estimates from state representatives, we understand total damages to State Routes to be in excess of $85 Million. As of the date of this letter we understand 17 State Highways remain closed at 19 locations and the state has employed 45 emergency contracts to expedite the repair.

You should proceed with any necessary emergency repairs to restore essential travel, to begin preliminary engineering comprising surveys, design, and preparation of construction plans, to perform the permanent restoration work required as an associated part of the emergency operations, and to use State forces and/or negotiated equipment rental contracts as necessary to perform the work.

The eligibility of such work for ER funds will be contingent upon a favorable finding by our office. Our decision will be based upon review of the Damage Survey Summary Report, compilation of other pertinent information and site reviews by our office. The Federal ER disaster number to be associated with this incident, encompassing all damage within all counties designated under both Governor Proclamations will be CA05-1.
All Emergency repairs accomplished within 180 days from the day of incident, December 28, 2004, may be reimbursed at 100 percent Federal share. Permanent Restoration (PR) work other than that performed as an incidental part of the Emergency Opening (EO), shall not be performed prior to program approval and authorization by this office. For all sites individually identified as potentially eligible for Federal ER reimbursement, recordkeeping should be adequate to permit audit of costs on a site-by-site basis. A complete photographic record of the site before repairs is also recommended.

We will be meeting with members of your staff to make arrangements for reviewing the disaster damages. The Federal Highway Administration representatives will be involved in field reviews and preparation of individual site damage assessment forms (DAFs) for sites not subject to the October 19, 1998 revised ER Program Delegation.

If you have any questions, please contact Scott McHenry at (916) 498-5854 or Nancy Bobb, at (916) 498-5033.

Sincerely,

/s/ Gene K. Fong

Gene K. Fong
Division Administrator

cc: (e-mail)
Jim Varney, Caltrans
Teresa Schmitt, Caltrans
Sue Clarke, Caltrans
Randy Steen, Caltrans
Greg Wolf, FHWA (HIPA)
John Dewar
Bill Forrester
Maisur Kaled
Scott McHenry
Nancy Bobb
Jeff Lewis
Ken Kochevar
January 18, 2005

Mr. Scott McHenry
Federal Highway Administration - California Division
650 Capitol Mall, Suite -100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. McHenry:

NOTICE OF INTENT

Under the provisions of Section 125, Title 23 of the United States Code, this is a Notice of Intent by the California Department of Transportation to request Emergency Relief (ER) funds to assist in the cost of repairing damages and protecting remaining facilities on Federal-aid highways, caused by winter storm damage that commenced on December 28, 2004 in the following counties: Ventura, Riverside, Santa Barbara, Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino, Orange, and San Diego. A series of severe storms brought unusually heavy rains that caused flash floods, mudslides, accumulation of debris, and washed out roads.

Enclosed are two Declarations by Governor Schwarzenegger of a State of Emergencies. The first Declaration, dated January 12, 2005, is in Ventura County and the second one, dated January 15, 2005, are in the following counties: Riverside, Santa Barbara, Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino, Orange, and San Diego. We will forward initial estimates of damage and repair costs as soon as possible.

If you, or your staff, have any questions, please contact Jim Varney, Major Damage Restoration Engineer, Division of Maintenance at (916) 654-3523, or myself at (916) 654-3043.

Sincerely,

FARADAD FALAKFARSA, Chief
Federal Resources Office
Division of Budgets

Enclosure

c: Gene Fong, California Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration
   Jim Varney, California Department of Transportation

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
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Executive Order

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

EXECUTIVE ORDER S-1-05
by the
Governor of the State of California

WHEREAS, a series of severe rainstorms swept through Southern California beginning on December 28, 2004; and

WHEREAS, the series of storms brought heavy rains that caused flash floods, mudslides, the accumulation of debris, washed out and damaged roads, and the loss of human life; and

WHEREAS, due to the extensive damage caused by these storms on January 12, 2005, I declared a State of Emergency in Ventura County, and on January 15, 2005, I declared a State of Emergency in the counties of Kern, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, and Santa Barbara; and

WHEREAS, it is imperative in the circumstances to bring every necessary resource to bear to alleviate the individual, social and economic impacts of these events and to remove bureaucratic barriers to recovery and to Californians in need of services.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor of the State of California, by virtue of the power and authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the State of California, do hereby issue this order to become effective immediately:

1. The California Department of Transportation shall formally request immediate assistance through the Federal Highway Administration's Emergency Relief Program, 23 U.S.C. §125, in order to obtain federal assistance for highway repairs or reconstruction in Kern, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, Santa Barbara, Ventura, Orange and San Diego Counties.

2. The statutes, rules and regulations, as they apply to the excavation of rock, gravel, sand or soil from public or private lands under the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (as amended) (Public Resources Code, Division 2, Chapter 9) are hereby suspended for excavation that is for the sole purpose of reconstructing state or local transportation facilities in the counties of Kern, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, Santa Barbara, Ventura, Orange and San Diego that were damaged in these storms.

3. That statutes, rules and regulations as they apply to California Department of Transportation contracts are suspended for 180 days following the date of this proclamation for the purpose of facilitating the reopening and restoration of transportation infrastructure damaged by these storms in the counties of Kern, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, Santa Barbara, Ventura, Orange and San Diego. California Department of Transportation officials shall use sound discretion in applying this suspension to ensure that the suspension of statutes, rules and regulations serves the purpose of accelerating the reopening and restoration of transportation infrastructure damaged in the storms.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have here unto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of California to be affixed this the fifteenth day of January 2005.

Isd Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor of California

Back to Top of Page
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Proclamation

Governor Declares State of Emergency in Seven Counties

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PROCLAMATION
by the
Governor of the State of California

I, ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor of the State of California, find that conditions of extreme peril to the safety of persons and property exist within the Counties of Riverside, Santa Barbara, Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino, Orange, and San Diego Counties, State of California, as a result of a series of severe rainstorms in that area that commenced on December 28, 2004. The series of storms brought unusually heavy rains that caused flash floods, mudslides, the accumulation of debris, washed out and damaged roads and the loss of human life. These counties have proclaimed local emergencies and have requested that I proclaim a state of emergency. Because the magnitude of this disaster exceeds the capabilities of the services, personnel, equipment and facilities of these counties, I find the counties of Riverside, Santa Barbara, Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino, Orange, and San Diego to be in a state of emergency. Under the authority of the California Emergency Services Act, set forth at Title 2, Division 1, Chapter 7 of the California Government Code, commencing with section 8550, I hereby proclaim that a State of Emergency exists within the Counties of Riverside, Santa Barbara, Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino, Orange and San Diego.

Pursuant to this proclamation, I hereby direct all agencies of the state government to utilize and employ state personnel, equipment and facilities for the performance of any and all necessary activities to alleviate this emergency in accordance with the State Emergency Plan.

I FURTHER DIRECT that as soon as hereafter possible, this proclamation be filed in the Office of the Secretary of State and that widespread publicity and notice be given of this proclamation.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of California to be affixed this the fifteenth day of January 2005.

/s/ Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor of California

Proclamations are posted as soon as possible but may not always be available on the day they are issued.
Proclamation

Disaster Proclamation for Ventura County

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PROCLAMATION
by the
Governor of the State of California

I, ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor of the State of California, find that conditions of extreme peril to the safety of persons and property exist within the County of Ventura, State of California, as a result of a series of severe rainstorms in that area that commenced on January 6, 2005. The series of storms brought unusually heavy rains that caused flash floods, mudslides, the accumulation of debris, washed out and damaged roads and the loss of human life. The County of Ventura has declared a local emergency and has requested that I proclaim a state of emergency. Because the magnitude of this disaster exceeds the capabilities of the services, personnel, equipment and facilities of the county, I find the County of Ventura to be in a state of emergency, and under the authority of the California Emergency Services Act, set forth at Title 2, Division 1, Chapter 7 of the California Government Code, commencing with section 8550, I hereby proclaim that a State of Emergency exists within Ventura County.

Pursuant to this proclamation, I hereby direct all agencoes of the state government to utilize and employ state personnel, equipment and facilities for the performance of any and all necessary activities to alleviate this emergency in accordance with the State Emergency Plan.

I FURTHER DIRECT that as soon as hereafter possible, this proclamation be filed in the Office of the Secretary of State and that widespread publicity and notice be given of this proclamation.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of California to be affixed this the twelfth day of January 2005.

Is: Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor of California

***

Proclamations are posted as soon as possible but may not always be available on the day they are issued.
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January 28, 2005

MEMO TO: LOCAL PROJECT SPONSORS WITH TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FUNDS

FROM: CAROL INGE, DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

SUBJECT: MARCH 21, 2005 DEADLINE FOR FY 2005 TE-STIP ALLOCATIONS

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) would like to take this opportunity to remind local project sponsors within Los Angeles County, who have Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds programmed in the FY 2005 year of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) (see Attachment 1), that they must meet an important March 21, 2005 deadline, or risk having their projects lapsed by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). Adopted STIP guidelines require that project sponsors receive an allocation vote from the CTC no later than June of the fiscal year in which funds are programmed. Since there is no CTC meeting scheduled for June 2005, sponsors must receive an allocation vote at the May 25, 2005 CTC meeting. (Attachment 2 is the Request for Time Extension and Instructions). It takes 60 days to get on the CTC agenda.

To receive an allocation vote, project sponsors must submit an allocation request and provide all required supporting documentation (including MTA review and concurrence) to Caltrans District 7 to have the allocation request agendized for action at the May 2005 CTC meeting. MTA requests that the allocation request with appropriate supporting documentation be transmitted to MTA no later than March 21, 2005, so that staff may have time to review the materials and if appropriate, provide concurrence in sufficient time to meet the Caltrans deadline. If the project is not ready to use the programmed funding, a one-time extension of up to twenty (20) months may be requested by the same deadlines. If a project has previously obtained a CTC extension, another extension may not be requested.

If a local project sponsor cannot request an allocation or extension by the deadline, the project will be lapsed and removed from the STIP, and the funds will be deferred until later years for the MTA to reprogram to other projects in Los Angeles County.

According to the MTA Letters of Agreement (LOAs), local project sponsors must follow all required Federal and State regulations related to funds programmed to them, or the MTA will deobligate their funds. Therefore, if project sponsors fail to meet required deadlines and the CTC lapses their project funding as a result, the executed LOAs dictate that they lose their funding without any future reimbursement.

If you have any questions regarding this memorandum, please contact your Area Team Director (Attachment 3) or Kathleen McCune at (213) 922-7241.

Attachments
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>PPHO</th>
<th>CFP NO</th>
<th>STIP NO</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>FY 05</th>
<th>FY 06</th>
<th>FY 07</th>
<th>FY 08</th>
<th>FY 09</th>
<th>R/W</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>PSAE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALABASAS</td>
<td>3147</td>
<td>4100</td>
<td>L0974100</td>
<td>U.S. 101 INTERJURISDICTIONAL BIKE LANE GAP CLOSURE CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPTON</td>
<td>3150</td>
<td>8245</td>
<td>LSP-LA010001</td>
<td>WILLOWBROOK RAIL CORRIDOR TRANS ENHANCEMENT - PHASE II</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPTON</td>
<td>3148</td>
<td>9073</td>
<td>LSP-LA010002</td>
<td>LONG BEACH METRO BLUE LINE MID-CORRIDOR LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULVER CITY</td>
<td>3153</td>
<td>8278</td>
<td>LSP-LA010003</td>
<td>SEPULVEDA BLVD. PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>551</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>3174</td>
<td>8220</td>
<td>L09690200</td>
<td>REUSE OF HISTORIC WATTS TRAIN STATION AS A MUSEUM</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>3157</td>
<td>8244</td>
<td>LSP-LA010004</td>
<td>ALVARADO TRANSIT CORRIDOR PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>3443</td>
<td>8260</td>
<td>LSP-LA010005</td>
<td>BARNSDALL PARK TRANSIT-ORIENTED DISTRICT</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>467</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>3156</td>
<td>8261</td>
<td>LSP-LA010006</td>
<td>BROADWAY SIDEWALKS RECONSTRUCTION PHASE II</td>
<td>481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>481</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>3170</td>
<td>8303</td>
<td>LSP-LA010007</td>
<td>ANGEL'S FLIGHT RAILWAY REHABILITATION</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>3398</td>
<td>8377</td>
<td>LSP-LA010008</td>
<td>HOLLYWOOD MEDIAN DISTRICT - BUS STOP IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>3459</td>
<td>82766</td>
<td>LSP-LA010009</td>
<td>L.A. BUS STOP AND PEDESTRIAN ENHANCEMENTS (B.D)</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>554</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>554</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>3403</td>
<td>4128</td>
<td>L0954128</td>
<td>ARROYO SECC BIKEWAY</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>1,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>8256</td>
<td>LSP-LA010010</td>
<td>COMMUTER BIKEWAY'S SIGNING PHASE II</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>286</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>3402</td>
<td>8295</td>
<td>LSP-LA010011</td>
<td>VERMONT AVENUE MEDIAN LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>901</td>
<td>901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>3406</td>
<td>8207</td>
<td>LSP-LA010012</td>
<td>HARBOR BLVD WILDLIFE UNDERCROSSING</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>901</td>
<td>901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>3427</td>
<td>8157</td>
<td>LSP-LA010013</td>
<td>LONG BEACH EAST/WEST BIKEWAY CONNECT &amp; BIKE SIGNAGE</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>286</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>3408</td>
<td>8163</td>
<td>LSP-LA010014</td>
<td>P.E. CENTER-OFT-WAY BIKEWAY AND PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>2,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>3409</td>
<td>8203</td>
<td>LSP-LA010015</td>
<td>PROMENADE STREETSCAPE SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>507</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYNWOOD</td>
<td>3411</td>
<td>8285</td>
<td>LSP-LA010016</td>
<td>LYNWOOD TREN SQUARE</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>PPNO</td>
<td>CPP NO</td>
<td>FTEP NO</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>FY 05</td>
<td>FY 06</td>
<td>FY 07</td>
<td>FY 08</td>
<td>FY 09</td>
<td>FY 10</td>
<td>FY 11</td>
<td>FY 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALIBU</td>
<td>3412</td>
<td>8204</td>
<td>LSP-LAOB100</td>
<td>CROSS CREEK ROAD PEDESTRIAN AND PARKING IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASADENA</td>
<td>3422</td>
<td>6129</td>
<td>LSP-LAOB100</td>
<td>PASADENA BLUE LINE COMMUNITY LINKAGES PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASADENA</td>
<td>3448</td>
<td>8184</td>
<td>LSP-LAOB100</td>
<td>NORTH LINCOLN AVENUE ENHANCEMENTS</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDONDO BEACH</td>
<td>3426</td>
<td>4387</td>
<td>LA974067</td>
<td>REDONDO BEACH PORTION OF THE BAY CITIES REGIONAL BIKEWAY</td>
<td>742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CLARITA</td>
<td>3429</td>
<td>8232</td>
<td>LSP-LAOB100</td>
<td>CANYON VIEW REGIONAL TRAIL ACCESS</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGV COG</td>
<td>3433</td>
<td>4133</td>
<td>LSP-LAOB100</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL VALLEY COG EASTERN REGIONAL CLASS 1 BIKEWAY</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH PASADENA</td>
<td>3435</td>
<td>8268</td>
<td>LSP-LAOB100</td>
<td>SOUTH PASADENA BUSINESS DISTRICT PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TORRANCE</td>
<td>3438</td>
<td>6148</td>
<td>LSP-LAOB100</td>
<td>STREETSCAPE PROJECT - HAWTHORNE BLVD.</td>
<td>808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITTIER</td>
<td>2872</td>
<td>7222</td>
<td>LAOBD732</td>
<td>GREENWAY BIKE PATH, NORWALK BL PENV ST (EXT 5-32)</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITTIER</td>
<td>3440</td>
<td>8161</td>
<td>LSP-LAOB100</td>
<td>WHITTIER GREENWAY TRASEG 1 DUAL. S$33 ACQUISITION DUAL.</td>
<td>3,074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funds already allocated by CTC

1/29/2005
REQUEST FOR TIME EXTENSION
LOCAL HIGHWAY PROJECTS

Local Agency Letterhead

To: (DLAE Name)
District Local Assistance Engineer
Caltrans, Office of Local Assistance
(District Address)

Date:
PPNO:
PROJECT #:________
EA:
(Brief Project Description)
(Location)
(County)
Assembly District:_______
Senate District:_______

Dear (DLAE Name)

We request that the California Transportation Commission approve a request for a time extension for this project.

A. Project description:
   (Enter description of project, location and scope from Project Nomination Sheet. Include programmed funding level by phase)

B. Project element for which extension requested: (check appropriate box)
   □ Allocation* □ Expenditure □ Award □ Completion
   (contract acceptance)

C. Phase (component) of project: (check appropriate box or boxes)
   □ Environmental Studies & Permits □ Plans, Specs. & Estimate □ Right of
   Way □ Construction*

D. Allocation and deadline summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation Date By Phase (if applicable)</th>
<th>Allocated Amount By Phase (if applicable)</th>
<th>Original Deadline</th>
<th>Number of Months of Extension Requested</th>
<th>Extended Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Reason for project delay

Indicate the reason for the project delivery delay. Please be concise. Specify the length of time the project will be delayed. The length of extension requested cannot exceed 20 months and must be directly attributed to the reason for delay specified.

* Per Section 66 of the CTC STIP Guidelines, "For each request to extend the deadline to allocate construction funds, the agency requesting the extension should submit, in conjunction with the request, a project construction STIP history. The request should also identify any cost increase related to the delay and how the increase would be funded. The STIP
history should note the original inclusion of project construction in the STIP and each project construction STIP amendment, including, for each, the amendment date, the dollar amount programmed for construction, and the scheduled year of construction delivery. It is the Commission’s intent to review this history when considering a construction allocation extension request.”

F. Status of project milestones/revised project milestones

1) Completion of Environmental Document:
   CEQA - Describe document type and date (original milestone date and revised date).
   NEPA - Describe document type and date (original milestone date and revised date).

2) Right of Way Certification:
   Indicate the date right of way was certified (or will be certified) for the project (original milestone date and revised date).

3) Construction:
   Indicate the date the project will be ready to advertise or was advertised (original milestone date and revised date).

G. Timely Use of Funds

We request that the Commission approve this request at the ____________ meeting, or by ____________

H. Local Agency Certification:

This Request for Time Extension has been prepared in accordance with the Procedures for Administering Local Grant Projects in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). I certify that the information provided in the document is accurate and correct. I understand that if the required information has not been provided this form will be returned and the request may be delayed. Please advise us as soon as the time extension has been approved. You may direct any questions to __________________________ at __________________________

(name) (phone number)

Signature __________________________ Title: __________________________ Date: __________

Agency/Commission: __________________________

I. Regional Transportation Planning Agency/County Transportation Commission Concurrence

Concurred

Signature __________________________ Title: __________________________ Date: __________

Agency/Commission: __________________________

J. Caltrans District Local Assistance Engineer Acceptance:

I have reviewed the information submitted on the Request for Time Extension and agree it is complete and has been prepared in accordance with the Procedures for Administering Local Grant Projects in the State Transportation Improvement Program.

Signature __________________________ Title: __________________________ Date: __________

Attachments:

Distribution: (1) Original to DLAE (2) copy to Division of Local Assistance, STIP Coordinator (3) copy to Regional Planning Agency/County Transportation Commission
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REQUEST FOR TIME EXTENSION INSTRUCTIONS

This request for extension is initiated by the implementing agency, and prepared on their letterhead as a letter addressed to the District Local Assistance Engineer (DLAE). Requests must be received by the DLAE and the Division of Local Assistance STIP Coordinator (P.O. Box 942874, MS-1, Sacramento, CA 94274-0001) at least 60 days prior to the deadline for which the extension is being requested, but not later than 60 days prior to the date of the CTC meeting where the request will be considered/voted.

Date: Date of request preparation.
PPNO: Provide STIP project identifier. (Project programming number)
Project # and EA: These numbers will be available if the project has been allocated.
Brief Description: Provide a brief description of the project.
Location: Provide location of project.
County: County where project is located.
Assembly District: Enter appropriate district number.
Senate District: Enter appropriate district number.
Address: Send letter to District Local Assistance Engineer assigned to this project.

A. Project Description: Use the original description of the project location and scope from the Project Nomination Sheet. Include amount programmed for the project, broken out by phase.

B. Project element: Check one box to indicate which element of the project needs to be extended. A separate form is required for each project element. Allocation time extension requests must be submitted separately from expenditure extension requests, etc.

C. Phase (component) of project: Check one box to indicate which phase of the project needs to be extended. Multiple phases can be checked on the same form if the request is for the same project element (extension type). For example, if the request is for an allocation time extension and an agency is requesting the extension for both the PS&E and R/W phases, one form can be used.

D. Allocation and deadline summary:

Allocation date by phase (if applicable): Actual allocation dates by phase for all phases the request refers to.
Allocated amount by phase (if applicable): Actual allocated amount by phase for all phases the request refers to.
Original deadline: Indicate date that was originally set as the timely use of funds deadline.
Number of months of Extension Requested: Indicate in number of months of time requested for the extension.
Extended Deadline: Provide the proposed new deadline, with extension incorporated.

E. Reason for project delay: In order to grant an extension, the CTC must find that "unforeseen and extraordinary circumstances beyond the control of the responsible agency have occurred which would justify the extension". The extension will not exceed the period of delay directly attributed to the extraordinary circumstance and will in no event be for more than 20 months. This is where you need to have a clear description of the circumstances delaying the project that leaves no question to the CTC that the circumstances are "unforeseen and extraordinary" and directly relates the number of months of the delay to the extension. The reason should be clear and concise.

* Per Section 66 of the CTC STIP Guidelines, "For each request to extend the deadline to allocate construction funds, the agency requesting the extension should submit, in conjunction with the..."
request, a project construction STIP history. The request should also identify any cost increase related to the delay and how the increase would be funded. The STIP history should note the original inclusion of project construction in the STIP and each project construction STIP amendment, including, for each, the amendment date, the dollar amount programmed for construction, and the scheduled year of construction delivery. It is the Commission’s intent to review this history when considering a construction allocation extension request.”

F. Status of project milestones/revised project milestones: Provide information about the original milestone dates and the revised dates for Environmental Documents (CEQA and NEPA), Right of Way Certification, and Construction.

G. Timely Use of Funds: Provide which meeting your request should be heard or set a date that you need the approval. Refer to the CTC calendar posted on the web to determine the appropriate date, and keep in mind that Caltrans will need sixty days lead time to process the request prior to the CTC meeting.

H. Local Agency Certification: Provide information on whom is the responsible party to contact with questions regarding this project and obtain signature of approving official.

I. Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA)/Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)/County Transportation Commission (CTC) concurrence: Obtain concurrence/approval from appropriate lead agency. Requests will not be processed without review and approval of the responsible RTPA/MPO/CTC official.

J. Caltrans District Local Assistance Engineer Acceptance: After reviewing the request for extension, the DLAE will sign off and forward the request to headquarters’ (Local Assistance Office of Resource Management, Attention: STIP Coordinator) for processing to the CTC for vote.
## Modal and Area Planning Team Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Modal/Area Planning Team</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diego Cardoso</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>(213) 922-3076</td>
<td><a href="mailto:CarodosoD@mta.net">CarodosoD@mta.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renée Berlin</td>
<td>South Bay</td>
<td>(213) 922-3035</td>
<td><a href="mailto:BerlinR@mta.net">BerlinR@mta.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Maekawa</td>
<td>Gateway Cities</td>
<td>(213) 922-3016</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MaekawaRaymond@mta.net">MaekawaRaymond@mta.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Mieger</td>
<td>Westside</td>
<td>(213) 922-3040</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MiegerD@mta.net">MiegerD@mta.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahrzad Amiri</td>
<td>San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>(213) 922-3061</td>
<td><a href="mailto:AmiriS@mta.net">AmiriS@mta.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Michel</td>
<td>San Fernando Valley/North County</td>
<td>(213) 922-2854</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MichelK@mta.net">MichelK@mta.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex Gephart</td>
<td>Transit Capital</td>
<td>(213) 922-3064</td>
<td><a href="mailto:GephartR@mta.net">GephartR@mta.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 28, 2005

MEMO TO: LOCAL PROJECT SPONSORS WITH TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT STIP FUNDS PROGRAMMED IN FY 2006

FROM: CAROL INGE, DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

SUBJECT: FEBRUARY 4, 2005 DEADLINE TO DEFER FY 2006 TE-STIP PROJECTS TO FY 2007 OR BEYOND

According to the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) guidelines, funds programmed in any given fiscal year cannot be deferred during the fiscal year in which they are programmed. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) would like to remind local project sponsors within Los Angeles County, who have funds programmed in the FY 2006 year of the STIP (see Attachment 1), that they may request a STIP Amendment to defer their FY 2006 funds to FY 2007 or beyond on a one-time basis with the MTA’s concurrence. No action is necessary if the project programmed in FY 2006 has received (or is on schedule to receive) a California Transportation Commission (CTC) allocation vote prior to June 30, 2006.

Project sponsors should request the deferral of FY 2006 TE-STIP funds to FY 2007 or beyond if they: (1) believe that the project will be delayed and not ready for an allocation of funds by June 30, 2006, and (2) they can document the circumstance that is causing the delay. Due to the effects of the State budget crisis, it is uncertain as to what course of action the CTC would take in FY 06 with regard to requests for time extensions. Therefore, MTA strongly urges project sponsors to diligently review their projects and determine whether their funds need to be reprogrammed to FY 2007 or beyond.

Los Angeles County project sponsors must submit their STIP Amendment requests to the MTA by February 4, 2005. Only requests that provide the following supporting documentation will be considered:

- A cover letter that justifies the request.
- Revised STIP Fact and Fund Sheets.

If you do not have your previously completed fact and fund sheets, they are available from the MTA by contacting Kathleen McCune at MccuneK@MTA.net. Blank fact and fund sheet forms are available from the Caltrans at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/stip.htm.
It is very important that local project sponsors avoid having their funds lapse. If a local project sponsor has funds programmed to a given project that has lapsed, the dollars are deobligated from the project and removed from the STIP. Such deobligated funding will be deferred until later years for the MTA to reprogram to other projects in Los Angeles County.

The MTA must evaluate each request and forward acceptable requests to Caltrans by their deadline in order for amendment requests to be submitted for action at the April 13, 2005 CTC meeting. Adopted STIP guidelines require that project sponsors wishing to defer FY 2006 funds obtain a final STIP amendment vote from the CTC no later than the May 2005 CTC meeting (as there is no June meeting). Therefore, the deadline to submit amendment requests to MTA is February 4, 2005.

If you have any questions regarding this memorandum, please contact your Area Team Director (Attachment 2) or Kathleen McCune at (213) 922-7241.

Attachments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>PPHO</th>
<th>CFP NO</th>
<th>PTP NO</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>FY 95</th>
<th>FY 96</th>
<th>FY 97</th>
<th>FY 98</th>
<th>FY 99</th>
<th>R/W</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>PS&amp;E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BURBANK</td>
<td>6190</td>
<td>6245</td>
<td>LSP-LA06100</td>
<td>BURBANK TRANSIT CENTER: LANDSCAPING ENHANCEMENTS</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPTON</td>
<td>3160</td>
<td>6245</td>
<td>LSP-LA06100</td>
<td>WILLOWBROOK RAIL CORRIDOR TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT - PHASE II</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPTON</td>
<td>3161</td>
<td>6247</td>
<td>LSP-LA06100</td>
<td>CENTRAL AVENUE CORRIDOR TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT PROG</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPTON</td>
<td>3162</td>
<td>6263</td>
<td>LSP-LA06100</td>
<td>ALONDRA CORRIDOR TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>3161</td>
<td>6019</td>
<td>LSP-LA06100</td>
<td>CULTURAL CRESCENT BLUE LINE ENTRANCE AND PARKING FACILITY</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>3176</td>
<td>6242</td>
<td>LSP-LA06100</td>
<td>PACOMA TOWN CENTER</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>6245</td>
<td>6585</td>
<td>LSP-LA06100</td>
<td>LA RIVER BIKE PATH, PHASE II</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>3161</td>
<td>6266</td>
<td>LSP-LA06100</td>
<td>101 FREEWAY CROSSING AT NORTH MAIN STREET, PHASE II</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>3446</td>
<td>5291</td>
<td>LSP-LA06100</td>
<td>SHERMAN WAY MEDIAN INSTALLATION - DE SOTO AVE TO TOPANGA CYN BL</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>3162</td>
<td>8307</td>
<td>LSP-LA06100</td>
<td>ANGELS WALK - WILSHIRE BOULEVARD</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>3328</td>
<td>8377</td>
<td>LSP-LA06100</td>
<td>HOLLYWOOD MEDIA DISTRICT - BUS STOP IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>9156</td>
<td>6155</td>
<td>INSTALL STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION DEVICES</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>6157</td>
<td>6157</td>
<td>INSTALLATION CATCH BASIN SCREENS IN SANTA MONICA</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>6245</td>
<td>LSP-LA06100</td>
<td>COMMUTER BIKEWAY SIGNING PHASE II</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>3401</td>
<td>6150</td>
<td>LSP-LA06100</td>
<td>SAN JOSE CREEK BICYCLE TRAIL - PHASE II</td>
<td>2,243</td>
<td>2,243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>3401</td>
<td>8190</td>
<td>LSP-LA06100</td>
<td>WHITTIER BLVD REVITALIZATION PROJECT</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>3403</td>
<td>8157</td>
<td>LSP-LA06100</td>
<td>LONG BEACH EAST/WEST BIKEWAY CONNECT &amp; BIKE SIGNAGE PROG</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>3408</td>
<td>8163</td>
<td>LSP-LA06100</td>
<td>P.E. RIGHT-OF-WAY BIKEWAY AND PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>2,416</td>
<td>2,416</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>3409</td>
<td>8203</td>
<td>LSP-LA06100</td>
<td>PROMENADE STREETScape/SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/29/2005
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>PPHO</th>
<th>CPNP NO</th>
<th>FTIP NO</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>FY 05</th>
<th>FY 06</th>
<th>FY 07</th>
<th>FY 08</th>
<th>FY 09</th>
<th>R/W</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>PSSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONROVIA</td>
<td>3416</td>
<td>8250</td>
<td>LAO06250</td>
<td>MONROVIA RAILROAD DEPOT MULTIMODAL TRANSIT CENTER</td>
<td>022</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASADENA</td>
<td>3448</td>
<td>8184</td>
<td>LSP-LAOB106</td>
<td>NORTH LINCOLN AVENUE ENHANCEMENTS</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASADENA</td>
<td>3422</td>
<td>8191</td>
<td>LSP-LAOB105</td>
<td>PLAYHOUSE DISTRICT STREETSAPES, WALKWAYS AND ALLEYS</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>925</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASADENA</td>
<td>3425</td>
<td>8290</td>
<td>LSP-LAOB107</td>
<td>RESTORATION OF THE HISTORICAL FLINT WASH TRAIL CROSSING</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MONICA</td>
<td>3445</td>
<td>6233</td>
<td>LSP-LAOB108</td>
<td>PEDESTRIAN EXTENSIONS TO DOWNTOWN TRANSIT MALL</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MONICA</td>
<td>3431</td>
<td>6239</td>
<td>LSP-LAOB109</td>
<td>EXPOSITION CORRIDOR COMMUTER BIKE PATH</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGV COG</td>
<td>3434</td>
<td>6153</td>
<td>LSP-LAOB105</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL BLVD. MASTER PLAN OF IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITTIER</td>
<td>8174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HISTORIC WHITTIER DEPOT SURFACE TRANS, MUSEUM</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Modal and Area Planning Team Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Modal/Area Planning Team</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diego Cardoso</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>(213) 922-3076</td>
<td><a href="mailto:CarodosoD@mta.net">CarodosoD@mta.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee Berlin</td>
<td>South Bay</td>
<td>(213) 922-3035</td>
<td><a href="mailto:BerlinR@mta.net">BerlinR@mta.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Mackawa</td>
<td>Gateway Cities</td>
<td>(213) 922-3016</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MackawaRaymond@mta.net">MackawaRaymond@mta.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Mieger</td>
<td>Westside</td>
<td>(213) 922-3040</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MiegerD@mta.net">MiegerD@mta.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahrzad Amiri</td>
<td>San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>(213) 922-3061</td>
<td><a href="mailto:AmiriS@mta.net">AmiriS@mta.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Michel</td>
<td>San Fernando Valley/ North County</td>
<td>(213) 922-2854</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MichelK@mta.net">MichelK@mta.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex Gephart</td>
<td>Transit Capital</td>
<td>(213) 922-3064</td>
<td><a href="mailto:GephartR@mta.net">GephartR@mta.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>123 Main St, City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>555-1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>456 Elm St, City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>555-5678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Johnson</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>789 Oak St, City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>555-9876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Verdugo</td>
<td>2424 W 15th St.</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>90067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hodelman</td>
<td>555 Main Ave.</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>90067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Levine</td>
<td>2698 W 7th St.</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>90017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Larry</td>
<td>434 Downtown</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>90656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Henderson</td>
<td>2368 E Copley</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>90801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Hughes</td>
<td>1268 W 7th St.</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>90801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TAC MEMBERSHIP CONTACT

(Appointments as of February 1, 2005)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCAG</th>
<th>Z-AREA: @scag.ca.gov</th>
<th>1996-213/236-213</th>
<th>1995-213(223)/236-213</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>ZIP Code</th>
<th>WorkPhone</th>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Coast</td>
<td><a href="mailto:samtigman@scag.ca.gov">samtigman@scag.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>7260-6276/213</td>
<td>7274-6276/213</td>
<td><a href="mailto:samtigman@scag.ca.gov">samtigman@scag.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>S8R West Seventh</td>
<td>1z Floor Room 210</td>
<td>Transportation Department of the City of Pasadena</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pasadena@scag.ca.gov">pasadena@scag.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>S8R West Seventh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County</td>
<td>Steve Williams</td>
<td>3522-667/213</td>
<td>10016-667/213</td>
<td>Steve Williams</td>
<td>9350-667/213</td>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>38250 California</td>
<td>38250 California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>Joanne Wohl</td>
<td>3691-30390</td>
<td>90000-30390</td>
<td>Joanne Wohl</td>
<td>1201 Venice Blvd</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Independent Living</td>
<td>1201 Venice Blvd</td>
<td>Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## STIP & SHOPP ALLOCATION CATEGORIES, 2004-05
($1,000's)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STIP &amp; SHOPP Allocation Categories</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Cumulative Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STIP AB 3090 Cash Reimbursements</strong></td>
<td>$17,528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable allocation level FY 2004-05</strong></td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocations through December 2004 CTC meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual R-of-W</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Minor B</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>$202,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual projects</td>
<td>$204,370</td>
<td>$406,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Emergency, Safety &amp; Seismic Retrofit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Improvements</td>
<td>$151,695</td>
<td>$558,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Damage</td>
<td>$45,840</td>
<td>$604,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Scour</td>
<td>$11,133</td>
<td>$615,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Seismic</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$615,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision Reduction</td>
<td>$8,170</td>
<td>$623,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Barrier Upgrade</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$643,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Safety</td>
<td>$4,657</td>
<td>$648,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Rail Replacement</td>
<td>$1,230</td>
<td>$649,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Grade Crossings</td>
<td>$2,885</td>
<td>$652,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior Commitments and Federal TE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for Projects Already Committed</td>
<td>$13,544</td>
<td>$666,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP Federal TE</td>
<td>$568</td>
<td>$666,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Mitigation</td>
<td>$10,576</td>
<td>$677,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Compliance</td>
<td>$1,840</td>
<td>$679,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Preservation, Rehabilitation &amp; Restoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Damage Restoration</td>
<td>$14,158</td>
<td>$693,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$53,816</td>
<td>$746,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Widening</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$746,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STIP Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Mitigation</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$747,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Bridge HBRR Match</td>
<td>$1,847</td>
<td>$749,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC Rail Seismic &amp; Track Protection</td>
<td>$10,254</td>
<td>$759,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Programming &amp; Monitoring</td>
<td>$8,446</td>
<td>$768,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Enhancements (TE)</td>
<td>$50,591</td>
<td>$819,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pavement Rehabilitation</strong></td>
<td>$328,177</td>
<td>$1,147,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacements</td>
<td>$9,016</td>
<td>$1,156,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage System Restoration</td>
<td>$5,265</td>
<td>$1,161,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Betterment &amp; Mitigation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Restoration</td>
<td>$43,492</td>
<td>$1,204,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside Rest Area Restoration</td>
<td>$7,860</td>
<td>$1,212,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Betterments</td>
<td>$27,767</td>
<td>$1,240,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside Mitigation</td>
<td>$11,488</td>
<td>$1,252,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautification &amp; Modernization</td>
<td>$5,027</td>
<td>$1,257,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Operations Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Improvements</td>
<td>$30,737</td>
<td>$1,287,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management Systems</td>
<td>$61,594</td>
<td>$1,349,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weigh Stations &amp; WIM</td>
<td>$1,569</td>
<td>$1,351,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs and Lighting Improvements</td>
<td>$16,138</td>
<td>$1,367,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Facility Upgrades</td>
<td>$49,962</td>
<td>$1,417,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Shop Upgrades</td>
<td>$1,374</td>
<td>$1,418,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Labs</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,420,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Facilities</td>
<td>$378</td>
<td>$1,420,864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 4

CMP Status Report
PLANNING & PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE
February 16, 2005

SUBJECT: STATUS REPORT ON CONGESTION MITIGATION FEE NEXUS STUDY

ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE

RECOMMENDATION

Receive and file status report on nexus study to determine the feasibility of implementing a congestion mitigation fee program in Los Angeles County.

ISSUE

As part of its approval of the 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan, the Board authorized work on a nexus study to explore the feasibility of working with local jurisdictions to implement a congestion mitigation fee. If enacted, a mitigation fee would generate new revenue to address unmet transportation needs countywide and meet local responsibilities under the Congestion Management Program’s Deficiency Plan.

BACKGROUND

Since 1992, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority has implemented a Congestion Management Program (CMP) for Los Angeles County that seeks to link transportation, land use, and air quality decision-making. By complying with the CMP, cities receive $93 million annually in State gas tax revenue. As part of this program, Metro partners with local governments to implement a Countywide Deficiency Plan to mitigate congestion hot spots that are caused by growth. Based on concerns with the current “debit/credit” approach to the Countywide Deficiency Plan, the Board directed staff to conduct a nexus study to assess the feasibility of implementing a mitigation fee for new development that would fund needed improvements to the regional transportation system.

State law requires that a nexus study draw a reasonable connection between proposed fees, the cost of the public transportation facilities, and the intended use of the fee revenue. As a result, the nexus study is evaluating how a congestion mitigation fee could help new development pay its fair share by helping fund needed transportation improvements that directly mitigate its traffic impacts on the regional system. The fee could ultimately generate new revenue for unmet transportation needs countywide by helping cities leverage local fee revenue with regional funds.
The nexus study is being carried out in two phases. The first phase consists of conducting the legally required technical analyses needed to establish a fee program framework. This includes growth forecast analysis, modeling, and identifying local and subregional transportation needs. This will be done concurrently with outreach activities that seek local support from cities and subregions. A proposed fee framework and assessment of local support will be presented to the Board in June 2005. The second phase consists of completing the nexus study by finalizing project priorities, fee structure, implementation guidance for cities, and establishing administrative procedures. The centerpiece of this phase will be to implement pilot projects with volunteer cities to demonstrate how the congestion mitigation fee can work. To accomplish this, additional outreach activities will occur through FY 2007 to garner support from cities that are interested in demonstrating the ability of this program to address their unmet transportation needs. A final nexus study and fee program would be presented to the Board by June 2006.

Ultimately, the nexus study is an important link between the 2005 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the 2007 Call for Projects. On the one hand, the nexus study, which relies on the same modeling analyses as the LRTP, will identify unfunded local priorities that will be identified in the 2005 LRTP. On the other hand, any locally-approved congestion mitigation fees provide volunteer cities with the opportunity to leverage these new local revenues in the 2007 Call for Projects. To that end, the nexus study is looking at ways that local fee revenue can provide incentives for the Call for Projects program.

**NEXT STEPS**

As the nexus study progresses, staff will keep the Board updated on developments and consult with subregions, cities, the private sector, and other key stakeholders to ensure the study addresses local concerns and issues. Staff will also ensure the study addresses the CMP’s County Deficiency Plan requirement to mitigate the transportation impact of growth on the regional transportation system. A framework for a potential congestion mitigation fee and all analyses from Phase 1 of this nexus study will be presented to the Board in June 2005.

Prepared by: Robert Calix, Transportation Planning Manager IV
Douglas Kim, Director, Long Range Planning
James de la Loza
Chief Planning Officer
Countywide Planning & Development

Roger Snoble
Chief Executive Officer
Attachment 5

LRTP Status Report
PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 16, 2005

SUBJECT: STATUS REPORT ON 2005 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE

RECOMMENDATION

Receive and file status report on the development of the 2005 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) for Los Angeles County.

ISSUE

Staff is initiating a minor update to the 2001 Long Range Transportation Plan that honors past Board commitments and serves as the primary transportation planning tool to guide further transportation investments throughout Los Angeles County through 2030. The LRTP will also address significant changes that have occurred since the 2001 LRTP, including growth patterns, the latest technical assumptions, and the uncertain transportation funding environment.

BACKGROUND

As the state-designated transportation planning and programming agency for Los Angeles County, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) proactively develops a long range vision of the transportation system based on the financial resources that will be available. The LRTP defines a comprehensive and balanced, multi-modal transportation system that reflects both regional needs and local concerns. The LRTP ensures that Metro’s long-range priorities are included in the Southern California Association of Governments’ (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan, thereby making them eligible for federal funding. This update will be incorporated into SCAG’s upcoming 2007 Plan.

Performance Measures

The 2005 LRTP will focus on identifying investments that support quality of life objectives through a performance-based evaluation process. Consistent with these goals, the following
quantitative performance measures would be used to evaluate the benefits of plan alternatives:

**Mobility**

**Mobility Index** — measures person flow in the transportation system (avg. vehicle occupancy multiplied by speed);
**Highway Speed** — measures the reduction in highway delay;
**Mode Share** — measures the proportion of person trips in drive-alone, carpool, and transit categories.

**Economy**

**Cost Effectiveness** — measures the cost per hour of travel time savings;
**Economic Benefits** — measures the increased economic activity that accompanies the capital investments in transportation infrastructure.
**Job Creation** — measures the full time job forecast as a result capital investments in transportation infrastructure.

**Air Quality**

**Air Quality Index** — measures the total mobile source pollutant emissions.

**Environmental Justice**

**Transit Accessibility (Title VI) Index** — measures the percent of population which can arrive at their work place within 1 hour via transit; and
**Impact on Transit Dependent/Minority Communities** — examines mobility and accessibility impacts on areas with high transit dependent and minority populations.

These quantitative performance criteria are also consistent with those applied by the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, and SCAG for regional transportation studies.

**Baseline Project Definition**

One of the first steps in developing the Long Range Transportation Plan is to establish a definition for Baseline projects for modeling purposes. Baseline projects are those major capital highway and transit projects that have Board commitments and will be completed by 2030. Such projects have been previously evaluated for their performance in the 2001 LRTP and are not re-evaluated or re-prioritized through the 2005 LRTP performance evaluation process. In essence, these capital projects are the foundation upon which the plan is built.
The definition of Baseline Projects are those major highway and transit projects that have one or more of the following actions:

- All projects that are operational by December 2004.
- All projects that are under construction.
- Projects adopted by the Board for programming (i.e., Transportation Improvement Program and prior Call for Projects).
- Projects adopted by the Board through the 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan, as amended by the September 2004 Board adopted acceleration plan.

Attachment A identifies new major capital highway and transit baseline projects that are added to the baseline system.

Beyond the baseline, new capital projects are added to the Plan based on their performance and the availability of funding. Alternative scenarios are developed to respond to the performance gaps and system deficiencies. These scenarios are then evaluated to determine which could best meet the goals of the plan. Finally, a financially constrained plan will then be proposed for Board consideration, which maximize system performance within available funding. These projects will be the basis of the draft LRTP.

**Schedule**

The following reflects the work schedule for developing the Long Range Transportation Plan update:

- December 2004 – Performance Measures and Baseline Assumptions
- March 2005 – Complete baseline modeling for 2004 base year and 2030 forecast year (with no new projects)
- July 2005 – Complete alternatives analysis (2 scenarios)
- October 2005 – Final plan recommendation
- December 2005 – Complete draft plan
- January 2006 – Board approval to release draft plan for public review.

**NEXT STEPS**

Staff will continue to develop the technical transportation model and financial analyses needed to establish the 2030 baseline scenario. Staff will use a performance-based approach to identify a recommended long range transportation program for the Board’s consideration. During this work effort, staff will provide the Board with status reports upon completion of major work plan activities, providing the Board the opportunity to comment on the plan as it develops. A Draft LRTP is planned for completion by the end of 2005.
ATTACHMENT

A. 2030 Baseline Capital Project List

Prepared by: Heather Hills, Transportation Funding Manager, Long Range Planning
Douglas Kim, Director, Long Range Planning
James L. de la Loza
Chief Planning Officer
Countywide Planning & Development

Roger Snoble
Chief Executive Officer
# HIGHWAY PROJECTS

**Project Description**

### September 2004 Accelerated Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-405 / US-101 Connector Widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-10 Carpool Lanes: Baldwin Ave to I-605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-405 Carpool Lanes: Century Blvd to SR-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-57/SR-60 Carpool Lanes Direct Connectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-101 Fwy and Ramp Realignment at Center St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-405 (SB) Carpool Lanes: Waterford St to I-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-405 Carpool Lanes: SR-90 to I-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Carpool Lanes: SR-118 to SR-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-405 / US-101 Connector Gap Closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-60 Carpool Lanes: I-605 to Brea Cyn Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-405 (NB) Carpool Lanes: Greenleaf to Burbank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Carpool Lanes: SR-170 to SR-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-10 Carpool Lanes: I-605 to Puente Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Carmenita Road Interchange Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Valley View Interchange Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Carpool &amp; Mixed Flow Lanes: I-605 to OC Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-14 Carpool Lanes: Pearblossom Hwy to Ave P-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-710 Fwy Improve: PCH - Downtown Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 / SR-14 Carpool Lanes Direct Connector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Corridor East (completion of Metro's 17% local match for both phases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Carpool Lanes: SR-134 to SR-170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Baseline Projects

- SR-90 Freeway Extension

---

# TRANSIT

**Project Description**

### September 2004 Accelerated Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastside Light Rail Transit: Union Station to Pomona / Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposition Light Rail Transit: 7th/Metro to Culver City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Orange Line: North Hollywood to Warner Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire Metro Rapid to Western, Rapid Transitway from Western to Santa Monica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crenshaw Corridor Transitway (Initial Improvements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley North-South Rapidway (Phase I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Line Extension: Sierra Madre Villa to Azusa (Citrus station) PE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Baseline Projects

- Metro Rapid: Implement 28 lines
- Metro Bus Fleet of 2,259  Muni Fleet of 1,395
- Metrolink Expansion
Attachment 6

Revised FY 05 Budget Amendment
FINANCE AND BUDGET COMMITTEE
JANUARY 20, 2005
FEBRUARY 17, 2005

SUBJECT: FY05 BUDGET AMENDMENT

ACTION: AMEND THE FY05 BUDGET

RECOMMENDATION

A. Approve the transfer of $19.2 million of local funds from the capital program to the operating program.

B. Amend the FY05 budget to add up to $8.2 million of General Fund revenues to the Enterprise Fund for additional bus operations fuel costs and up to $8 million of Proposition A 35% funds for rail operations.

C. Eliminate 14 positions as a result of the capital program changes.

ISSUE

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) is facing an FY05 budget shortfall of approximately $42.2 million. This shortfall is caused by lower than projected passenger fare revenues and higher than planned expenses for fuel, PL/PD insurance claims, and workers’ compensation costs. Staff is proposing that the shortfall be mitigated through a combination of solutions including reducing expenses, deferring capital projects, and adding revenue to the Enterprise Fund from fund balances.

DISCUSSION

The fare revenue for the first five months of FY05 is approximately $9 million under budget. We expect this trend to continue through the fiscal year, and therefore project a revenue shortfall of about $20 million for the year.

As reported in the FY05 first quarter report, operating expenses are projected to end the year $22.2 million over budget. Trending the first quarter experience with fuel throughout FY05, indicates that fuel will be over budget by $8 million. During the first quarter of FY05, several prior period bus accident claims settled at higher values than originally estimated. These claims will add $6 million to the FY05 budget. Even though workers’ compensation claims and lost work days are under budget and less than prior years, costs are greater than budget and greater than last year due to rising medical and indemnity costs. Also, we have
not been able to attract or keep bus operators and will be forced to use overtime to deliver service. With significant market competition from both ports and Transit Security Administration, the pool of qualified candidates for operators has dwindled. When consent decree service was implemented in December, we were short 140 operators. The need to fill assignments will result in increased utilization of overtime until we can recover from the shortage. With the current recruitment rates offset by attrition, we do forecast to have sufficient labor to cover assignments until June. This will result in an increase of $4.2M in overtime. All other budgeted expenses are tracking right on budget.

The solutions to the fare revenue shortfall and expense overruns are to reduce operating expenses by $6.8 million (including non-contract vacancy savings of $300,000), defer $19.2 million of capital projects and transfer the funding to operating, add $8 million of Prop A 35% rail revenues to mitigate the rail fare revenue shortfall and to add $8.2 million of General Fund revenues to mitigate the fuel increases. The Prop A 35% funds are set aside for rail purposes and are available from prior year sales tax receipts.

The following table summarizes the changes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Rail</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Shortfall</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense Overrun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator overtime</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL/PD &amp; Workers Comp</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes Required to Balance Budget</td>
<td>$30,200</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$42,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating Expense Reductions
Non-Contract Vacancy Savings
Capital Project Deferrals
Subtotal Expense Reductions
Revenue Increases
Prop A 35%
General Fund Revenues
Transfer PC5% funds from rail to bus
Total of Reductions and Revenue Increases

Staff will also bring a proposal to the board to approve advertising on the Metro Rapid buses that may bring an additional $400,000 of revenues to the Enterprise Fund thereby lowering the General Fund Revenue requirement to $7.8 million.

Staff has identified 14 positions which can be eliminated as a result of the capital program changes.
FINANCIAL IMPACT

These actions will increase the operating expenses by $15 million from $990 million to $1,005 million. The capital fund expenditures and revenues will be decreased by $19.2 million from $754.4 million to $735.2 million. The Prop A 35% and General Fund balance will be decreased by $8 million and $8.2 million respectively. Lowering the rail expenditures allows the transfer of the Prop C5% funds from rail operations to bus operations; there is no impact on fund balances with this transfer.

NEXT STEPS

Continue to monitor progress on the FY05 budget and report to the board quarterly.

[Signature]
Richard Brumbaugh
Chief Financial Officer

[Signature]
Roger Snoble
Chief Executive Officer
Attachment 7

ADA Paratransit Service Update
ADA Paratransit Service Update

Technical Advisory Committee
March 2, 2005

MTA FY04 Highlights

- MTA Membership on ASI
- ASI Board Seat for MTA
- Flores Settlement
- FTA Compliance Review
### Flores Settlement Agreement

- Filed by ASI Riders
- ASI & MTA defendants
- September 27, 2004 thru September 27, 2007
- Injunctive & Declaratory Relief
- Detailed Reporting Procedures
- New Complaint Procedure
- New Denial Tracking Procedure
- Install Signage at 125 Pick-Up Locations
- Annual Audit

### FTA Paratransit Compliance Review

- Review Conducted January 2003
- Final Report Completed in August 2004
- Begun Quarterly Reporting Process
- Continue to Discuss Several Issues w/ FTA
- Available Online At:
  - [http://www.fta.dot.gov/14531_16159_ENG_HTML.htm](http://www.fta.dot.gov/14531_16159_ENG_HTML.htm)
Corrective Actions Under Discussion

- MTA Does Not Have Direct Control Over ASI
- ASI Fare Not Compliance With MTA's Night Fare
- Riders Inappropriately Denied Paratransit Eligibility
- 24-Hour Advance Reservation Policy
- Trip Denials Not Tracked Properly
- Taxi DDS System Encourage Late Trips and Single Passenger Trips
- Missed Trip Rate
- Excessive Trip Length

ASI FY04 Highlights

- Change to Primarily Next-Day Service Model
- New Eligibility Contractor
- Ridership Declined 4.4% below FY03 (11.9% Under ASI Budget Projection)
- Under Budget by $677,203
- Eligibility Interviews Up 16.2%
- Completed 2005-2009 Business Plan
- ADA Paratransit Demand Analysis & Projections
### ADA Paratransit Funding - FY05

- Access Services requested $68.6 million for FY 05 budget based on existing service with 9.9% projected ridership increase
- MTA Board approved $65.4 million
  - $3.2 million less than requested by ASI
  - $3.6 million more than FY04 allocation
- As requested by ASI Board, MTA outlined cost reduction measures

### Non-Mandated Service Reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same Day Service</td>
<td>-$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toll-Free Phone Service*</td>
<td>-$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent/Relocation*</td>
<td>-$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Owl Service</td>
<td>-$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit Certification Trips</td>
<td>-$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Management</td>
<td>+$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not Included in Final ASI Budget
Upcoming in FY05

- ASI Implementation of Plan Changes
  - Three Working Groups
- Implementation of Flores Settlement
- MTA 10-Year Financial Forecast (ASI Growth at 6.9% per year)
- CTA ADA Paratransit Taskforce