Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

GATEWAY CONFERENCE ROOM

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

2. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees
   Bus Operations  Information
   Local Transit Systems  Andre Colaiace
   Streets and Freeways  Joyce Rooney
   TDM/Air Quality  Ed Norris
   Attachment 1: Subcommittee Agendas  Mark Yamarone
   Attachment 2: Subcommittee Actions
   10 min

3. Consent Calendar  Action/Concurrence
   • Approval of Minutes
     Attachment 3: Draft April 5, 2006 Minutes

4. Chairperson’s Report  Information
   10 min (Randy Lamm)

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

6. SCGCA 2006-07 Annual Work program  Action
   10 min (Patricia Chen/Jay Fuhrman)

7. Long Range Transportation Plan  Update
   Attachment 4: LRTP Receive and File Report  (Heather Hills)
   10 min

8. CTC Meeting Recap  Information
   10 min (Tim Papanderou)
9. New Business

10. Adjournment

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

Please call Randy Lamrn at (213) 922-2470 or e-mail to “lamrn@metro.net”, if you have questions regarding the agenda or the meeting. The next meeting will be on June 7, 2006 at 9:30 am in the Union Station Room.
Attachment 1

Subcommittee April 2006 Agendas

Bus Operations Subcommittee

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

TDM/Air Quality Subcommittee
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Windsor Conference Room — 15th Floor

1. Call to Order
   1 minute
   Action
   Andre Colaiace

2. Approval of Minutes
   March 21, 2006 Minutes
   1 minute
   Action
   BOS

3. Chair’s Report
   5 minutes
   Information
   Andre Colaiace

4. Legislative Report
   5 minutes
   Information
   Marisa Yeager / Michael Turner

5. TPM Forms/ Funding Marks
   10 minutes
   Action
   Susan Richan

6. SAFETEA-LU – Final Information
   10 minutes
   Action
   Steve Henley

7. 15% Project Applications
   90 minutes
   Information
   Dana Lee

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

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

Please call Desirée Portillo-Rabinov at 213-922-3039 if you have questions regarding the agenda or meeting. The next BOS meeting will be held Tuesday, May 16, 2006 at 9:30 am in the Windsor Conference Room, 15th Floor of the Gateway Building.
LTSS
NOT AVAILABLE
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

Windsor Conference Room, 15th Floor

1. Call to Order
   1 min

2. Approval of the March 16, 2006 Minutes
   Attachment 1: Draft Minutes/Sign-in Sheet
   1 min

3. Chairperson Report
   10 min

4. 2006 Long Range Transportation Plan
   10 min

5. Metro Report
   10 min

6. Caltrans Report
   15 min

7. I-5/I-710 Interchange Mini-Study
   15 min

8. Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan
   Attachment 2: Southern California Goods
   Movement Action Plan Survey
   Attachment 3: Draft Technical Memorandum
   15 min

Action (Ed Norris)

Action (Subcommittee)

Information (Ed Norris)

Update (Heather Hills)

Information (Renee Berlin)

Update (Kirk Cessna)

Update (Ernest Morales)

Update (Michelle Smith)
9. SAFETEA-LU Administration and Conformity
   15 min
   Information
   (Herman Cheng)

10. LA SAFE- Call Box Programs
    15 min
    Information
    (Cathy Thunstrom)

11. New Business
    5 min
    Discussion (Subcommittee)

12. Adjournment
    1 min
    Action (Subcommittee)

The next meeting of the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee will be held on May 18, 2006, at 9:30 AM in the Windsor Conference Room, 15th Floor. Please contact Renee Berlin at (213) 922-3035, email to berlinr@metro.net, or Ryan Ross at (213) 922-1079, email to rossry@metro.net, should you have any questions or comments regarding this or future agendas.
TDM/AQ

Did not meet in April
Attachment 2

Subcommittee Actions
Disposition of April Subcommittee Actions

BOS:
April 18, 2006 Meeting

- FAP and Cap Allocations: A motion was approved by 12 votes and one abstention from Metro to take $30 million of the $60 million from Prop A growth over CPI to use for transit operations and to be distributed under the FY 07 FAP;
- 15% 5307 Discretionary Grant funds Actions:
  A two part motion was approved unanimously to take off the top $900,000 of the 15% Section 5307 Discretionary funds needed to fund UFS TAP Municipal Operator share capital contribution, and that BOS strongly supports the use of regional CMAQ funds as first preference to be used to meet the Muni capital share for the TAP UFS program:
    - It was approved with three opposition from LADOT, Gardena and Montebello to give Metro their 50% of the 15% 5307 Discretionary grant funds, as agreed to in the past;
    - It was approved with two opposition from LADOT and Gardena to fund a portion of 1st priority projects and to not consider 2nd priority and other project categories;
    - The final 15% allocation of funds for 1st priority projects was approved unanimously.

LTSS:
April 25, 2006
Not available

Streets and Freeways:
April 20, 2006 Meeting

No actions taken

TDM/AQ:
Did not meet in April
Attachment 3

Draft April 5, 2006 TAC Minutes
Sign-In Sheet
Handouts
Meeting Minutes

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. Agenda Reports By Standing Committees

BOS (Andre Colaiace)
• Met on March 21st;
• Received report on:
  - State Transportation Bonds;
• Discussed:
  - Funding Marks;
• Next meeting will be held on April 18th.

LTSS (Joyce Rooney)
• Met on March 30th;
• Received reports on:
  - Call for Projects Guideline Changes;
  - Metro Rapid Implementation;
  - Proposition A Incentive Reserve Fund;
  - National Transit Database (NTD) Funding Marks;
  - DOT's proposed rule changes for ADA;
• Action:
  - Approved FTA Section 5310 (funding for Paratransit Vehicles) Recommendations;
• Next meeting will be held on April 25th.

Streets and Freeways (Ed Norris)
• Met on March 16th;
• Received reports on:
- STIP-TE CTC extension and allocation requests’ deadline;
- Approval of Propositions A and C Guidelines by the Planning and Programming Committee;
- Propositions A and C Local Return and TDA 3 & 8 Funding marks for FY 07;
- Proposed guideline changes to the Call for Projects;

- Received updates on:
  - Caltrans review of Safe Routes to School applications;
  - Removal of projects from the Inactive list;
  - State Route 2 Southern Terminus Freeway project;
  - Big Rig Tow Service;
- Next meeting will be held on April 20th.

TDM/AQ (Mark Yamarone)
- Subcommittee did not meet in March;
- Next meeting will be held on May 17.

2. Consent Calendar (Renee Berlin) Handout
Ms. Berlin informed TAC members that there were two items on the Consent Calendar: the March meeting minutes and LTSS recommendations for the FTA Section 5310 scores.

The Consent Calendar was approved on motion by Joyce Rooney (LTSS) and seconded by Jano Baghdanian (LTSS). Steve Huang (South Bay Cities COG) abstained.

3. Chairperson’s Report (Renee Berlin)
- Ms. Berlin welcomed new TAC members Emma Nogales, new temporary alternate representing MTA Operations; Clement Lau replacing Dave Cowardin as the alternate for Los Angeles County Regional Planning and John Whitbread the alternate representing ADA. Changes are reflected in the updated TAC roster which was distributed;
- Those who are going to use federal funds in federal FY 06 ending September 30th must turn in Obligation plans to Kallieh Honish if they have not already. The deadline was Monday, April 3rd;
- The FTA signed the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Exposition LRT Project;
- The Fly Away Shuttle between Union Station and LAX began service on March 15th. The shuttle uses Berth 9 on the Transit plaza and runs every 30 minutes on the hour and half hour from 5 a.m. to 1 a.m. The fare is $3 one way for adults, $1 for children between 2 and 12 and free for children under 2;
- Propositions A and C and TDA actual sales tax revenues through the 2nd quarter were 9% higher ($69.5 million) than the budget and 8.9% above the same period last year;
- The April Board Meeting has been moved to May 3rd;
- Daniel Wong is a new intern for Metro’s South Bay Area Team and will be assisting on TAC;
March Board Meeting:

Approved:
- Fasana/Antonovich motion to direct staff to work with various agencies to implement a shuttle service between Metro Rail lines (Gold, Blue, and Red) and Dodger Stadium no later than April 14th, if possible. The Board wants to identify business partners to subsidize the service through sponsorships and advertising opportunities. They also want to work with other agencies in implementing similar shuttle services to other large venue events.

Received and Filed:
- Status report on the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP);

Approved on Consent:
- TDA Article 8 Findings and Recommendations;
- Caltrans costs increases of $4.2 million and $20 million for HOV projects on Route 405 and Route 60 respectively;
- Re-adopted Propositions A and C Local Return guidelines;
- Amendment to the 2006 Federal Legislative program to request FTA Small Starts funding for some Rapid Bus Lines.

Carried over to the next meeting the color designations for new segments of Metro Rail and other fixed guideway projects for use in printed and electronic communications materials.

4. Legislative Update

Federal Update (Raffi Hamparian, Metro)

Mr. Hamparian began by stating that there were three issues to report on: Transit security, the Highway Trust fund, and DOT proposals with respect to rule making for the Americans with Disability Act (ADA).

There have been Senate and House hearings on transportation security. The conclusion is that the Department of Homeland Security has not done an adequate job of allocating funding for improvements to transit providers. The House Subcommittee for Homeland Security has proposed that DOT distribute the money directly to transit providers.

There are questions about the viability of the Highway Trust Fund. As part of SAFETEA-LU, a committee was formed to address the future of the trust fund. Secretary Mineta is making appointments to the committee. Mr. Hamparian suggested that one appointee should be someone who has experience in transportation issues in Southern California. The appointments will happen in the next couple of months.

Mr. Hamparian discussed DOT's proposed rule changes for ADA. There were two main issues raised by the DOT. First, was the specification that the gaps on rail platforms should be 3 5/8 inches. The second is the definition of "origin to destination". The rule making warns about not using the terms "door to door" and "curb to curb". There is a fair amount
of concern in the transportation community because of a legal issue over the terms. DOT is trying to clarify the issue on the "door to door" and "curb to curb" terms. DOT has left the impression that they want a "curb-to-curb" type rule for transit providers. APTA is not opposed to the rule change, but is concerned about how much DOT is willing to fund this mandate. The deadline to submit feedback is April 28th. Mr. Hamparian stated that he will send the proposed rules to Mr. Lamm for distribution to members. Patrick DeChellis (County of Los Angeles) asked Mr. Lamm to email the rules. Mr. Lamm replied that he would once he received them.

Ellen Blackman (ADA) asked for clarification on the specifications for rail platforms. Mr. Hamparian replied that the platform gap could be no more than $3 \frac{1}{8}$ inches with a horizontal gap with no more than 3 inches. If the $3 \frac{1}{8}$ inches gap requirement is met, nothing further needs to be done. Mr. Hamparian stated that the specifications were lengthy and that he will send it out for review.

Mr. DeChellis asked if there was a resolution on the Highway Trust fund in Congress - if there was a resolution to close the gap? Mr. Hamparian replied that he believes that members of Congress will have to raise the Federal Gas Tax to accommodate the large number of funding earmarks in the Transportation bill.

Mr. DeChellis asked if the Republican controlled Congress would have an issue with the Gas Tax? Mr. Hamparian replied that there would be ideological debates, but in the end, they will act on the desire to fund projects in their home states.

**State Update (Michael Turner, Metro)**

Mr. Turner reported that since the last TAC meeting, the Bond measure failed to make it out of the State Legislature. Discussions have continued to propose a new Senate bill that would use AB 134 as a model. The Legislature’s majority and minority leadership are involved in the negotiations. In the past, Republicans were opposed to the Bond measure without indicating what they would support. The dynamics of the discussion have changed now that the Republicans have specified funding allocations for what they favor. They have taken a position against the sizeable Transit component in the Bond. Democrats want to preserve Transit while the Republicans want to spend it on uses that would divert funding from Los Angeles County. The Republicans outside of Los Angeles County want to use the STIP formula to allocate the Bond proceeds. TAC members should be concerned about how these formulas could adversely affect funding for Los Angeles County. For example, the STIP formula only gives 17% of the money to the County. The main reason is that the STIP formula uses centerline miles instead of lane miles to count the length of a highway.

The main components of the AB 134-like proposal are: $4.5$ billion to the Corridor Mobility Improvement program available to Caltrans and agencies such as Metro to relieve key congestion points in the County, $3$ billion for Goods Movement, and $4.5$ billion for Transit that uses a STA-like formula. There are also smaller earmarks for items like State and Local Partnership programs, Seismic Retrofitting, and Safe Routes to School.

Mike Uyeno (City of Los Angeles) asked if the bill was comprised of General Obligation bonds that were tied to future Gas Tax revenues. Mr. Turner replied that the legislature has only considered a General Obligation bond in line with the original AB 134 measure. The
carmarks that the Republicans want would result in the diversion of funds or an increase in the size of the Bond.

The legislature will be going on Spring recess next week. When they reconvene, the policy committees will go through unheard bills. Budget negotiations will start and the key issues to be aware of are the Proposition 42 allocations and the proposal to use $920 million to pay back Proposition 42.

Ms. Berlin asked Mr. Turner to talk about the Metro Board composition bill. Mr. Turner stated that they do not have a position because the Board vote was split. The bill is SB 1507 sponsored by State Senator Margett. SB 1507 would take one of the City of Los Angeles public appointee seats and turn it over to the cities outside of Los Angeles. It requires the City Selection Committee to define the corridors that would be created under the bill. The Board is concerned that the bill is not derived from a local consensus. There is a mechanism in the law that allows the reshaping of the Board based on population shifts, but results in decision making being made in Sacramento versus locally. The bill will be brought back to the Board in April.

Mr. DeChellis asked Mr. Turner if there is an effort to protect Proposition 42 funds during the discussions over the Bond measure. Mr. Turner replied that an effort to protect Proposition 42 is not coming from the legislature. Private sector interests are working on gathering signatures to put an initiative on the ballot that would prevent the diversion of Proposition 42 funds. Mr. Turner believes that the initiative will go before the voters. Mr. Turner stated that he sees opposition to Proposition 42 protection coming from the Teachers association and the Service Employees International Union (SEIU).

Mr. DeChellis expressed concern that without protection, paying back General Obligation bonds will come from Proposition 42 sources. He believes that the State’s structural deficit makes Proposition 42 a prime target for repaying bonds, which is why the teachers and SEIU are against protection. Whether or not there is a Bond, future deficits could lead to the diversion of Proposition 42 funds. The amount that is diverted could depend on the amount of one-time revenues that the State receives through sources such as Capital Gains taxes. Mr. Turner agreed that transportation agencies could still lose with the Bond measure if Proposition 42 funding gets diverted.

Mr. Turner stated that the cities and counties are pushing for a one-time allocation of $1 to 2 billion from the Bond measure for street and road repairs. After 2009, the Proposition 42 formula changes. The TCRP program ends and the $700 million in funds allocated to it revert to the 40/40/20 split. Currently, Proposition 42 generates $1.4 billion which should increase with the rise in gas prices. Mr. DeChellis stated that the price of gasoline does not have to go up because there is $350 million going into a spillover account that results from passage of the TDA bill in the early 1970s that limited the amount of money. Proposition 42 revenues should increase as the price of taxable goods goes up naturally due to inflation. There should be $1.7 billion available to Proposition 42 in the future. Mr. DeChellis said that his staff has run projections of how much cities should get and is willing to share that data with TAC members on request.

Gina Mancha (City of Los Angeles) asked if everything was on track to receive Proposition 42 allocations in FY 07. Mr. Turner replied that it is possible as long as the legislature approves
the budget recommendation from the Governor. Mr. Turner was optimistic that the allocation will take place. Mr. Turner stated that according to the Governor’s proposal, cities and counties would not receive a Proposition 42 allocation in FY 06-07 or FY 07-08. Under a previous agreement, Mr. Turner explained that cities and counties received Proposition 42 funds in FY 01-02 and FY 02-03 when other agencies did not receive funds. In return, cities and counties agreed to forfeit allocations in FY 06-07 and FY 07-08. Mr. DeChellis replied that the County is giving up twice as much money in FY 06-07 and FY 07-08. Mr. Turner added that cities and counties would receive a share of the $920 million in Proposition 42 repayment. Mr. DeChellis stated that if available in FY 06-07, these repayment funds would not be available until May or June. Ms. Mancha stated that she needed a definitive answer as to whether or not the City of Los Angeles would be receiving any Proposition 42 funds. Ms. Berlin replied that no definitive answer could be given at this time. Mr. Turner stated that nothing would be definite until the legislature finalized the budget. Mr. DeChellis asked Ms. Mancha to call him to discuss the matter.

6. Proposition A and C Local Return, TDA 3 and 8 Funding Marks (Susan Richan, Metro)

Ms. Richan stated that Attachment #6 contains the draft FY 07 estimates for Propositions A and C Local Return, TDA Articles 3 & 8 Funding marks. There should be no changes. The Funding marks are scheduled for Metro Board adoption in June.

Ms. Richan informed TAC that for TDA Article 3, a 2% surcharge is taken off the top for administrative and planning fees. The remaining funds are split with 15% going to the City and County of Los Angeles to maintain regional bikeways and the remaining 85% is divided among all agencies on a population basis.

Ms. Richan stated that the TDA Article 3 audits look fairly good, except that a lot of cities are asking for waivers and extensions. She is concerned that old allocations have not been spent and are lapsing. Agencies should return the money to Metro even if they are drawn down later. The money would be reserved under their name while Metro would collect the interest. Currently, FY 01 funds are subject to lapse on June 30th.

Ms. Richan stated that the Local Return funds look good as well. Workshops will be scheduled in June to explain the changes to the guidelines and forms. The Local Return funds are allocated purely on a population basis. A 4% inflation rate has been factored into the FY 07 estimates, even though FY 05 actual returns have come in higher. The estimates contained in Attachment #6 should be sufficient for budget purposes. Proposition A Local Return sales tax revenues should hit the $300 million mark this year.

The Article 3 marks reflect each city's allocation. Adjustments would be made next year for excess interest that might accumulate. Cities may reserve or draw down their Article 3 allocations. Mr. Norris (City of Long Beach) asked how many times per year could cities draw down their funds. Ms. Richan replied that Article 3 could be drawn down as many times as necessary until June 30th. She prefers one claim per year, but the maximum is usually three.
Mr. DeChellis asked for clarification on the Local Return estimates. He referred to a statement that Ms. Berlin made in the Chairperson’s report that sales tax receipts were 9% over budget for the current year. He wanted to know how that number compared with the 4% growth used by the Metro Budget department. He was concerned that because it was a low estimate, agencies may under spend the actuals received. Ms. Berlin replied that the 4% estimate is a very conservative figure. It is up to the discretion of the local jurisdiction to use a higher or lower estimate in their budget.

Ms. Berlin stated that the report by Ms. Richan is an action item. The Propositions A and C Local Return and TDA Articles 3 & 8 Funding Marks were approved on a motion by Mr. Colaiacce and seconded by Mr. Norris. Mr. DeChellis abstained.

7. SAFETEA-LU Implementation Issues (Herman Cheng, Metro; Naresh Amatya, SCAG)

Mr. Cheng explained that SAFETEA-LU included changes to regulations that require that funding amounts for projects programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and a Metropolitan Planning Organization’s (MPO - SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) be more closely aligned than they were in the past. Mr. Cheng introduced Mr. Amatya representing SCAG, who explained how the changes would impact the processing of projects in the TIP. Mr. Amatya explained that in the past, Federal DOT required that the RTP be updated every three years. SAFETEA-LU now allows RTP updates every four years in Non-attainment and Maintenance areas. July 1, 2007 is the deadline for having an RTP that is in conformity with SAFETEA-LU. The problem arises when SCAG needs to amend the TIP or the RTP.

Mr. Amatya explained that in a typical year SCAG amends the TIP 15 to 20 times. When SCAG submits a TIP amendment after July 1, 2007, it may be denied because the current RTP is not compliant with all of the planning provisions of SAFETEA-LU and SCAG may not have a SAFETEA-LU compliant RTP in place by July 2007. SCAG is attempting to accelerate the RTP adoption as close to the July deadline as possible. However, SCAG needs the Air Resources Board (ARB) to adopt a new emissions budget for preparing a new RTP, which will not occur until June 2007. Therefore, the earliest possible date for the new RTP to be adopted is around fall of 2007. This would leave about a 6 month period when the TIP could not be amended. SCAG is also pursuing a legislative fix to eliminate the inconsistency and is working with the federal government to incorporate some language that would allow certain types of amendments to be processed. Mr. Amatya does not know if any of these options will be successful, but they will be moving as quickly as possible to adopt a new RTP close to the July 2007 deadline.

Mr. Amatya mentioned that the triennial MPO certification process where federal agencies do an evaluation on the MPOs planning processes is also an issue. In the last certification, SCAG was advised that there needs to be increased consistency between the TIP and the RTP. When there are substantial changes to projects in the TIP, the RTP needs to be amended. In the past, unless the changes were so significant that it changed the scope of the project, SCAG was not required to amend the RTP. Now the federal government is tightening the process and may require an amended RTP, which is more involved, concurrent with a TIP amendment. Mr. Colaiacce asked if the TIP is part of the RTP. Mr.
Amatya responded that the TIP is supposed to reflect the projects in the RTP. Ms. Berlin asked if this would only affect larger projects that affect Air Quality conformity, and would the lump sum projects be affected. Mr. Amatya explained that if it goes beyond scope differences, costs increases need to be amended into both the RTP and TIP. Theoretically, the RTP and TIP are financially constrained documents. If the costs go up on one project, then it will cause other projects to drop out unless new sources of funds are added.

Mr. Colaiace asked if the 2006 TIP is affected. Mr. Amatya said no. Mr. Colaiace suggested that if SCAG needed assistance with changing the legislation, he should contact the Muni Transit operators’ Government Relations offices. Mr. Amatya said this is a problem for a lot of the California MPOs/RTPAs. He distributed a chart that showed that only one RTPA, SANDAG, would have a conforming plan in place by the July 1, 2007 deadline. All the other RTPAs will be affected. Mr. Amatya informed members that the State of Ohio is doing a “gap analysis” by looking at their current RTP and evaluating where they meet the SAFETEA-LU planning requirements and what gap exists in the current plan that they can augment and adopt an interim addendum so they can continue in the fourth transition year. Mr. Yale (Metro) asked how did SANDAG get a conforming plan and why can’t we do it. Mr. Amatya responded that SANDAG is on a different cycle. They adopted their plan earlier than SCAG and any entity that adopted their transportation plan after April 2004 will have this problem. SANDAG’s three-year update is due earlier than July 1, 2007.

Mr. Yale asked if SCAG has proposed legislative language that would resolve the TIP amendment issue and can it be sent to us? Mr. Amatya agreed to email it to Mr. Lamm. Gina Mancha asked if the “Lump Sum” or non-capacity enhancing projects in the TIP would be impacted as well. Mr. Amatya said if there is a discrepancy for example of say more than 10-15% in the funding programmed in the TIP and the RTP, the federal government has said they are looking into requiring the MPOs/RTPAs to amend the TIP or amend the RTP to insure consistency in terms of not only projects and scope, but also funding. He emphasized that the federal government has not officially made this a requirement. Mr. Uyeno commented that the RTP four-year update cycle is optional and SCAG could do updates more frequently. He asked if SCAG would be better off updating the RTP and the TIP more frequently. Mr. Amatya said SAFETEA-LU allows the TIP to be updated every four years, but that is probably not practical because project schedules and funding change more often.

Mr. Cheng commented that when funds are programmed into the TIP they need to more closely match what is programmed in the RTP. This issue could reduce the number of TIP amendments. Mr. Cheng stated that TIP amendments could slow down project delivery because funding may not be as accessible due to time lags making the TIP and RTP consistent. Ms. Berlin asked if this would affect administrative amendments or formal amendments. Ms. Honish (Metro) commented that sponsors often give Metro staff a rough project funding estimate because they think they are saving time to meet a TIP deadline. They will not be saving time when they find out they have to wait for the next TIP/RTP update. Deandra Knox (SCRR) asked if this means that there will be fewer amendments and will there be a compromise solution. Ms. Honish said if the requested changes in the TIP do not change the project from how it was shown in the RTP, then there is no reason why they cannot be processed. If there is a major difference, then the project might not be able to be updated until a new RTP and new TIP are adopted.
Mr. DeChellis asked how the bridge program would be handled, since it is handled by Caltrans and is very fluid. Ms. Honish responded that to the degree it's a lump sum category in the TIP, those projects won't be impacted unless the total lump sum amount changes enough to make it inconsistent with the RTP. Mr. DeChellis commented that there might be problems because a project elsewhere in the state cannot be delivered and frees-up money. Since it's a lump sum project, the TIP needs to be updated, but now it's not consistent with the RTP. Ms. Honish responded that it would have to be a huge increase to be inconsistent and if it's less than a 10 or 15% increase, then it may not be an issue. If the federal government restricts the financial consistency to a 0% difference between the TIP and the RTP, then a situation like this would be a possible problem. Mr. DeChellis echoed Mr. Uyeno's comment that the RTP should be updated more often, not less. Ms. Honish said there is an administrative impact to SCAG - they do not have the staff. Mr. Amatya said this might force SCAG into more updates of the RTP than is normally done. Mr. Uyeno commented that the longer the interval between updates of the RTP and the TIP, the larger the difference between the two will become.

Mr. Yale commented that if the TIP and the RTP become a serious impediment to the flow of funds to our region, then we would be less competitive in getting money. Mr. Yale commented that SCAG has to respond to this requirement in such a manner that it does not become a serious impediment to the Los Angeles County Transportation program. Mr. Yale expressed his personal opinion that arguments revolving around the administrative burden being too great do not apply to the issue of resolving serious impediments to funding. These suggestions about more frequent updates to the TIP and RTP might be a new reality for SCAG. Mr. Amatya agreed that SCAG will work with Los Angeles County to the extent possible. It is in everybody's interest for the region to get its fair share.

Mr. Norris asked how often are the TIP amendments done - annually? Mr. Amatya replied that the TIP update is conducted every two years and amendments are made more frequently. Ms. Berlin commented that we are currently on amendment number 22. Mr. Cheng stated that SCAG has limited staffing resources to deal with the TIP. Ms. Berlin asked if it would be possible to make minor updates to SCAG's RTP every year that would adjust costs. Mr. Amatya replied that is something SCAG could look into and that it is in SCAG's interest to make sure that the TIP and RTP are aligned as closely as possible during the shelf life of the plan. Mr. Cheng stated that since last November, SCAG's TIP staff has worked on the upcoming 2006 TIP. They do not have any additional resources to deal with the 2004 TIP amendment. SCAG may need to shift some resources from other areas to deal with the TIP issue. Mr. DeChellis commented that the impacts are unknown and he supported Mr. Yale. He recommended that Mr. Amatya take TAC's input along with input from the other counties and regions around the state and report back to the TAC with some conclusions before it's too late. Mr. Amatya agreed.

Mr. Yale commented that it may already be too late because we can not update the RTP in time. Mr. Amatya responded that one of the ideas SCAG is considering is developing a "gap analysis" to show that the SCAG region is demonstrating that it is at least conforming to the planning provisions of SAFETEA-LU. It is hoped that that should leave enough time to continue processing TIP amendments for the transitional year. In about two weeks, SCAG will consider this issue at its RTAC and TCC meetings. Ms. Berlin asked when the gap analysis will be done. Mr. Amatya responded that there needs to be agreement on the process first. The gap analysis would need to be in place by February or March 2007. Ms.
Berlin asked if it would be possible to return to the May 3rd TAC meeting to provide a status update. Mr. Amatya said he would be happy to return at that point, if he had new information to share.

8. California Transportation Commission (CTC) Meeting Recap (Toye Oyewole, Metro; David Yale, Metro) Handouts

Mr. Oyewole stated that the CTC had conducted two meetings in March: a South Counties STIP hearing on March 9th and their regular meeting on March 15-16.

Mr. Oyewole distributed copies of Los Angeles County’s 2006 STIP proposal. Mr. Oyewole stated that at the March 9th meeting, Metro Board Chairman Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa, Metro CEO Roger Snoble and other executives were able to present the Exposition LRT project, one of Los Angeles County’s major STIP projects. The presentation was well received. Mr. Oyewole stated that Metro expects to hear from the CTC next week when the staff recommendation will be released.

Mr. Oyewole stated that $208 million was allocated for the Exposition Line at the March 15-16 meeting. The CTC also released a list of projects with approaching construction allocation deadlines. Mr. Oyewole distributed a copy of the list. Ms. Berlin asked about the status of two projects on the list, Lynwood and South Pasadena, whose deadlines were past. Mr. Oyewole said that he did not know, but would find out. Ms. Berlin asked if the STIP adoption is still on for April 27th. Mr. Oyewole replied that everything was still on schedule. Mr. Yale stated that the CTC is required to hold a hearing within the county 60 days in advance if it plans to reject a county’s STIP proposal. It is safe to assume that the STIP will be approved on schedule.

9. Call for Projects Changes (Renee Berlin, Metro) Handouts

Ms. Berlin distributed copies of the proposed changes to the Call for Projects guidelines contained in Attachment #7, page 65 of the agenda. Ms. Berlin stated that this item is an update for discussion purposes only.

The proposed changes affect those projects that are non-Caltrans sponsored. Local agencies have experienced cost overruns and have requested that Metro amend its guidelines and contribute to increases similar to what it does for Caltrans. Metro staff is proposing four options to address cost increases (see attachment #7). These proposals will be presented to the Metro Board on April 19th and May 3rd. Ms. Berlin stressed that the proposals are to address cost increases for existing project scopes and not to augment project scopes.

Ms. Berlin summarized the proposals which include: allowing sponsors to down scope an existing Call Project, move funds among approved Call Projects, and keep audited savings for completed Call Projects to use on other Call Projects. There are conditions attached to the proposed changes: the funds have to be eligible for the project; at a minimum, the same proportion of local sponsor to Metro funds must be maintained. Additionally, federal and state funds that have been allocated, obligated, or extended are not eligible. Agencies can reapply in future Calls for portions of the scope that are eliminated or cancelled projects, but will receive no priority for funding. In the event that a sponsor can’t take advantage of the
first three options, Metro is identifying a specific amount of money and is developing a process to evaluate requests for supplemental funding based on the following criteria: project readiness, relative ranking received on the original Call application, the size of additional local match the sponsor is willing to contribute and type of funding available versus type for which project eligible.

Mr. DeChellis stated that there must be money available because it has been a while since the last Call and that Metro is re-evaluating its guidelines on cost overruns. He was concerned that new projects developed since the last Call might take second priority to the older projects seeking supplemental funding. Ms. Berlin responded that the revised guidelines would apply to projects funded for FY 07 or earlier. Newer projects will require a new application for funding. No project will receive priority over another.

Mr. DeChellis wondered if the new cost overrun policy would divert funding for newer projects. Ms. Berlin replied that the decision to fund older or newer projects is left for the local jurisdiction to decide. The proposed guidelines are in essence a zero sum game that involves moving money from one project to another. Proposal #4 provides local agencies the same opportunity as Caltrans for receiving supplemental funding. Mr. DeChellis replied that Ms. Berlin made a good point because Caltrans gets money for their cost overruns while local agencies do not receive any.

Mr. Uyeno stated that the supplemental request for funding is aimed at projects that are set to go. He anticipates that there will be a minimal effect on newer projects that would not proceed right away.

John Drayton (Metro Operations) asked for an estimate on the number and value of the projects that will be eligible under the revised guidelines. Ms. Berlin replied that she does not know. Mr. Drayton asked if the number is big or small. Mr. Uyeno stated that he believes that the number of projects is small. Like Mr. DeChellis had said earlier, the last Call for Projects was in 2001. As a result, it will only affect a small number of projects that are programmed for 2007 or earlier.

Ms. Berlin stated that Metro staff has been trying to determine the number of projects that will come forward for cost increase funding. She is hoping that the guidelines will act as a last stop measure for this problem. Mr. Drayton replied that he thinks that the proposal is a reasonable measure, if the proportion of outstanding projects is small.

Mr. Drayton asked if Metro staff could report back with an estimate on the number of eligible projects and costs. Ms. Berlin and Mr. Uyeno replied that they couldn’t because they do not know what sponsors and projects will be making the requests. Mr. DeChellis asked if the estimate could be derived from the amount of money that is set aside for Proposal #4. Ms. Berlin replied that there were a couple of figures being thrown around. Once the Board approves the proposal then based on the amount of funds and applications received an amount could be determined.

Mr. DeChellis stated that since there was no figure available, he wanted to know what the definition of small meant in the assertion that a few projects will come back with cost increases. He believes that those projects seeking cost increases should apply for funding in a new Call. Ms. Berlin replied that should a 2007 Call be conducted, project funding
recommendations would not be made by the Board until July 2007, resulting in continued
cost escalation for the rest of the year. The proposed guidelines are meant to keep projects
moving.

Mr. DeChellis asked if the guidelines are set for those projects that are ready to list from now
until Spring, 2007. Ms. Berlin replied that the key evaluation factor is project readiness. Mr.
Yale stated that the time frame is 18 months. Mr. DeChellis stated that it was his
understanding that the MOU's stipulate that projects will only get money once from Metro.
Ms. Berlin replied that she would ask Metro's legal counsel to develop an amendment to the
MOUs.

Ms. Berlin then explained to Mr. DeChellis how the 18 month time period was derived. She
stated that it usually take six months to have an executed MOU/LOA, another 6 months to
advertise and finally another 6 months to begin construction.

Referring to the proposed guidelines, Mr. DeChellis asked if there was a step that required
going through a Call process. Ms. Berlin replied that the first three options are internal to
Call sponsors and the fourth proposal is a "quasi" Call process. Mr. Yale asked if they could
go back into a Call. Ms. Berlin replied yes, but sponsors who received funding through prior
Calls would not receive priority and had no guarantee of funding.

Mr. DeChellis asked Ms. Berlin to define how small is small. Ms. Berlin again responded
she did not have an answer. Mr. DeChellis asked if the amount is six figures or less. Mr.
Yale stated that how much money gets set aside depends on the result of any ballot measure
to protect Proposition 42 and what estimates Metro staff receives from the survey of
outstanding projects. Mr. DeChellis asked if they would be getting back to TAC with a
number. Ms. Berlin replied that once they set a mark they would come back. Mr. Yale
stated that a survey should be conducted first.

Ms. Knox asked when there would be a Call. Ms. Berlin replied that hopefully a Call would
occur next year. Mr. Yale stated that if there is a Call, applications would go out in
December, would be due back next February, and that Board action would occur next July.
Mr. DeChellis stated that it might have been in 2003 when there was a pre-application
available in November. Mr. Yale stated that Metro would put the 2003 application package
on the web. Ms. Berlin stated it should only be used as a guide as the application package
may change.

Ms. Berlin stated that for future Calls, Metro is considering allowing project development
expenditures to count toward the local match. However, if state or federal funding is
awarded to a project, the sponsor will be required to provide the hard match to be expended
with these funds. Mr. DeChellis stated that the proposal is not a bad deal because the federal
government has considered allowing the use of local funds upfront as part of the match. It
is in the process of being approved. He asked when Metro would finalize its procedure and
if it would be enacted for a possible future Call. Ms. Berlin replied that the proposal would
go before the Board for approval in April. If approved, the next Call application would be
modified to reflect the change.
10. Goods Movement Action Plan (Michelle Smith, Metro) - handouts
Ms. Smith reported that Metro and its project partners are still working on the Goods Movement effort. Last May, the Board approved a contract with Wilbur Smith Associates to develop an action plan over an 18-month period. The completion date should be early 2007. The deliverables that have been completed include a Project Management Plan and Draft Technical Memorandum #3. The Executive Summary was handed out to TAC members. The memo covers the existing conditions and constraints of the Goods Movement system. They are trying to receive feedback from project stakeholders through Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) meetings. The group first met in October of last year and most recently met on March 22nd. Meetings are every 2 months. The next meeting is on May 24th in Riverside.

Ms. Smith stated that she is hoping to get more stakeholders to attend the SAG meetings. The challenge is that there are lots of Goods Movement meetings going on such as the state workshops. It might require that Metro and its project partners use existing forums such as TAC, SCAG Goods Movement Taskforce, and the I-710 Tier meetings to keep stakeholders informed. There was also an effort to outreach to agencies such as the ports, trucking associations and the railroads. She anticipated having up to 5 workshops at the end of the outreach period to share the proposed improvements with the stakeholder community and receive feedback.

A project web site has been developed that is accessible on Metro.net under the Programs and Projects section. The site provides a project overview, links to member agencies, a factsheet, a page for comments on the meetings, information on the Wilbur Smith Associates’ project team, and a frequently asked questions page.

In addition to the web site, a survey was created to solicit feedback from stakeholders. A copy of the survey was distributed. Ms. Smith asked TAC members to respond to the survey by the end of April. The survey results would be included in the study efforts and will help identify the most critical and pressing issues in Goods Movement. A second survey will be conducted to see if stakeholders are in agreement with the proposed solutions that have been identified.

Ms. Smith stated that the full text for Technical Memorandum #3 is on the web site. TAC members were encouraged to view the memo and offer comments by April 24th. She asked that comments be emailed or mailed to her or other project partners.

In the next six to nine months after the constraints are identified, the project would look at several scenarios and create models to depict future conditions. They would also look at the environmental, economic, and community impacts. The data would help develop strategies and mitigation measures. Strategies could include operational and capital improvements as well as institutional arrangements. Once the viable strategies are identified, workshops would be held to seek comments, advice, and buy-in from stakeholders.

11. Congestion Mitigation Fee (Doug Kim, Metro)
No report given.
12. Long Range Transportation Plan (Renee Berlin, Metro)
Ms. Berlin gave the report on behalf of Mr. Kim who was unable to attend the meeting. Ms. Berlin referred TAC members to Attachments #9 and #10, which were the LRTP status report updates. Ms. Berlin stated that Metro staff was conducting performance evaluations and financial modeling. Results would be presented to the Board in April. Staff hopes to have recommendations for the Board's consideration in May. A draft Plan is scheduled for release this summer and would be subjected to a 45-day comment period.

Marianne Kim (Auto Club) asked if TAC members would receive a copy of the draft LRTP plan. Ms. Betlin replied that if a draft is available, a copy could be distributed.

13. New Business
No new business

14. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m. The next meeting will be held on May 3, 2006 in the Union Station Room, 3rd Floor, at 9:30 a.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Member/Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Automobile Club of California</strong></td>
<td>1. Dan Beal/ Marianne Kim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus Operations Subcommittee (BOS)</strong></td>
<td>1. Andrea Cordoba/Laura Cornejo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. David Reyno/Dana Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>California Highway Patrol</strong></td>
<td>1. Capt. Stephen Webb/Lt. Joe Vizcarra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caltrans</strong></td>
<td>1. Raja Mitwasi/Alberto Angelini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rose Casey/Kirk Cessna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizen Representative on ADA</strong></td>
<td>1. Ellen Blackman/John Whitbread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Long Beach</strong></td>
<td>1. Suma Gant/Ed Norris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Los Angeles</strong></td>
<td>1. James Okazaki/James Lefton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Haripal Vir/Mike Uyeno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Gina Mancha/Ron Olive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>Mark Herwick/Clement Lau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Maselhas/Maged El-Rabaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick V. DeChellis/Shari Afshari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td>Greg Herrmann/Cathi Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities COG</td>
<td>Desi Alvarez/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgines Malibu Conejo COG</td>
<td>Jim Thorsen/Tom Gdala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
<td>Mark Bozigian/Tom Horne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td>David Liu/Dan Rix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side Cities</td>
<td>Steven Huang/Victor Rollinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Feinberg/Art Ida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Name</td>
<td>Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE (LTSS)</td>
<td>John Baghdanian/Thomas Uwal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joyce Rooney/Bertha Tafoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (MTA)</td>
<td>Renee Berlin/Randy Lamm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carolyn Flowers/Emma Nogales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTA Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY (SCRRA - Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>Steve Laiz/Deandra Knox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG - Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>Eyvonne Sells/Kathryn Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>LaDonna DiCamillo/Ron Guss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/AIR QUALITY SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>Mark Yamrane/Phil Aker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Newman/Brooke Geer Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
HAND OUTS
E.1 MULTI-COUNTY GOODS MOVEMENT ACTION PLAN

This Technical Memorandum (Tech Memo) documents the existing conditions and constraints in the goods movement system within the Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan (MCGMAP) study area (counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura). See Figure E-1. It also sets the stage for the analysis of future conditions, followed by strategies for improving the movement of goods as well as mitigation strategies.

The MCGMAP is a multi-agency effort led by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), and includes the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG), Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC), Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

The goods movement system is vital to the economic competitiveness and job security of the study area, as well as an important pipeline for trade to the rest of the nation. However, the volume of goods movement is so significant that it impacts the safety, health and the quality of life of the residents and communities in the study area.

The MCGMAP is a strategic opportunity for improving the competitiveness of the goods movement system while minimizing adverse impacts on air quality and public health. While there are numerous interrelated economic and environmental forces driving the need for the MCGMAP, they can be narrowed down to:

- Globalization of trade, particularly the rise of China as a leading manufacturing center
- Changes in logistics management
- Employment and upward mobility
- Transportation capacity limitations, productivity, reliability, and labor availability
- Growing public concerns over the health and air quality impacts of goods movement
- Funding shortages

All of these factors are being considered as a backdrop to the development of the MCGMAP. The following is a summary of the key findings of this review of the existing conditions and constraints related to the study area’s goods movement system.
E.2 EXISTING CONDITIONS

A national policy that promotes reduced barriers to trade, combined with the export of US industrial jobs, particularly to Asia, has increased the nation's reliance on imports. As a result, U.S. manufacturing employment in 2004 reached its lowest level since 1950 - 14.3 million jobs - dropping 3 million from 2000. The US trade deficit in manufactured goods rose by $164 billion from 2000 to 2004. The study area bears the brunt of an unfunded trade mandate that has rapidly increased the flow of goods through its system. The MCGMAP study area also represents the third largest manufacturing center in the nation. Its strategic location makes the study area the nation's largest goods movement gateway, carrying a disproportionate share of international trade.

The study area's San Pedro Bay Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles are the largest container ports nationally and the fifth largest in the world, handling over 14 million Twenty-Foot Equivalent Units (TEUs) of containers in 2005, a full one-third of all US waterborne container traffic. Three quarters of the trade through the ports is produced or consumed elsewhere. Only one quarter is for local consumption. Nearly $200 billion in trade passing through the ports in 2000 supported a national total of two million jobs, which generated over $61 billion in income.

The study area is home to the nation's largest single rail intermodal operation. The Hobart terminal handles over 1.3 million lifts annually with one of the highest throughput densities at 5,500 lifts per acre annually. The study area has a total intermodal volume of 5 million lifts annually, 64 percent of which are international and 36 percent are domestic containers.

It is served by two major railroads, the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway (BNSF) and the Union Pacific Railroad (UP). On an average weekday, 80 freight trains run through the local communities, hauling 52 percent of the ports' international containerized goods to and from other parts of the country, as well as conventional carload traffic and automobiles.

The study area's highways are the most congested in the nation and carry some of the highest truck volumes. The study area has six of the most congested bottlenecks for trucks in the nation. One third of its 9,000 lane miles of freeways carry more than 10,000 trucks per day. I-710, which feeds trucks directly to and from the ports, and the I-605 and SR 91, carry as much as 40,000 trucks on an average weekday.

---

2 "Manufacturing in Southern California"; Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation, April 2005.
5 BNSF Railway, UP Railroad, Port of Los Angeles and Port of Long Beach, 2005.
7 "2005 Urban Mobility Report"; Texas Transportation Institute; 2003 data.
8 "An Initial Assessment of Freight Bottlenecks on Highways"; Federal Highway Administration, October 2005.
9 Caltrans Truck Volumes 2004, 2003 data.
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The second largest air cargo hub in the nation is the Los Angeles International Airport, handling 73 percent of the study area's 2.2 million tons of air cargo in 2003\(^9\).

Warehouse, distribution, transload or cross-dock operations occupy over 1.5 billion square feet of building space throughout the study area, representing 15 percent of the national market, and 60 percent of the entire west coast. Another 32 million square feet of building space are under construction\(^1\).

The Alameda Corridor, at a cost of $2.4 billion, is one of the largest public/private goods movement projects in the nation. It has doubled railroad speeds between the ports and downtown Los Angeles and allows nearly 50 trains a day to avoid conflicts at 200 at-grade crossings between downtown Los Angeles and the ports.

While the MCGMAP study area goods movement system is large, its disproportionate role in supporting the growth in international trade creates significant impacts on the local multi-modal goods movement system, communities and the environment. The following is a discussion of the issues and constraints that impact the area’s goods movement system.

**E.3 EXISTING ISSUES AND CONSTRAINTS**

**Community Concerns about Air Quality and Congestion** - Community-based concerns over public health and other environmental impacts present a significant challenge to the future development of the goods movement system. Over time, the focus on types of air quality impacts has changed. For much of the 20th century, concerns were generally about the visual impacts. In recent years, as the visual nature of air pollution (smog) was reduced, concern shifted to the health effects associated with various pollutants. Research conducted by the Keck School of Medicine at the University of Southern California (USC) indicates that the combination of gases and fine particles in transportation exhaust, especially diesel fuels, affect lung function and contributes to arterial thickening, birth defects and low birth weights.\(^12\) Data also indicate that the closer one lives to pollution sources, such as the ports, intermodal yards, or major transportation arteries, the higher the risk. As examples, the increased incidences of cancer and of asthma in children are shown to be related by proximity to pollution sources.

The widespread dissemination of this information has raised awareness of these issues and increased concern within affected neighborhoods. Environmental groups have forced a significant slowdown in port development in recent years. An example is the proposed Pier J expansion at the Port of Long Beach that was halted due to concerns with the environmental document. Improvements to the China Shipping Terminal at the Port of Los Angeles were delayed because of

---

\(^9\) Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Air Carrier Statistics T-100 database.

\(^1\) National Association of Industrial and Office Properties and Warehouse Education Research Council

\(^12\) "Road To An Unhealthy Future For Southern California's Children", Andrea M. Hricko, USC Keck School of Medicine, August 2004.
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a lawsuit by the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC). Community-based resistance has also affected plans to address the existing levels of highway congestion. Local residents opposed the original plans for the expansion of I-710, primarily because of anticipated displacement impacts. Concerns over the negative health impacts of diesel emissions threaten the viability of the I-710 improvements and other goods movement projects, including plans to expand rail intermodal capacity, airport capacity, and the development of warehouse and distribution facilities.

Port and Airport Facility Capacity and Throughput - In addition to community-related concerns, there are also physical and operational constraints affecting existing capacity and throughput at the ports and airports in the study area. The potential throughput at the port terminals is constrained by existing operational and management practices. While the estimated maximum throughput capacity at the San Pedro Bay ports is about 11,000 Twenty-Foot Equivalent Units (TEUs) of containerized cargo per acre per year, current average throughput at both ports combined is about 4,700 TEUs per acre per year. Terminal capacity is affected by the availability of berths, backland acreage and the number of cranes, as well as operational and management practices related to container stacking and storage, container dwell times, hours of service, and labor productivity. Capacity is enhanced by the use of information technology such as optical character recognition systems and Radio Frequency Identification (RFID).

While container traffic has received most of the attention in recent years, the terminal capacity for commodities such as petroleum liquid bulk is a growing concern at the ports. California is now a substantial net importer of refined fuels, and demand is outstripping petroleum storage capacity. The need to accommodate containerized cargo is crowding out the petroleum facilities, adding to the overall complexity surrounding the expansion of the terminals.

Competition for space also impacts the airports in the study area, particularly Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), where high demand exists for both passenger and cargo services. Needed for air cargo services are runways, taxiways, aprons to park aircraft, maintenance facilities, and cargo-handling facilities. One strategy to alleviate this competition at LAX is to attract cargo to newly developed cargo-only airports in the study area. The potential growth at all air-cargo airports has been limited, however, because a significant portion of air cargo moves in the belly of large passenger aircraft, most of which fly out of LAX.

Highway Congestion and Delay - While congestion and delay affect the everyday lives of commuters in the study area, they also have a significant impact on goods movement. Eighteen percent of all truck volumes on the freeways within the study area experience delay due to congestion, which results in an increase in the cost of transporting goods by 50 to 250 percent. Goods rely substantially on trucking to connect warehouses, distribution facilities, intermodal

---

13 In 2005, however, consensus was reached by all I-710 Corridor cities and Metro on a hybrid alternative that minimized right-of-way impacts.
14 Based on estimates by Moffat & Nichol Engineers and JWD Group.
15 Based on 14.2 million TEUs in CY 2005 and 3,002 gross acres for container terminals at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach combined.

Wilbur Smith Associates
facilities and other businesses. For the most part, these facilities and businesses operate during daytime hours, though some operate during the night, too. Daytime operations cause conflicts between everyday commuter traffic and truck traffic. This conflict also creates a perception that goods movement is a major contributor to congestion and delays. However, the bulk of truck traffic does not occur during the traditional morning and early evening peak commuter hours. Approximately two thirds of truck travel occurs during the off-peak hours. Therefore, the issue of congestion and delays on the highway system cannot be fully addressed without including strategies to reduce the impact of commuter traffic as well as goods movement. In addition, trucks contribute to pavement deterioration. While an 80,000 pound truck weighs as much as 20 automobiles, it has the same impact on pavement condition as 9,600 automobiles.17

**Truck Access and Turnaround Times at Goods Movement Facilities** - MCGMAP-related research has involved the analysis of the amount of time trucks spend waiting for cargo to be loaded or unloaded at ports, intermodal facilities, and at warehouse and distribution centers. While delay on the roadway system impacts goods movement, the most significant delays are at the goods movement facilities. The issue is most evident at the port container terminals, where almost half (44 percent) of the total roundtrip time is spent waiting for the container to be loaded and unloaded.18 The delay is not associated with the actual turnaround of the load, which on average takes about 35 minutes, but the queuing time to be loaded.19 Tighter regulatory measures, such as AB 2650, a state law passed to impose a fine on terminal operators if trucks idle outside the gate for a period longer than 30 minutes, have been effective in reducing queuing outside terminal gates. However, some truckers complain that the queuing has simply moved inside the terminal gates. Terminals that maintain appointment systems or extend gate hours are able to avoid AB 2650-related fines. Such actions, along with the lack of manpower to monitor truck idling, have reduced the effectiveness of the tighter regulations.20

**Mainline Rail Capacity** - The most immediate issue facing the railroads is the capacity of the mainlines east of Los Angeles. As a result of historical growth in the intermodal container market, mostly due to growth in Asian imports, mainlines are reaching their capacity. The impact of mainline capacity constraints is a reduction in system velocity, which results in delay and increased backlog along the mainlines as well as at the rail yards. The average train trip is delayed by over 30 minutes east of Los Angeles.21 A backup in the system is far reaching, resulting in the delay in the delivery of time-sensitive shipments to customers nationwide. In addition, Metrolink commuter passenger rail services, in general, operate on the existing freight rail system.

17 American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Road Test.
18 "A Study of Drayage at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach"; METRANS Transportation Center; Kristen Monaco and Lisa Grobar, Department of Economics, California State University Long Beach, December 15, 2004.
19 "PierPASS Exceeds Expectations in OffPeak's First Two Weeks"; PierPASS, August 2005; based on a single transaction turn: excludes queuing, waiting, etc.
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Rail Intermodal Capacity Constraints - Rail intermodal facilities transfer containers and trailers carried by trucks to railcars, and vice versa. The location of an intermodal yard, relative to the ports, has an impact on the amount of truck travel through the study area. A truck carrying a port-generated container to an intermodal yard in or near a port (i.e., an on-dock or near-dock intermodal yard) will travel a shorter distance than one going to an inland facility (i.e., an off-dock intermodal yard).

The efficiency of an intermodal yard has an impact on the overall productivity and velocity of the goods movement system. On-dock facilities typically are single user facilities, and therefore are less efficient than near-dock and off-dock facilities, which are typically common user facilities. Also, on-dock facilities restrict train movements in and out of the facilities while trains are being loaded and unloaded. This restriction was imposed to address safety concerns for marine terminal workers. On the other hand, near-dock and off-dock facilities do not have this constraint. Intermodal throughput capacity is also affected by the types of operations and practices utilized by the railroads operating the intermodal yards. For example, the UP uses a “wheeled operation” at its Intermodal Container Transfer Facility (ICTF), where almost every container is stored on a trailer chassis. While this lowers the cost of operations, it also limits the container throughput per acre. In comparison, the BNSF uses management techniques to increase throughput per acre at its Hobart facility, including stacking containers vertically, allocating containers (per carrier), and imposing fees on containers that stay longer than a day. The result is that throughput per acre per year is twice as high at Hobart22 as it is at ICTF.23

Grade-Crossings - The impacts associated with at-grade crossings include noise, congestion, emissions and safety. While communities and transportation agencies have worked hard to address grade-crossing issues, in conjunction with efforts to encourage diversion from truck to rail, there is a significant shortfall in funding to fully implement existing plans. The Alameda Corridor project was successful in eliminating conflicts at 200 at-grade crossings between downtown Los Angeles and the ports. The project continues to reduce accidents, emissions, and congestion, as well as improve safety for the traveling public. There are existing efforts to eliminate at-grade crossings east of Los Angeles. However, the amount of federal funding provided accounts for only 23 percent of what was requested.24 This is arguably a national issue, given that the freight traffic on the rail system is headed for destinations throughout the nation. The shortfall in funding for grade separation projects has implications for the safety of the communities along the rail freight corridors.

Truck Safety - Truck accidents result in a higher probability of damage to the other vehicle and injury to its occupants. Of all accidents involving large trucks, 84 percent of fatalities are passengers in vehicles other than the truck.25 Between 2000 and 2003, the number of fatalities in accidents involving a truck increased by 17 percent in the study area.26 The fact that trucks are

---

21 5,500 lifts per acre per year (1,350,000 lifts per year on 245 acres).
22 2,700 lifts per acre per year (650,000 lifts in 2005 on 237 acres).
23 Alameda Corridor East related projects, including specific grade separations, received approximately $212 million of the estimated $900 million requested as part of the most recent national transportation reauthorization bill.
generally much larger than cars also affects the quality of the driving experience for the occupants of cars. The perception of being vulnerable to accidents with larger vehicles reduces the quality of the trip experience. It is reasonable to assume that if there is less concern about truck traffic, the public will perceive goods movement more positively. Increased concern about truck volumes without an associated increase in public awareness of the overall role of goods movement in both the local and regional economy, at least in part, results in an under-appreciation of goods movement as a whole. Such a sentiment may affect the implementation of goods movement and trade initiatives in the study area.

**Security** - While there are existing federal programs to improve security, seaports and airports must fund many of the security projects using their own resources, which are already limited. Congress is currently evaluating the effectiveness of security procedures and programs for air cargo and maritime cargo. For example, one of the options for air cargo is to implement 100 percent screening, requiring large amounts of land near air cargo facilities, the consolidation of air cargo facilities, additional warehouse screening buildings, separate secure access roads for trucks, increased security personnel, and screening equipment and technology.

**Availability of Funding** - Funding for goods movement-related projects is falling behind. The most tangible example is the shortfall in funds requested by communities and agencies in the study area in conjunction with the most recent national transportation reauthorization legislation (SAFETEA-LU). Although its political leaders and transportation agencies jointly supported several key projects for funding, the study area received a minor share of the total amount requested. While there is a growing awareness of the existing capital needs required to accommodate goods movement as well as to mitigate the impact of goods movement, this awareness has not translated into funding. The MCGMAP will address the need for mechanisms that translate the value (created by improvements to the study area's goods movement system) into revenue to be directed to improving infrastructure and meeting mitigation needs.

**Changes in Regional Shipping and Transfer Modes** - There are several changes being made in the way goods are transferred from ports to inland locations that impact the goods movement system. These changes are already occurring and affecting the existing system. An example is the growth in the transload business, whereby contents from international containers are transferred to larger containers for distribution throughout the domestic network. This results in an increase in local truck traffic between ports and warehouse and distribution centers where the consolidators perform these tasks. These changes, as they exist today, are driven by market forces to continually reduce costs and improve the efficiency of the goods movement system. Improving the physical goods movement system can take years, but market forces change in relatively short periods of time. Public policies and investments in response to these changes are often not agile enough to produce the intended results.

**Migration of Land Uses and Development** - The locations chosen by private sector developers for land uses associated with goods movement, specifically warehouses and distribution centers, are shifting away from the traditional locations close to the ports and intermodal rail yards. This practice is impacting communities located throughout the study area and in particular, to the east of Los Angeles. Increased truck travel to reach these more distant locations causes increased
emissions and congestion. Moreover, these new warehouse and distribution facilities are appearing in high growth real estate markets where residential and other commercial development demands are growing. The result is a conflict between residential and goods movement uses. Therefore, the same concerns raised by communities around existing goods movement-intensive land uses (increased truck traffic, intrusion on neighborhoods and schools, noise, congestion, emissions, safety) are emerging in new areas.

System-wide Goods Movement Data and Information - Good information and data are required to make effective decisions about the goods movement system and its impacts. Currently, the level of existing data and information is not sufficient to effectively support decisions concerning an ever-changing, market-driven goods movement industry. The Tech Memo identifies two specific areas of concern. The first is the data and information used to support travel demand modeling tools and techniques. The second is a lack of system-wide performance data for the goods movement system. While the carriers and the modal operators typically have data and information regarding the performance of their particular areas, there is no system-wide approach to monitoring and managing the performance of the system as a whole. Shippers and receivers have good data about their specific shipments, including location, volume, type, and other information they need to make decisions about the allocation of their inventory and stock. But they do not track data on the operational aspects of the modal system, its efficiencies, its performance, where the bottlenecks and delays are, what the average speeds are, the velocity of the system, and the allocation of assets (e.g., trucks, chassis, container slots) other than the areas within their respective sphere.

Not having a means for measuring and determining performance across the system undermines the ability to identify opportunities for optimization throughout the system. System-wide measures will likely help to identify opportunities for improving performance. Also, the lack of system-wide performance data undermines the effectiveness of policies and investments directed at specific issues. For example, existing policies directed at shifting truck traffic to off-peak hours have been effective at reducing congestion on the highway system.27 However, these policies have had negative impacts for individual truck drivers who spend longer hours away from their families,28 as well as for communities near warehouses and distribution centers that now have to deal with more noise and traffic at night. Performance measures for all aspects of the goods movement system, including operations and throughput, congestion and delay, air quality and emissions, and others, are needed to improve the effectiveness of the system.

A Disparate Goods Movement System and Community - Today’s goods movement system is organized disparately, and it is increasingly difficult to tackle the issues in a coordinated and strategic manner. Although the system operates well enough to allow goods to effectively move from mode to mode, the organizations involved in goods movement — private carriers, intermodal operators, warehouse and logistics operators, port owners and operators, and the public entities and transportation agencies — function independently. Many of the identified issues and

27 “PierPASS OffPeak Program Diverts a Million Truck Trips from Daytime Los Angeles Traffic”, PierPass, January 2006.
constraints require a system-wide solution. Private sector entities operate in a competitive environment that makes it difficult to create broad-based support for major solutions, since a solution that helps one mode may reduce the competitiveness of another. While individual operators within the system address operational and investment strategies within their respective sphere of influence, they do not have the means nor the information to address system-wide issues. Coordination among the modal components, where it does exist, is to increase their competitive edge. It is not driven by the need or desire to develop a totally integrated logistics supply chain.

Public agencies each have their own specific transportation plans and therefore have different priorities. A project viewed as a priority in one jurisdiction may be viewed as competition for finite resources by a neighboring jurisdiction. There are many communities affected by goods movement throughout the study area, and each represents potentially different ideals and priorities. One community’s view of economic growth and prosperity may translate to health and congestion concerns in another. The challenge is to develop an institutional approach that can garner the collective support of the private sector to tackle specific solutions that are broad and system-wide. The fragmented nature of the goods movement system will make it more difficult to address some of the major issues identified by the existing conditions Tech Memo 3.

E.4 CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

The MCGMAP study area has a significant goods movement system that creates local economic prosperity and job opportunities, and supports the national and global economies. The goods movement system also impacts the health and safety of the communities in the study area. These negative impacts potentially affect the future viability of the system.

The next step of the MCGMAP effort, evaluating future conditions and forecasts, is currently underway. It is likely that many of the same conclusions drawn from the existing conditions Tech Memo will surface during this step. The findings of the forecasting analysis will be documented and presented to the stakeholders in the MCGMAP study area. Thereafter, strategies to accommodate goods movement and to mitigate their impacts will be evaluated and presented.
April 4, 2006

Dear Colleague:

The attached survey is one of the initial outreach efforts conducted by Metro and its project partners (OCTA, RCTC, SANBAG, VCTC, CT and SCAG) to gather information for the Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan and to document transportation problems and issues related to goods movement and its impact on local communities and the environment. The Action Plan will develop strategies that will result in an implementation plan that supports the efficient movement of goods and effective environmental and community impact mitigation strategies. We are seeking your opinion as an individual or as a representative of an organization or public agency about specific goods movement issues. The input we receive from the survey will help Metro and its project partners focus on the most important issues to stakeholders.

THE ATTACHED SURVEY CAN BE COMPLETED WITHIN 5 TO 10 MINUTES. (This survey is intended to collect anecdotal information only and will not achieve results that are statistically significant.) Please return the completed survey to Michelle Smith, at Metro, One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-8, Los Angeles California 90012. The fax number is (213) 922-6353.

We would appreciate your survey response by April 28, 2006.

If you would like to complete the survey online click on www.metro.net/mcgmapsurvey and scroll down to begin. We expect to survey you again when improvement options are under consideration. If you have any questions or comments about the survey, call Michelle at (213) 922-3057 or send an email to goodmoves@metro.net.

For general information about the Action Plan visit the project website at www.metro.net/mcgmap.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this effort!
Southern California Goods Movement Action Plan Survey

Section 1: Individual, Public Agency or Organization Information

1. I am responding to this entire survey as a(n): (Check one only.)
   ___ Individual
   ___ Representative of Public Agency (Federal, state, county or city, etc.)
   ___ Representative of an Organization (Community-based, non-profit, professional association, issues advocacy, etc.).
   ___ Private Business

2. In which county are you located? (Check all that apply to you or your organization.)
   ___ Los Angeles County  ___ Orange County
   ___ Ventura County      ___ Imperial County
   ___ San Bernardino County ___ San Diego County
   ___ Riverside County    ___ Other: __________________________

3. Would you like your name and contact information added to our mailing list for this project? (Check one only.)
   ___ Yes (Please complete form below.)
   ___ No (Skip to Question #11 below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.</th>
<th>Individual’s Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Agency, Organization or Business Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>If Public Agency, check one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Federal government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>If Organization, check one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Community Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Professional Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>If Private business, Check one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Trucking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Maritime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Logistics/3PL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section 2: Goods Movement Issues

14. What are the top three most important goods movement issues to you, your agency, organization or business?

#1 Issue: ________________________________

#2 Issue: ________________________________

#3 Issue: ________________________________

How important are the following goods movement issues to you, your agency, organization or business? Place a check mark in the box that most closely describes the importance of each goods movement issue. The issues are organized by the following topics:

- Highway/Truck Issues
- Freight Train Issues
- Ports & Industrial Areas Issues
- Aviation Issues
- Goods Movement Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGHWAY/TRUCK ISSUES</th>
<th>Level of importance to you, your agency, organization or business (Please check only one box per line.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Traffic delays on freeways due to congestion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Traffic delays at freeway interchanges due to congestion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Traffic delays on local streets due to congestion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Truck noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Air pollution from trucks, including health impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Truck traffic intrusion into neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Truck accidents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Poor pavement condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREIGHT TRAIN ISSUES</th>
<th>Level of importance to you, your agency, organization or business (Please check only one box per line.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Delays at railroad crossings due to freight trains.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Freight train noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Air pollution from freight trains, including health impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Freight train accidents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PORT & INDUSTRIAL AREA ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of importance to you, your agency, organization or business</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Substantially</th>
<th>Major Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. Air/water pollution from cargo ships, including health impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Daytime noise from the marine port terminals or land ports of entry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Daytime noise from the industrial/warehouse areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Nighttime noise from the marine port terminals or land ports of entry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Nighttime noise from the industrial/warehouse areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Air pollution from marine port terminals or land ports of entry, including health impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Air pollution from industrial/warehouse areas, including health impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Increased truck traffic in and around marine port terminals or land ports of entry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Increased truck traffic in and around industrial/warehouse areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AVIATION ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of importance to you, your agency, organization or business</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Substantially</th>
<th>Major Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39. Aircraft noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Air pollution from aircraft, including health impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Increased truck traffic in and around airports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOODS MOVEMENT BENEFITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of importance to you, your agency, organization or business</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Substantially</th>
<th>Major Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43. Job creation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Higher paying jobs that do not require college degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Increased economic activity that improves my job or business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Opportunities for private entrepreneurship and creation of wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Maintaining our standard of living in Southern California.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Abundance of low cost goods to purchase at retail stores.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
50. Of the issues from the previous tables, what are the top three most important goods movement issues to you, your agency, organization or business? (Use numbers 15-49 from previous tables.)

#1 important issue: ☐☐

#2 important issue: ☐☐

#3 important issue: ☐☐

☐ None of the goods movement issues from the tables above is important to me, my agency, organization or business.

51. What solutions, if any, should be considered to address any of the goods movement issues identified above?

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

52. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about goods movement issues in Southern California?

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

53. Please suggest any other possible survey responders.

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your time in completing this important survey! See the cover page for information on submitting your survey form.
## SUMMARY OF RTIP PROPOSALS FROM COUNTY SHARE FOR 2006 STIP

Does Not Include STIP Interregional Share Funding (See Separate Listing)

($1,000's)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed New Non-TE Programming:</th>
<th>316,683</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>316,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>454,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under (Over) Non-TE Target</td>
<td>16,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Los Angeles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Rte.</th>
<th>PHA</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Voted</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>05-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>09-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>RAW</th>
<th>Cons/T</th>
<th>E &amp; P</th>
<th>PS &amp; E</th>
<th>FW &amp; S</th>
<th>Cont</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>2358</td>
<td></td>
<td>GARVEE debt service (RT 405 aux)(I20)(G-105)</td>
<td>16,611</td>
<td>4,628</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,611</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>2358</td>
<td></td>
<td>GARVEE debt service (RT 405/101 gap)(T-105)(T-12)</td>
<td>12,684</td>
<td>3,259</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,684</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td></td>
<td>GARVEE debt service (RT 6 HOV, RT 119/Ft 119)</td>
<td>16,321</td>
<td>5,190</td>
<td>2,644</td>
<td>2,644</td>
<td>2,644</td>
<td>2,644</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,321</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>3448</td>
<td></td>
<td>North Lincoln Av enhancements</td>
<td>6,899</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,889</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>3119</td>
<td></td>
<td>Broadway sidewalks reconstruction, phase 2</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita</td>
<td>3429</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canyon View regional trail access</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>9001</td>
<td></td>
<td>AB 395 reimbursement (C-23-32)(FY 03 PPM)</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So Pasadena</td>
<td>3453</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business district pedestrian improvements</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>9001</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning, programming, and monitoring</td>
<td>6,862</td>
<td>6,862</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td></td>
<td>Widows freeway, College St-Av 26 (supplemental)</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA County</td>
<td>3101</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eagle Rock byway rehabilitation</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA County</td>
<td>3429</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doherty field pedestrian undercrossing</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>2932</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenway kfs, path, Norwalk-Pomona</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>3988</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hollywood media district bus stop improvements (C4-27)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA County</td>
<td>3402</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vermeul Av media landscape</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>3402</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastin east bikeway and sidewalk</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>3429</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hermosa streetcap/pedestrian improvements</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>3422</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Line links pedestrian improvements</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redondo Beach</td>
<td>3452</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bay Cities regional bikeway</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance</td>
<td>3452</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hawthorne Blvd streetscape</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>3346</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenway trail</td>
<td>3,974</td>
<td>3,974</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>3391</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lancastrian wayway, Antelope Valley Freeway (C4-27)</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>3350</td>
<td>Widest at Twin Bridges (RIP)(C-23-32)</td>
<td>11,637</td>
<td>11,637</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>3356</td>
<td></td>
<td>AB 395 reimbursement (C-23-32)(East side)</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>3325</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sun Valley (San State only)(C4-27)</td>
<td>29,169</td>
<td>29,169</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>3450</td>
<td></td>
<td>LANC, bus stop/pedestrian improvements (RIP-405)</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>3172</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail line at station at museum (ext 5-05)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSVC</td>
<td>3436</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Gabriel rifle master plan (C4-27)</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>3181</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cudahy Crescent - Blue Line entrance, parking (C4-27)</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>3429</td>
<td></td>
<td>Playhouse district streetscape</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>3301</td>
<td></td>
<td>Downtown programming and marketing</td>
<td>3,772</td>
<td>3,772</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>RI 101 Center Sth Rl &amp; rail structure (3-1, 2, 06)</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>NB HOV lane, Ventura B-Burbank B</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA County</td>
<td>3402</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arroyo Seco bikeway (ext 5-05)</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>3429</td>
<td></td>
<td>FT FW bikeway and ped improvements (ext 5-05)</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>Whistle stop bridge, Mt. Rose Road (Bliss)</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2126</td>
<td>Western Ave interchange, Honolulu (RIP)(C4-S)</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>Widening Dra Co-Rt 65 (RIP)(C4-S)</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>Covina lanes, Rt 134-Rt 170 (C4-S)</td>
<td>17,968</td>
<td>17,968</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SUMMARY OF RTIP PROPOSALS FROM COUNTY SHARE FOR 2006 STIP

### Los Angeles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Total by Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Project Total by Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>151E Empire Av access (RTIP) $2,900</td>
<td>$16,100</td>
<td>$16,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>159K HOV lanes, RT 170-Rt 110 (CRP #41)</td>
<td>$16,125</td>
<td>$16,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>16AM RI/SF HOV connector (4S-14)</td>
<td>$8,738</td>
<td>$8,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>20GA Inglewood Ctr-Ct-Rt 60 (RTIP) (CRP #4S-14)</td>
<td>$8,738</td>
<td>$8,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>20H HRT 905-905-AV Hov lanes (4S-24)</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>20H RI/HOV lanes, RT 606-Port (with $500,000 in RTIP)</td>
<td>$6,738</td>
<td>$6,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>26H HRT 905-28th St, new signal, HWY</td>
<td>$6,738</td>
<td>$6,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>27H HRT 905 S/F to 101 NB connector</td>
<td>$6,738</td>
<td>$6,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>29H South Pasadena RI 10-10 160 0</td>
<td>$6,738</td>
<td>$6,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>3354 4th St bridge &amp; ramp construction</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>3354 4th St bridge &amp; ramp construction</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>3354 4th St bridge &amp; ramp construction</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>3354 4th St bridge &amp; ramp construction</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>3354 4th St bridge &amp; ramp construction</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>3354 4th St bridge &amp; ramp construction</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prior Commitments (Not Part of 2006 STIP Target)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>151E Empire Av access (RTIP) $2,900</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>159K HOV lanes, RT 170-Rt 110 (CRP #41)</td>
<td>$16,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>16AM RI/SF HOV connector (4S-14)</td>
<td>$8,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>20GA Inglewood Ctr-Ct-Rt 60 (RTIP) (CRP #4S-14)</td>
<td>$8,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>20H HRT 905-905-AV Hov lanes (4S-24)</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>20H RI/HOV lanes, RT 606-Port (with $500,000 in RTIP)</td>
<td>$6,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>26H HRT 905-28th St, new signal, HWY</td>
<td>$6,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>27H HRT 905 S/F to 101 NB connector</td>
<td>$6,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>29H South Pasadena RI 10-10 160 0</td>
<td>$6,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>3354 4th St bridge &amp; ramp construction</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>3354 4th St bridge &amp; ramp construction</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>3354 4th St bridge &amp; ramp construction</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>3354 4th St bridge &amp; ramp construction</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>3354 4th St bridge &amp; ramp construction</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>3354 4th St bridge &amp; ramp construction</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## SUMMARY OF RTIP PROPOSALS FROM COUNTY SHARE FOR 2006 STIP

Does Not Include STIP Interregional Share Funding (See Separate Listing)

($1,000's)

### Los Angeles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Rte</th>
<th>Proj</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Voted</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>PAW</th>
<th>Const E &amp; P</th>
<th>PS&amp;E</th>
<th>For Sup</th>
<th>Con Sup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3236</td>
<td>Soundwall, HOV lanes, Ri 118-Ri 14 (028-11)</td>
<td>16,140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>HOV lanes, Ri 134-Ri 70, add R/W &amp; curbst</td>
<td>ADD</td>
<td>18,930</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>17,280</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>Empire Ave access (RTIP), add construction</td>
<td>ADD</td>
<td>21,516</td>
<td>3,203</td>
<td>18,313</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,203</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1588</td>
<td>HOV lanes, Ri 179-Ri 118 (04S-41)</td>
<td>45,790</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45,790</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45,790</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>Ri 5/14 HOV connector (04S-74)</td>
<td>13,222</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>11,812</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Widening, 1919 State Hwy 60 Connector (04S-74)</td>
<td>229,393</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>229,393</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>229,393</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2830A</td>
<td>Interchange, 04S-21 (048-14)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4,291</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3669</td>
<td>HOV lanes, Ri 605-Puente (04S-440)</td>
<td>38,964</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38,964</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,684</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2095W</td>
<td>Crenshaw/Pomona soundwall (RTIP)</td>
<td>incl</td>
<td>3,642</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,642</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,642</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2789</td>
<td>Van Nuys Bvd signal ramps, add lanes (RTIP)</td>
<td>incl</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3325</td>
<td>Widening, 04S-21 (048-14)</td>
<td>4,067</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,067</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3326</td>
<td>Widening, 77th St &amp; 290th St (04S-600), STr</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3327</td>
<td>Widening, 96th St &amp; 280th St (04S-131), STr</td>
<td>4,774</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,774</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,774</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3329</td>
<td>Widening, 96th St &amp; 290th St (04S-600), STr</td>
<td>2,730</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,730</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,730</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3331</td>
<td>Widening, 96th St &amp; 290th St (04S-600), STr</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>6842A</td>
<td>Widening, 176th St &amp; E-Large Vistas (04S-20)</td>
<td>7,622</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,622</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,622</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>Arbor Vista interchange (04S-20)</td>
<td>30,391</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,391</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,391</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT, SF Springs</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>Valley View grade separation at Bansk, (04S-542)</td>
<td>DELETE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-30,391</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>9007</td>
<td>Roadside services</td>
<td>DELETE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>9001</td>
<td>Planning, programming, and monitoring</td>
<td>21,382</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,855</td>
<td>4,042</td>
<td>4,353</td>
<td>4,934</td>
<td>4,575</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,382</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Non-TEPTA Proposed for Programming in 2006 STIP:** 467,022  
43,712  
50,531  
174,850  
236,908  
39,617  
4,818  
42,313  
399,485  
0  
4,254  
1,610  
93,756

### Highway/road Reprogramming Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>4,818</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under (over) target</td>
<td>465,612</td>
<td>49,930</td>
<td>33,536</td>
<td>290,109</td>
<td>51,286</td>
<td>773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative under (over)</td>
<td>465,612</td>
<td>49,930</td>
<td>33,536</td>
<td>290,109</td>
<td>51,286</td>
<td>773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LACMTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>4,818</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3326</td>
<td>32,671</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,537</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3366</td>
<td>3,128</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,454</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3452</td>
<td>314,653</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>314,653</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total PTA-Eligible Proposed for Programming in 2006 STIP:** 350,352  
29,665  
220,627  
0  
0  
0  
0  
0  
0  
0  
0  
0

### PTA Programming, 2004 STIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>4,818</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under (over) target</td>
<td>35,696</td>
<td>29,665</td>
<td>6,031</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative under (over)</td>
<td>35,696</td>
<td>29,665</td>
<td>6,031</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SUBJECT: 2006 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN: PRELIMINARY PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE

RECOMMENDATION


ISSUE

Staff are updating Metro’s Long Range Transportation Plan. As an early step in this process, staff are conducting system and corridor performance analysis as well as updating the financial assumptions of the Plan. The results of this analysis will be presented to the Board in April.

DISCUSSION

The following section discusses the performance analysis for the countywide transportation system and corridors, as well as the Plan’s financial analysis update.

System Analysis

The first step of the performance analysis is to examine how the transportation system is functioning today and projected to in the future. This has been done through examining the performance of several transportation modeling scenarios. Staff have examined the benefit of three scenarios; 1) the existing transportation system today, 2) the future transportation system for 2030 with no new projects, but with increases in population and employment (the no build scenario), and 3) the future transportation system for 2030 with future population and employment increases and the projects that are included in the constrained 2001 Long Range Transportation Plan. Staff have evaluated these scenarios using performance measures for mobility, cost effectiveness, air quality, and access. These scenarios provide a starting point for evaluating the performance of new projects that could be included in the 2006 Long Range Transportation Plan. The results of this analysis will be included in the April staff presentation.
Corridor Analysis

In order to assess the performance of new projects that could be included in the 2006 Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan, staff examined various corridor performance measures for corridor mobility and corridor need. These included the following corridor mobility measures:

- Transit projects
  - Boardings per mile
  - Boardings per million dollars
- Highway projects
  - Hours saved per mile
  - Hours saved per million dollars

The following measures of current corridor need were also analyzed:

- Population and employment density
- Major activity centers/mile
- Boardings/mile
- Transit dependent population
- Highway congestion

The objective is to estimate the benefit of candidate projects. All projects in the 2001 Strategic Plan as well as various projects beyond the strategic plan were studied. The results of the corridor analysis will be included in the April staff presentation.

Financial Analysis

The financial foundation of the Long Range Transportation Plan is a rigorous analysis of projected revenues and costs through the Plan’s 2030 horizon date. The staff presentation will provide an outline of the financial picture, including funds that are uncommitted and can be used for new transportation initiatives.

NEXT STEPS

Staff is proceeding with the development of the Draft Long Range Transportation Plan. In May, staff will present recommendations to the Board for programs and projects that could be included in the Constrained Plan element or the Strategic Plan element. Upon Board action, staff will integrate Board recommendations into a draft Plan that will be released for public review.

In July, staff plan to provide the Board with the draft Long Range Transportation Plan update and seek Board approval to release the document for a 45-day public review period.
Finally, in October, upon review of comments received during the public review process, staff plan to present to the Board any recommendations for changes to the draft Plan. The Board will then take final action to approve the 2006 Long Range Transportation Plan update, which can then be submitted to the Southern California Association of Governments for inclusion in their pending 2008 Regional Transportation Plan.

Prepared by: Brad McAllester, Deputy Executive Officer, Long Range Planning
Douglas Kim, Director, Long Range Planning
Carol Inge
Interim Chief Planning Officer

Roger Snoble
Chief Executive Officer