Agenda
Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Union Station Conference ROOM

1. Call to Order/Roll Call  
   Action (Renee Berlin, Fanny Pan)

2. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees  
   Bus Operations  
   Local Transit Systems  
   Streets and Freeways  
   TDM/Air Quality  
   Attachment 1: Subcommittee Agendas  
   Attachment 2: Subcommittee Actions  
   10 min  
   Information  
   (Dana Lee)  
   (Joyce Rooney)  
   (Sharon Perlstein)  
   (Mark Yamarone)

3. Consent Calendar  
   • Approval of Minutes  
   Attachment 3: Draft April 4, 2007 Minutes  
   Action/Concurrence

4. Chairperson’s Report  
   Attachment 4: TAC Appeals Protocol Guidelines  
   5 min  
   Information  
   (Renee Berlin)

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

6. Fare Changes  
   Attachment 5: Fare Changes Letter to Transportation Colleague  
   15 min  
   Information  
   (Michelle Caldwell)

7. CTC/ Infrastructure Bonds  
   10 min  
   Update  
   (Tim Papandreou)
8. SCAG RTP/RTIP SAFETEA-LU Compliance Update (David Rubinow)

9. Proposition A Incentive Mini Call – Funding Recommendations Update/Possible Action (Jay Fuhrman)

10. 2007 Call for Projects Update (Heather Hills)

11. Long Range Transportation Plan Update (Heather Hills)

12. Countywide Congestion Mitigation Fee Feasibility Study Update (Robert Calix)

13. FTA Section 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities Discretionary Program Information (Gladys Lowe)

14. Federal Urban Partnership Initiative Update (Gladys Lowe)

15. New Business

16. Adjournment

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

Please call Fanny Pan at (213) 922-3070 or e-mail to “panf@metro.net”, if you have questions regarding the agenda or the meeting. The next meeting will be on May 9, 2007 at 9:30 a.m. in the Union Station Room.
Attachment 1

Subcommittee April 2007 Agendas

- Bus Operations
- Local Transit Systems
- Streets and Freeways
- TDM/Air Quality
  ➢ No Meeting in April
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Windsor Conference Room — 15th Floor

1. Call to Order
   1 minute

2. Approval of Minutes
   March 20, 2007 Minutes
   1 minute

3. Chair’s Report
   5 Minutes

4. Transit Corridor Overview
   10 minutes

5. Legislative Report
   15 minutes

6. FTA Funding - Bus and Bus Facilities Discretionary Programs
   10 minutes

7. FY08 15% Capital Discretionary/FY07-08 TEA Allocation Process
   10 minutes

8. FY08 Preliminary Funding Marks
   10 minutes

9. FAP Motions
   15 minutes

Action
Dana Lee

Action
BOS

Information
Dana Lee

Information
Anthony Loui

Information
Raffi Hamparian/Marisa Yeager/Michael Turner

Information
Ray Tellis - FTA

Action
BOS

Information
Nalini Ahuja

Discussion/Possible Action
BOS

Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Metro
10. New Business

11. Adjournment

Information Items:

90-day Rolling Agenda
Pre-SAFETEA-LU 5307 15% Discretionary Fund Balances
Pre-SAFETEA-LU 5307 85% Fund Balances
Pre-SAFETEA-LU TE1% Fund Balances
RTAA-CMAQ Fund Balances
SAFETEA-LU 5307 15% Discretionary Fund Balances
SAFETEA-LU 5307 85% Fund Balances
SAFETEA-LU TE1% Fund Balances
Summary of Invoices — FY07
2006 Document Requirement Status
Summary of EZ Pass Invoices — FY07
TDA/STA Claim Summary for FY07
Regional Pass Sales

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

Please call MARTHA BUTLER at 213-922-7651 or Ilda Licón at 213-922-2805 if you have questions regarding the agenda or meeting. The next BOS meeting will be held Tuesday, May 15, 2007 at 9:30 am in the Windsor Conference Room, 15th Floor of the Gateway Building.
Agenda
Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE
Union Station Room– 3rd Floor

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes – March 29, 2007
   (Attachment #1)

3. Prop. A Incentive Reserve Mini Call --
   Approve Funding Recommendations
   (to be handed out at meeting)

4. LACMTA Deficit Management Plan
   (Attachment #2)

5. Joint LTSS/BOS Meeting (5/15/07) to Review
   Call for Projects Preliminary Recommendations

6. ASI Election Results

7. Metro Bus Loading Zone Enforcement

8. New Business

9. Adjournment

Action
Joyce Rooney, Chair

Action
Joyce Rooney

Information
Jay Fuhrman, Metro

Information
Joyce Rooney

Information
Joyce Rooney

Information
Joyce Rooney

Information
Joyce Rooney

Action
Joyce Rooney
Agenda

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

Windsor Conference Room, 15, Floor

1. Call to Order 1 min

Action (Sharon Perlstein)

2. Approval of Minutes
   Attachment 1: Draft March 15, 2007 Minutes 1 min

Action (Subcommittee)

3. Chairperson Report 10 min

Information (Sharon Perlstein)

4. Metro Report 15 min

Information (Randy Lamm)

5. Caltrans Report 15 min

Information (Kirk Cessna)

6. Delegation of Environmental Approval to Caltrans 5 min

Information (Ron Kosinski)

7. Goods Movement Efforts
   Attachment 2: Board Report 10 min

Information (Shahrzad Amiri)

8. 2007 Call for Projects 10 min

Update (Heather Hills)

9. CMP Nexus Update
   Attachment 3: Board Report 10 min

Update (Robert Calix)
10. CTC Update
10 min
Update (Tim Papandreou)

11. 57/60 Interchange Improvement Feasibility Study
10 min
Information (Ben Jong)

12. New Business
5 min
Discussion (Subcommittee)

13. Adjournment
1 min
Action (Subcommittee)

The next meeting of the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee will be held on May 17, 2007 at 8:30 AM in the Windsor Conference Room, 15th Floor. Please contact Randy Lamm at (213) 922-3035 or Daniel Wong at (213) 922-2398 should you have any questions or comments regarding this or future agendas.

Agendas can be accessed online at: http://www.metro.net/sfs
Attachment 2

Subcommittee Actions
Disposition of April 2007 Subcommittee Actions

Bus Operation Subcommittee:

April 17, 2007 meeting

FY 08 15% Capital Discretionary/FY 07-08 TEA Allocation Process
• BOS reviewed the Principles and approved with a few language changes to Principle #5. If an agency receives full funding from other another sources for the same project, the agency must return excess equal funds to the “pot” for reallocation (no double dipping).
• Primary Priorities & Other Priorities was approved as is with one member opposing.
• The FY 07 Sec 5307 1% and 15% Transit Enhancement Funding Project Description & Justification forms are due back to Laura Cornejo (BOS Secretary) on May 8, 2007. This item will be placed on the May 15, 2007 BOS Agenda.

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:

April 26, 2007 meeting

N/A

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:

April 19, 2007 meeting

No Actions

TDM/Air Quality Subcommittee:

Canceled April meeting
Attachment 3

Draft April 4, 2007 TAC Minutes

Sign-In Sheet

Handouts
Meeting Minutes
Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. Call to Order/Roll Call
   Fanny Pan (Alternate Chair) called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m., took roll and declared a quorum was present.

2. Agenda Reports By Standing Committees

BOS (Dana Lee)
- Last met on March 20th;
- Discussed:
  - SCAG MOU for transit operators;
  - FY 08 15% Capital Discretionary funds and FY 07-08 TEA fund allocation process;
    - Priorities will be finalized next month;
- Next meeting is April 17th.

LTSS (Joyce Rooney)
- Last met on March 29th;
- Received reports on Proposition A Incentive Reserve Mini Call;
  - Applications were due on March 23rd:
    - 28 local cities and county submitted applications;
    - 154 Dial-A-Ride and 72 fixed route vehicles are eligible for funding;
    - All $14 million of the available funds will be spent by the locals;
    - It is expected to go to the Metro Board for approval in May, with first year expenditures in FY 08;
  - Thanked TAC and BOS for helping to protect the funds for the locals;
- Updates on:
  - Access Services for the Los Amigos Demonstration project;
  - The voluntary NTD reports for FY 07 statistics;
- Discussed Budget hearing on May 2nd (was later cancelled):
- Concern that proposed fare increases for senior and disabled passes from $12 to $37.50 a month will impact all local cities and the county that subsidize the pass and erode the Proposition A revenues;
- Elected Jano Baghdanian and Joyce Rooney as the new representatives for the locals on Access Services Board;
- Next meeting is April 26th.

David Feinberg (League of California Cities - Westside Cities) asked how many cities applied for the Proposition A Incentive Mini Call. Ms. Rooney responded that 28 cities, plus the County applied. Mr. Feinberg further asked how many cities had needs and how many applied. Ms. Rooney stated that most of the people who responded to the survey applied for the Mini Call.

**Streets and Freeways (Sharon Perlstein)**
- Last met on March 15th;
- Received presentation on the preliminary 710 Tunnel technical studies;
- Updates on:
  - The CMP Nexus Study;
- Next meeting is April 19th.

**TDM/AQ (Mark Yamarone)**
- Did not meet in March;
- Next meeting is May 9th, to review the 2007 Call for Projects Rainbow report – TDM mode.

3. **Consent Calendar (Renee Berlin)**

Ms. Berlin stated that there are two items on the Consent Calendar. The first is the minutes and the second item is to establish Capital Reserve accounts for four cities. The City of Bradbury requested that $68,443 of its Proposition A Local Return funds be reserved for its Dial-A-Ride and Taxi Voucher program; the City of Downey requested that $1,521,400 of its Proposition C Local Return funds be reserved for its Street Resurfacing project; the City of Manhattan Beach requested that $3 million of its Proposition C Local Return funds be reserved for its Local Match for its 2007 Call for Projects application for its Sepulveda Boulevard Bridge Widening project; and the City of San Dimas requested that $650,000 of its Proposition C Local Return funds be reserved for its Foothill Boulevard Reconstruction project. The Cities of Pasadena and Hermosa Beach are requesting three year extensions on their current accounts for the Metro Gold Line projects and Pier Avenue Street Improvement, respectively.

The Consent Calendar was approved on a motion by David Feinberg and seconded by Greg Herrmann (League of California Cities - Arroyo Verdugo Cities), with corrections to the minutes by David Feinberg on Page 14 “Mr. Feinberg commented there are issues regarding the 65 45 foot buses.”, and by David Liu (League of California Cities - San Gabriel Valley COG) on Page 6 “Mr. Liu commented that there is interest among the Metro CTC Commissioners for more design/build projects.”.
4. Chairperson’s Report (Renee Berlin)

Ms. Berlin reminded TAC members of some key upcoming meeting dates:
- May 9th is the Special TAC meeting to review the 2007 Call for Projects Rainbow report;
- May 21st – 23rd is the 2007 Call for Projects sponsor appeals;
- May 2nd TAC and Subcommittee’s Metro Budget briefing meeting scheduled for 1:00 pm is being postponed as the budget is not going to the Board in May, but rather in June;
- June 6th TAC meeting agenda includes appeals for those Call sponsors whose funds subject to lapse on June 30, 2007;
- Gerald Francis, Metro’s General Manager for Rail Operations resigned to assume a post at Washington Metro. Carolyn Flowers will temporarily assume his duties;
- Jack Eckles has been appointed as the new Deputy Executive Officer for Safety and Security. Most recently, he was employed by the Los Angeles County Office of Education in Downey where he was Security Services Manager;
- Edward Del Genio is Metro’s new Deputy Executive Officer of Labor Relations. Prior to coming to Metro, he was with the United Airlines Law Division and Labor section;
- FY 07 second quarter financial performance shows that for the six months ending December 31, 2006 Propositions A and C and TDA sales tax revenues are projected to be $22.7 million or 2.8% more than the budget amount. STA revenues totaled $96.4 million, which is $62.5 million or 184% more than budgeted. STA was ahead of budget due to high gasoline prices during the past 12 months which created a windfall during FY 06 which is collected and received by Metro in FY 07.
- TAC Subcommittee chairs met prior to the TAC meeting to discuss the Subcommittee schedule for the review of 2007 Call for Projects Rainbow report:
  - Streets and Freeways will meet on May 17th, to review the Regional Surface Transportation Improvements (RSTI), Signal Synchronization & Bus Speed Improvements, Bikeway Improvements, Pedestrian Improvements and Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) modes;
  - BOS and LTSS will conduct a joint meeting on May 15th to review Transit Capital mode;
  - TDM will meet on May 9th to review the TDM mode.

Jano Baghdanian (LTSS) asked if TAC members could be emailed with the schedule of the TAC meeting dates for month of May. Ms. Berlin said yes.

Mark Yamane (TDM/AQ) asked if Metro will be sending out the TAC Appeals Protocol Guidelines. Ms. Berlin stated they are usually handed out at the meeting, but will be emailed to members as requested.

At the March Metro Board Meeting:
- Approved:
  - Villaraigosa motion that the Board direct the Metro Office of Inspector General to conduct a performance and compliance audit of Access Services, Inc., and its contractors including those charged with determining eligibility for paratransit services, and report back to the Board with recommendations no later than October 18, 2007. Staff to report back in 60 days with the scope of the audit;
• Following positions on State Legislation:
  - Oppose AB 889 (Lieu) - Establish a Metro Green Line Construction Authority;
  - Support AB 900 (Nunez) - Expands voting membership on the California Transportation Commission (CTC);
  - Oppose SB 163 (Migden) - Obligates the State to fund connecting ramps from the San Francisco Oakland Bay Bridge to Yerba Buena Island;
  - Support Work with Author SB 974 (Lowenthal) - Requires the Ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach and Oakland to impose container fees;
  - Support SB 650 (Padilla) - Expands the maximum vehicle length requirement for articulated bus or articulated trolley coach to 65 feet;
  - Support SB 724 (Kuehl) – Would specify an expedited process for the Exposition Construction Authority Grade Crossing applications.

• Approved on consent:
  - SB 497 (Boxer) – A bill that would repeal a prohibition on the use of federal funds on the Los Angeles to San Fernando Valley Metro Rail Project;

• Approved as amended by Molina, Antonovich and Fasana the 2006 STIP Augmentation that staff work with the Los Angeles Delegation to sponsor a bill that would allow Caltrans to utilize design/build on the I-10 HOV project in the San Gabriel Valley, and staff should also work to develop a countywide, bipartisan, public/private sector coalition to support passage of the legislation;

• Received and Filed and approved as amended to delete references to environmental clearance, the status update on efforts to advance the Route 710 Tunnel concept and programming $5 million in STIP Augmentation funds for preliminary engineering and technical studies for Metro’s contribution contingent upon Caltrans programming $5 million in ITIP funds;

• Forwarded to the April Executive Management and Audit Committee meeting the Fasana motion on a new, simplified and equitable Formula Application Process (FAP) be developed that would replace the existing FAP. Proposal is that participants funding share will be the ratio of their total vehicle service hours (VSH) to all participants’ total VSH. No more than 25% of the annual amount shall be allocated for the support of non-fixed route general purpose transportation service (Dial-A-Ride).

5. Legislative Update
Federal Update (Raffi Hamparian, Metro)

Mr. Hamparian discussed three issues: Transit security, the Congressional budget resolution and Appropriations dollars.

In regards to Transit security, the Senate passed a bill that included $632 million in transit security for both passenger and freight; the House version included $225 million. This is contained in the legislation coming before Congress that has a date certain withdrawal from Iraq that will most likely be vetoed. Both the House Homeland Security and the House T & I committees are working on Transportation Security Authorization Bills to fund $3.3 billion for transportation security, with a heavy emphasis on transit. The big challenge is that the
Homeland Security Committee believes the best way to get transit security money is through the Homeland Security Department, while the House T & I Committee believes that the best way is through the Department of Transportation. Betty Thomson and Jim Oberstar have competing versions of the Bill.

Second, in early February, the President released his proposed budget that tracked SAFETEA-LU dollar amounts and had a few shortfalls in the highway and transit funding. After the Easter recess, Congress will return to work out a budget resolution. Senator Reed and Speaker Pelosi commit to having a budget resolution identical to the SAFETEA-LU authorized amounts.

The third item is the Appropriations process. Last year, Congress passed a Continuing Resolution for FY 07. The Department of Transportation got roughly $901 million that would normally be earmarked; $450 million was earmarked through SAFETEA-LU. The FTA will earmark the remaining $450 million, and the application deadline for the remaining funds is May 22nd.

Mike Uyeno (City of Los Angeles) asked Mr. Hamparian to discuss the Rescission. Mr. Hamparian's understanding of the Rescission is that it has a domino effect of $3.7 billion in Rescissions demanded from State Department of Transportation. California's share of this is in the amount of $300 million. Mr. Hamparian believes Los Angeles County owes about $33 million. Metro, particularly Frank Flores (Regional Programming & Policy Analysis), is currently working with Caltrans to sort out the issue. Mr. Uyeno stated that his understanding is that it is a Rescission of a portion and not Obligation Authority, so it does not involve real dollars. Mr. Hamparian stated he will get more information and contact Mr. Uyeno directly.

Gina Mancha (City of Los Angeles) asked the status of the earmarks. Mr. Hamparian stated he has not heard anything. Ms. Mancha mentioned that her staff submitted an authorization request on a 2006 project that's for a SAFETEA-LU earmark. Mr. Hamparian believes the matter should be sorted out in a matter of weeks.

State Update (Patricia Torres, Metro)

Ms. Torres reiterated the process of extending articulated buses from 60 to 65 feet. Metro is intending to dedicate them for Metro Orange Line service. SB 650 is going to the Committee on April 10th and both Ms. Torres and Mr. John Drayton (Vehicle Acquisition Manager) will be testifying on behalf of the Bill.

The Metro Board's Executive Management & Audit Committee took an opposed position on AB 889, which would establish a Metro Green Line Construction Authority to move the project forward. Metro met with Assembly member, Ted Lieu, the Bill's author, who was concerned with Metro's opposed position. Meanwhile, Councilman Rosendahl has been pushing forward a Resolution for the Los Angeles City Council to support the Bill. Metro Board Chairwoman Molina and other elected officials have agreed to hold their process for now, in favor of working together.

Metro has also been working on bills for the State and Local Partnership and Transit Security portions of the Infrastructure Bond.

Draft TAC Minutes, April 4, 2007
At the last TAC meeting, Patrick DeChellis (County of Los Angeles) requested information regarding SB 445 to establish a Road User Task Force. At the next Board meeting, Metro staff is recommending its support of the Bill. Mr. DeChellis expressed concern that the long range ideas will take 10-15 years to implement due to California’s political process. He reiterated that this issue needs to be addressed both short and long term.

Ms. Torres also addressed Metro’s participation in an Assembly Budget Subcommittee on Transportation. State Senator Mike Feuer asked Metro to testify and present its transit projects to promote transit in light of the Governor’s proposal to take transit funds. Both Will Kempton (Caltrans Director) and John Barna (CTC Executive Director) testified at the hearing to testify.

6. Transit Corridor Overview (Anthony Loui, Metro)

Mr. Loui provided a PowerPoint presentation. He first updated TAC on the Small Starts Program. This is a federal funding program under SAFETEA-LU for transit capital investment projects with a total capital cost of less than $250 million and a federal match of less than $75 million per project. He informed TAC of the Very Small Starts Program, a subset of lowest-cost Small Starts, which may follow an even more simplified project development and evaluation process which are for bus and street car projects. Metro has been awarded its first Small Starts Award for a Metro Rapid System Gap Closure Project in the amount of $16.7 million. The project description is for $25.7 million and includes closing the gaps in eight Metro Rapid lines: West Olympic, Garvey - Chavez, Manchester, Atlantic, San Fernando South, South Sepulveda, Torrance - Long Beach, and Central by 2008. To date, 15 out of the 28 corridors have been implemented with a targeted completion date of June 2008 and include 500 buses, 420 miles of Metro Rapid Bus Lines in 35 cities with 4 operators.

Mr. Loui outlined the gap closures of the eight selected projects. The current implementation schedule for West Olympic, Garvey-Chavez, Manchester and Atlantic is December 2007 and for San Fernando South, South Sepulveda, Torrance-Long Beach and Central is June 2008.

Mr. Feinberg asked how far West Olympic goes? Mr. Loui stated it ends in Century City.

Mr. Loui outlined the emerging 2007 Long Range Transportation Plan Baseline Major Transit Corridor Projects. The currently assumed Fixed Guideway project costs and sequencing include: the Metro Gold Line Eastside Light Rail Transit, Exposition Light Rail Transit, Wilshire Metro Rapidway, Exposition Corridor Phase II to Santa Monica, Metro Orange Line North Extension and the Crenshaw Corridor.

Currently, Metro has either procured or is in the procuring process for seven transit corridors. The first is Metro Orange Line North/Canoga Extension in which proposals were received December 21st. The Metro Orange Line North/Canoga Extension is a State and Locally funded EIR/PE. The Metro Board awarded the contract in March and the scope of work includes a 4-mile extension Busway with a possible 2-mile extension to the SR-118 Freeway. The City of Los Angeles is looking to evaluate bus speed improvements along Van
Nuys Boulevard. This project has a Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) funding commitment from the State in the amount of $98 million.

The Crenshaw Transit Corridor is an alternatives analysis draft/final EIS/EIR with the option to assist with the New Starts process after a draft EIS is completed. The RFP was issued in December 2006 with Metro Board contract approval scheduled for April 2007. The scope of work includes a Bus Rapid Transit or Light Rail Transit project from the Mid-City to LAX. Metro is looking to start the project either at Wilshire and Crenshaw or Wilshire and Exposition. The PE design will be procured during the draft EIR/EIS phase.

The third project is the Regional Light Rail Transit Connector project. Its RFP was issued on January 29th with proposals due on March 15th. Metro is anticipating a recommendation to the Metro Board for contract approval in May. This is an alternatives analysis with an option for a later New Starts draft EIR/EIS. The scope of work includes a 1.75 miles Light Rail Connector from the 7th Street/Metro Center station to the Metro Gold Line and Union Station, with options for an aerial, at-grade or subway.

Mike Uyeno (City of Los Angeles) asked who is handling the environmental study. Mr. Loui responded that the Central Area Planning Team is in charge of the study. He added that it is not an environmental clearance yet, and that the Metro Board only approved an alternatives analysis study. Metro is looking to add a draft EIR/EIS after the alternatives analysis is completed.

The Westside Extension Transit Corridor’s RFP was issued on February 14th and proposals were due on April 2nd with an anticipated May contract award. This study is also an alternatives analysis study with an option for a later draft EIS/EIR. Both the Regional Connector and Westside Corridor will undergo an intense alternative analysis study by June of next year. The scope of work includes an extension of the Metro Red and Purple Lines. Metro is looking to extend the Purple Line to West Los Angeles.

The Eastside Extension Phase II Transit Corridor RFP was issued on February 23rd and proposals are due in April.

A technical feasibility study of the Harbor Subdivision was completed and presented to the Metro Board January 2007, at which time the Metro Board reaffirmed conducting an Alternatives Analysis. The RFP is under preparation. This project is an alternative analysis study. The scope of work will include Diesel Multiple Unit trains, Light Rail Transit, Bus Rapid Transit and other technologies from Downtown Los Angeles to LAX and the South Bay via existing Metro-owned Railroad ROW.

Mr. Loui also reported that Metro staff is preparing a scope of work for a Diesel Multiple Unit Feasibility study for all Metro-owned Rights-of-Way. In addition, the Exposition Line Construction Authority is conducting environmental clearance and PE on the second phase of the Exposition Line to Santa Monica. The contract was awarded on November 2, 2006. The notice of intent and project scoping closed on April 4th.

Ms. Berlin asked Mr. Loui to send the presentation to Ms. Pan to distribute to TAC members. Ms. Pan will post it online.
7. **California Transportation Commission Meeting Recap (Tim Papandreou, Metro)**

Mr. Papandreou informed TAC that the CTC met on March 14th and 15th. He stated that the CTC approved $16.7 million in TCRP funds for the Exposition Light Rail Transit project, to reimburse a previously approved Letter of No Prejudice. In addition, the CTC allocated funds to the Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation (EEM) projects for several cities in Los Angeles.

KC Butler from the California Bicycle Coalition presented the Complete Streets Concept to the CTC. The CTC agreed that more needs to be done to develop a “complete streets” type evaluation criteria to ensure that all modes are coordinated and integrated in transportation improvements. When the EEM project list was approved, several Commissioners noted that the CTC should look at ways to work with the Legislature so that EEM projects are geared toward the Complete Streets Concepts that are not currently funded. Caltrans Director, Will Kempton, wanted to reemphasize to all Districts that Directive 64 requires all agencies to look at accommodating bicycle facilities when they consider transportation improvement projects. Mr. Papandreou wanted to remind TAC members to remember to consider all modes when transportation improvements are being considered.

He stated there was some policy discussion on the proposed 2007-2008 budget. Mr. Papandreou added that he testified in front of the Commissioners on behalf of Metro and Los Angeles County to state Metro’s opposition to the CTC staff budget recommendations to eliminate the spillover mechanism from the sales tax on gasoline for transit. Metro opposed this because the spillover mechanism is beneficial for transportation agencies like Metro and Los Angeles County transit operators. Another reason for opposition is that if passed as requested the funds would get diverted from the Transportation Improvement Fund to the State Highway Account (SHA) which is not the intent of this program.

Joanna Capelle (SCRRRA) asked if there was a bill in the legislature that stated the CTC intentions. Mr. Papandreou said that he was not aware of such a bill, but will let TAC know as soon as he can. He mentioned that Metro is working with its lobbyists to ensure an equitable solution. The Legislative Analyst office has agreed that the spillover mechanism should be eliminated, but should go to the Transportation Investment Fund (TIF). Ms. Capelle stated that there was a bill. Mr. Papandreou said the CTC is taking a support position.

Mr. DeChellis asked what the bill number is? Mr. Papandreou did not know and will inform TAC members when he knows for sure.

Ms. Capelle stated that there were two bills, one being sponsored by OCTA and the other going into either the TIP or SHA.

Mr. Papandreou stated that Metro submitted the STIP Augmentation last week with CTC approval scheduled for June 2007. He said since this is an augmentation to the 2006 STIP, it is considered an amendment. Under the STIP guidelines, everything up to the base amount is protected and everything above the base is not. Los Angeles County’s base is zero and its target share is up to $477 million since a lot of the money is Public transit Account (PTA) money. The fund estimate assumed that there will be extra PTA money. The Governor’s budget proposal will take some of the PTA capacity which may affect PTA funding capacity.
for the next two years. Metro went for the whole amount of $477 million. The performance criteria are getting more detailed and a project level evaluation for projects over $50 million in costs is being required. Metro needs to do these evaluations for the Exposition Line Rail Transit Extension and the Countywide Light Rail Vehicle Fleet.

Metro's Call for Projects process has been nationally recognized as one of the most transparent processes and Metro is now using it as a model for the evaluation.

The next CTC meeting is scheduled for April 24th and 25th.

As part of the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA), Metro signed an executive agreement with Caltrans and the CTC. The CTC wants to start its Project Delivery Council which is basically a mediator to the CMIA program. The Delivery Council is looking to be composed of RTPA members, Caltrans, the CTC and some other members.

The next category in the Bonds is the Trade Corridor Infrastructure Fund for the Goods Movement. The working group is composed of both private and public sector executives from around the State. Mr. Papandreou will be working closely on the guidelines.

Mr. Uyeno asked about the possibility of the CTC extending the contract award deadline of STIP projects from six to eight months. Mr. Papandreou stated there have been complaints around the State that sponsors are not able to meet the six month deadline. Mr. Papandreou asked TAC members to contact Mr. Uyeno if sponsors are having trouble meeting award deadlines.


In May 2006, then Secretary Mineta announced the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) Congestion Initiative. In December 2006, a notice was published in the Federal Register soliciting proposals from Metropolitan areas to enter into Urban Partnership Agreements (UPAs) with the USDOT. This notice did not include any federal funding, but promised priority for future federal monies to those areas designated as urban partners. A preliminary list of up to 10 urban partners is to be announced by June of 2007, with the final designation of up to 5 urban partners scheduled to be released in August of 2007. Although there was no funding in the UPA solicitation, it was in the interest of Metro and other transportation agencies in the Los Angeles County region to submit a proposal and become a USDOT designated urban partner.

To become an urban partner, the region would have to address the four strategies with a combined record of effectiveness in mitigating traffic congestion: tolling, telecommuting, technology and transit (4T's). Los Angeles County has the most extensive implementation of technology improvements, transit, telecommuting, and flex schedules in place in the nation. However, it lags behind regarding its consideration of policies and projects that fall under the tolling/congestion pricing strategy, which is the focus of the USDOT in the UPA application. The Off Peak program that is administered by Pier Pass, Inc. in the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, which has diverted about 30% of Goods Movement traffic to off peak hours along major freight corridors, is a successful implementation of a congestion pricing strategy. However, our region can not depend on this program only. For the Los Angeles County's UPA application to be more competitive, there is a need for a congestion
pricing strategy that targets passenger travel, particularly in view of potential applicants that already have implemented such policies, such as the San Francisco Bay Area and San Diego.

The UPA solicitation was followed by other three related USDOT notices. The notice for the Intelligent Transportation Systems Operational Testing to Mitigate Congestion (ITS-OTMC) included $100 million in federal funding for FY 07 – FY 09. The notice for the Value Pilot Pricing program included up to $36 million for FY 07 – FY 09. The notice for the Bus & Bus Facilities program included up to $438 million in federal funds for FY 07. The notice for this and other discretionary programs was released on March 23, 2007. Ms. Berlin asked Mr. Hamideh to discuss a general overview of the types of projects that our region will be submitting. Mr. Hamideh mentioned that the focus of the region’s ITS-OTMC application is in developing and Integrated Corridor Management for the I-10/I-710. Metro is targeting to receive $60 million of the national $100 million OTMC pot. He added that SCAG is considering conducting a network feasibility study that could include the analysis of the application of congestion pricing strategies in our region. As for projects to be included under the Bus and Bus Facilities and other discretionary programs, Mr. Hamideh mentioned that proposed projects are still being reviewed to determine eligibility.

The application deadlines for the UPA, ITS-OTMC, and VPP program are April 30th. The deadline for the Bus and Bus Facilities program is May 22nd, but project categories need to be identified prior to this date to be included in the UPA application.

9. 2007 Call for Projects (Heather Hills, Metro) Handout

Metro is on schedule to release the Rainbow report with preliminary staff recommendations with project scores and funding recommendations on May 4th. The report will also be posted online at Metro’s Call for Projects website by 8 AM on May 7th.

Ms. Hills stated that last month David Yale, DEO of Regional Programming, presented to TAC the approximate funding estimate for the 2007 Call for Projects of $450 million. Metro staff is taking this estimate along with proposed modal category funding marks, and the fund sources to the Board in April. She reminded TAC that the first two fiscal years for Transit Capital has been assigned to the STIP Augmentation process that was approved by the Board last month and was also reviewed and approved by TAC.

Ms. Berlin commented that the TEA funds have been programmed in the out years and do not start until FY 10.

10. Long Range Transportation Plan (Heather Hills, Metro)

Metro staff brought the Baseline Model to the Planning and Programming Committee on February 14th and to the full Metro Board the following week. The Baseline model run forecasts approximately $6.3 billion that would be available for new projects that have not already been approved and committed by Metro Board action. For comparison purposes, Ms. Hills noted that $11.2 billion was available in the 2001 Long Range Plan. The Bonds that were passed last November 2006 have helped bring projects that were deferred due to the State funding deficit in 2003 and accelerate them forward to earlier years. In addition, the cost of the highway and rail programs in the last 14 months has increased by approximately $2 billion. Metro staff anticipates presenting to the Board in late June the
staff preliminary recommendations. If the Board supports the recommendations, Metro will release a draft plan in late summer for a 45-day public review period. Adoption is scheduled in late fall.

David Rubinow (SCAG) asked if late June will be the first time Metro will be presenting a draft. Ms. Hills stated that late spring will be the first time staff brings their recommendations to the Board for review and approval. If the Board approves staffs’ recommendations then staff would prepare and produce a draft document for the Board in late summer and ask for approval to release a draft for the 45-day public review period.

11. Countywide Congestion Mitigation Fee Feasibility Study (Robert Calix, Metro) Handout

Mr. Calix distributed the revised Draft Guiding Principles for the Countywide Congestion Mitigation Fee Feasibility Study. Metro has received a number of comments from different sources. A revised set of Guiding Principles will be distributed with the Board report. A section was added to the Guiding Principles to address predictability, certainty in the entitlement process and transparency. The next Policy Advisory Committee meeting is on April 25th.

Mr. DeChellis commented the meeting conflicts with the CTC meeting in San Luis Obispo.

12. New Business

Ms. Berlin commented that April 18th is the Planning and Programming Committee. At this meeting, the Funding Marks, Urban Partnership and Congestion Mitigation Fee will be presented.

Mr. Feinberg asked about Metro’s fare increase? Ms. Berlin stated she has been in contact with Michelle Caldwell to present the item to TAC. Ms. Berlin stated she would try and provide more detailed information to TAC on Metro’s proposal.

Marianne Kim announced she has AAA informational flyers regarding driving costs.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m. The next meeting will be held on May 2, 2007 in the Union Station Conference Room on the 3rd Floor, at 9:30 a.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>1. Marianne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Beal/ Marianne Kim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (BOS)</td>
<td>1. Dana Lee/Susan Lipman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. David Reyno/Laura Cornejo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>1. Raja Mitwasi /Alberto Angelini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rose Casey/ Kirk Cessna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVE ON ADA</td>
<td>1. Ellen Blackman/John Whitbread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1. Abdollah Ansari/Samir Kant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>1. James Lefton/David Rzepinski</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Mark Herwick/Clement Lau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Paul Masich/Maged El Rabaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Patrick V. DeChellis/Shari Afshari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td>1. Greg Herrmann/Cathi Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities COG</td>
<td>2. Desi Alvarez/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes Malibu COG</td>
<td>3. Vacant/Tom Gdala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td>4. Tom Hornc/Mark Bozligian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
<td>5. David Liu/Dan Rix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td>6. Steven Huang/Victor Rollinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Cities COG</td>
<td>7. David Feinberg/Sharon Perlstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE (LTSS)</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jaro Baghdanian/Thomas Uwal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joyce Rooney/Bertha Tafodya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (Metro)</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renee Berlin/Fanny Pan Countywide Planning &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Drayton/Christopher Gallanes Metro Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SCRRA - Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>Steve Lantz/Joanna Capelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SCAQMD -- Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>Elyvonne Selie/Kathryn Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SCAG -- Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>David Rubinow/Annie Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LaDonna DiCamillo/Ron Guss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR QUALITY SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>Mark Yamarone/Phil Aker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Newman/Brooke Geer Person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TAC Audience Attendance

April 4, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Karen Fleming</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>24952</td>
<td>fleming @ meba.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>David Krupinski</td>
<td>LAPD</td>
<td>213-576-5411</td>
<td>drupinski @ laci.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Desert P. Robbins</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>922-8039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Son Green</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>922-4848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Maged Elbanah</td>
<td>CA D/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cecile Fournier</td>
<td>City Planning</td>
<td>213-978-1377</td>
<td>fcecil.fournier @ lacity.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Robert Caijo</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>213-922-5684</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attendance Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Real/Marianne Kim</td>
<td>AUTO CLUB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Leor/Susan Lipman</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Reynol/Laura Carrejo</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Steve West/Joe Vazana</td>
<td>CHF</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raji Mikhail/Alberto Angelini</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Casey/Kik Cessna</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Blackman/John Whitemend</td>
<td>CITIZEN REP ON ADA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdollah Ansari/Sume Gaur</td>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Lafore/David Rappaport</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haripat Vir/Mike Lyden</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Mancha/Rob Oliver</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hendrick/Clement Lau</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Maselback/Maged El-Rebaa</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick DeChellis/Sham Afshar</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg Hermann/Calbi Cole</td>
<td>ARROYO VERDUGO CITIES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dasi Alvarez/Lisa Rapp</td>
<td>GATEWAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viktor/Tom Giska</td>
<td>LAS VIRGENES MALIBU COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Hoke/Mark Bogziian</td>
<td>NORTH L.A. COUNTY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lu/Dan Rix</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL VALLEY COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Huang/Victor Rollinger</td>
<td>SOUTH BAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Feldberg/Art Barska</td>
<td>WEST SIDE CITIES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Beghdanian/Thomas Uwal</td>
<td>LTSS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Rooney/Bethesda Tafoya</td>
<td>LTSS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee Barin/Fanny Pan</td>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Drayton/Christopher Galtanes</td>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Lantz/Kaia Capellini</td>
<td>SCOPA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyvonne Sills/Kathryn Higgins</td>
<td>SCVMD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Rubinow/Annis Ham</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaDunna DiCamillo/Ron Guss</td>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Yeman/Phil Aker</td>
<td>TDM/AG SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Newman/Brooke Gere Persh</td>
<td>TDM/AG SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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HANDOUTS
Metro Planning Look Ahead

Small Starts Projects

New Transit Planning Initiatives

Metro Technical Advisory Committee
April 4, 2007
Small Starts Program Update

- Small Starts Program - A federal funding program under SAFETEA-LU for transit capital investment projects with a total capital cost of less than $250 million and a federal match of less than $75 million per project.

- Very Small Starts Program – a subset of lowest-cost Small Starts, which may follow an even more simplified project development and evaluation process.
Small Starts Program Update

Small Starts Projects awarded by the Federal Transit Administration

Metro Rapid System Gap Closure Project $16.7M federal

Project Description:
Construct final eight Metro Rapid lines $25.7 total cost
- West Olympic
- Garvey – Chavez
- Manchester
- Atlantic
- San Fernando South
- South Sepulveda
- Torrance – Long Beach
- Central

Metro
Los Angeles Bus Rapid Transit Network

- 15 of 28 corridors have been implemented to date

- Network targeted to be complete in June 2008
  - 500 buses
  - 420 miles
  - 35 Cities
  - 4 Operators
Small Starts: Selected Projects

Implementation Schedule
December 2007:
West Olympic,
Garvey-Chavez,
Manchester, Atlantic

June 2008:
Fernando South,
South Sepulveda,
Torrance-Long Beach,
Central
# 2007 LRTP Baseline Major Transit Corridor Projects

Currently assumed Fixed Guideway project costs and sequencing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost (Escalated $)</th>
<th>Opening Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro Gold Line Eastside Light Rail Transit (LRT)</td>
<td>$899 M</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposition LRT (Phase I to Culver City)</td>
<td>$640 M</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excludes sixteen rail cars being purchased through countywide option package)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire Metro Rapidway (BRT)</td>
<td>$124 M</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposition Corridor Phase II to Santa Monica</td>
<td>$822 M</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Orange Line North Extension (BRT)</td>
<td>$243 M</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crenshaw Corridor</td>
<td>$550 M</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Technology to be determined although funds are reserved for BRT or LRT until Metro Board action on LPA)</td>
<td>$948 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major Corridor Planning Studies

Professional Service Contracts are being procured for seven (7) transit corridors:

1. Metro Orange Line North/Canoga Extension
   - Proposals Received December 21st
   - Recommendation to Board in March

2. Crenshaw Transit Corridor
   - Proposals Received January 19th
   - Recommendation to Board in April
Metro Orange Line North/Canoga Extension

- State & Locally Funded EIR/PE
- RFP Issued November 3, 2006
- Board Contract Approval in March 2007
- Scope of Work to Include 4-mile extension of Metro Orange Line Busway, with possible 2-mile extension to SR 118 Freeway
- City of LA to Evaluate Van Nuys Blvd Bus Speed Improvements
- State TCRP Funding Commitment of $98 million
Crenshaw Transit Corridor

- New Starts AA/EIS/EIR
- Option to assist with New Starts process after Draft EIS.
- RFP to be Issued in December 2006
- Board Contract Approval in April 2007
- Scope of Work to Include BRT or LRT Project from Mid-City to LAX
- PE to be procured during DEIS/DEIR phase

Metro
Major Corridor Planning Studies (cont.)

3. Regional LRT Connector
   - RFP Issued on January 29th
   - Proposals due on March 15th
   - Recommendation to Board in May

4. Westside Extension
   - RFP Issued on February 14th
   - Proposals due on April 2nd

Metro
Regional LRT Connector

- AA Study with Option for later New Starts DEIS/DEIR
- RFP to be Issued in December 2006
- Board Contract Approval in May 2007
- Scope of Work to Include 1.75 mile LRT Connector from Metro Blue/Expo Lines to Metro Gold Line with Aerial, At-Grade & Subway Options

Metro
Westside Extension Transit Corridor

- AA Study with Option for later New Starts DEIS/DEIR
- RFP to be Issued in January 2007
- Board Contract Approval in May 2007
- Scope of Work to Include Extension of Metro Red Line/Metro Purple Line in Multiple Phases to Beverly Hills, Century City, Westwood and West LA
Major Corridor Planning Studies (cont.)

5. Eastside Phase II Transit Corridor
   - RFP Issued February 23rd
   - Proposals due in April

6. DMU Feasibility Study
   - RFP to be issued in Spring, 2007

7. Harbor Subdivision
   - Technical Feasibility Study Completed in January, 2007
   - RFP under preparation

Metro
Harbor Subdivision ROW

- AA Study
- RFP to be Issued in 2007
- Scope of Work to Include DMU, LRT, BRT and other technologies from Downtown LA to LAX and the South Bay via existing Metro-owned Railroad ROW.
Exposition LRT – Phase 2 to Santa Monica

- AA/DEIS/DEIR w/2nd Phase FEIS/FEIR/PE
- Prepared in Accordance w/New Starts Program
- Expo Board Approval to Award Contract on November 2, 2006
- Notice of Intent and Project Scoping in Early 2007
- Planning for this study prepared by Exposition Metro Line Construction Authority
**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**

**2007 Countywide Call for Projects**

**Modal Category Funding Marks**

($ in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modal Category</th>
<th>Program Year *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 07-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Surface Transportation Improvements/Goods</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Synchronization &amp; Bus Speed Improvement</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Demand Management (TDM)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Bikeways</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Capital</td>
<td>11,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Enhancements</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Mark</strong></td>
<td>30,380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Individual FY total amounts are estimated and are subject to revisions without changing overall programming totals as approved.

Prepared by: Countywide Planning and Development

Fees should be structured to mitigate congestion from new development without discouraging economic development.

Fees are to augment other regional funds, not replace or redirect them.

Cities identify local projects with regional benefit consistent with agreed upon guidelines.

Cities adopt, collect, and administer congestion mitigation fees.

Cities build projects (or cities may choose to participate in multi-jurisdictional or regional projects, if mutually desired).
Cities with existing fee programs receive dollar-for-dollar credit for local projects with a regional benefit consistent with agreed upon guidelines.

Fees should be structured to support transit oriented development, and to exempt mixed use and high density residential development within ¼ mile of rail stations consistent with CMP statute.

The program will be developed in a manner to encourage certainty, predictability, and transparency among cities, business, environmental and development communities.
Attachment 4

TAC Appeals Protocol Guidelines
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CALL FOR PROJECTS PROCESS

TAC Call for Projects Roles and Responsibilities: Since TAC membership consists of various countywide agencies, the TAC’s role and responsibility with regard to the Call for Projects process is to provide an objective, technical, and countywide perspective when considering both Metro staff project funding recommendations and applicant appeals, and developing TAC recommendations. To ensure the spirit and intent of TAC’s countywide perspective, these TAC protocols have been developed to provide rule by which TAC member shall abide during the Call for Project’s highly competitive grant award process.

- For projects for which their respective agency has submitted an application(s), TAC members and/or Alternates should have someone other than themselves provide oral testimony.

- Motion seconds should be made from an agency/jurisdiction/TAC subcommittee representative other than the agency/jurisdiction/TAC subcommittee that originated the motion.

- TAC members and/or Alternates should not participate in TAC discussions concerning project(s) their agency sponsored so as not to be perceived as taking an advocacy role.

- The Alternate TAC member shall only participate in the meeting when the primary TAC member is not present.

- Any discussion involving the public should be limited to "Public Input Discussion Period" and will only be allowed when acknowledged by the TAC chairperson.

- TAC discussions and motion development is intended for TAC members’ participation only.
Attachment 5

Fare Changes Letter to Transportation Colleague
April 24, 2007

Dear Transportation Colleague:

I am writing to inform you that the Metro Board of Directors will consider adopting a new fare structure following a public hearing to be held on May 24, 2007. It is an action that is the last thing we want to do but have forestalled far too long.

Despite rising costs for new equipment, fuel, labor, and other operating expenses, Metro has maintained one of the lowest fare structures in the United States even as we undertook the greatest expansion of service in our history. Over the past decade, under a federal court Consent Decree, Metro purchased more than 2,000 new clean air buses and added more than 1 million annual bus revenue service hours. It’s unfortunate that at a time of such high demand for our transit services, Metro will not be in a position to continue serving that demand without additional revenue.

Although the base Metro cash fare is $1.25, the average Metro rider pays only 58 cents a boarding. This is due to deep discounts for the various pass holders. Fares cover just 24 percent of the cost of a ride; 76 percent is subsidized by taxpayers. That compares to 1988 when taxpayers subsidized 56 percent of each boarding passenger’s ride. It’s simple economics; our revenues don’t cover our cost and if we don’t do something now, we are just postponing the inevitable, and making the problem worse for the future.

Staff is recommending we keep the Metro regular cash fare at $1.25 until 2009. That’s the lowest of any major metropolitan area in the nation. New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, San Diego and other cities currently charge $2 or more. It should be noted that discount fares for seniors, students and the disabled have not been changed since 1995. In 2004, Metro cut the regular cash fare a dime to $1.25, eliminated transfers, instituted the popular day pass and changed the monthly pass by $10, from $42 to $52, among other adjustments.

Metro has diminished its reserves, slashed more than 500 administrative positions in the past five years, reined in workers compensation costs and aggressively pursued every avenue to raise more revenue, including blanketing our buses and Metro Rail stations with ads — but it’s still not enough.

As a result, Los Angeles County taxpayers are not getting what they expected when they voted twice for local sales taxes intended to further modernize and expand public transit and improve streets and highways that benefit the vast majority of county residents. Last November, the voters overwhelmingly approved a nearly $20 billion state bond measure for highway, public transit, and related capital projects. Metro’s massive operating deficit is siphoning funds that could be leveraged with that bond money or other state and federal dollars to fast track critical relief on our congested highways and the bus and rail system.
Metro’s legislative mandate is to serve the transportation needs of all 10 million residents of Los Angeles County no matter if they walk, bike, take a bus or train, carpool or drive a car or truck. Everyone, regardless of ethnicity and income, pays the sales taxes that fund our transportation programs no matter what transportation mode they use.

As an agency, we are faced with the difficult but very real choice between charging higher fares and providing less service. History tells us that customers are willing to pay more as long as the quality and level of service remains high. The fare change is this agency’s commitment to deliver the service our patrons have come to rely upon. By not doing the fare change, it will be much worse for our patrons because cuts in service would be more painful, inconveniencing many and leaving some riders stranded.

If the Metro Board adopts the proposed fare changes, the average passenger fare still will be only 86 cents per ride, much lower than what passengers pay in other large urbanized areas. A gallon of gas now costs about four times what Metro riders will pay, so Metro will continue to be a mobility bargain.

As Metro’s CEO, it is my responsibility to provide the greatest level of service we can to our customers while operating within our means. We remain committed to providing mobility opportunities for the entire region. We realize that this is a difficult issue, but we are asking for your support and consideration to fulfill Metro’s commitment to our patrons and taxpayers.

Sincerely,

Roger Snoble
Chief Executive Officer
Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Attachment A: Proposed Fare Modifications
## PROPOSED FARE MODIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Last Change</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed 7/1/07</th>
<th>Proposed 1/1/09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Token</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Pass</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi Monthly</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
<td>Eliminate</td>
<td>Eliminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EZ Transit Pass</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$58.00</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular – Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Zone 1</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$0.80</td>
<td>$1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Zone 2</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.60</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly premium each zone</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owl/Late-Night/Off-Peak</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro to Muni Transfer</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/Disabled/Medicare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$0.45</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.40</td>
<td>$0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$0.80</td>
<td>$1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Pass</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$37.50</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EZ Transit Pass</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$29.00</td>
<td>$47.50</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly premium each zone</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro to Muni Transfer</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$52.50</td>
<td>$84.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Eligibility</td>
<td>As of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>July 1, 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>July 1, 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>July 1, 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Congestion Mitigation Fee Policy Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda & Summary
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan
Transportation Authority

Congestion Mitigation
Fee Policy Advisory
Committee

Los Angeles Area Chamber
of Commerce - Board Room
350 S. Bixel Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017

1. Welcome & Introductions – David Abel, Abl Reports

2. Presentation: Regional Transportation Mitigation
Program – Robert McCleary, Executive Director,
Contra Costa Transportation Authority

3. Breakout Sessions To Review What We Heard on Policy
Issues at March’s PAC Meeting

4. Report on Breakout Session Results - David Abel

5. Next Steps – Brad McAllester

Congestion Mitigation Fee Policy Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary
March 28, 2007

Welcome and Meeting Overview

David Abel, Publisher of Metro Investment Report and Facilitator, welcomed everyone, gave an overview of the PAC Meeting agenda, and introduced the guest speaker Mr. Rick Bishop, Executive Director of the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG). Mr. Bishop made a presentation of the congestion mitigation fee program for the WRCOG named the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) program. Following Mr. Bishop's presentation, a number of questions were asked regarding the TUMF program.

One question was asked on whether the percentage share of funding allocated to transit improvements could be increased relative to the share of funding allocated to regional arterials and local zones. Mr. Bishop responded that the only way the share of funding can be increased is if the cost of the transit improvements increases. The Nexus analysis of the growth and the cost of transportation improvements to accommodate the growth determine the allocations between modes.

Another question was asked on the issue of rehabilitation and changing the use of the property. For example, if a 10,000 square foot industrial zoned property is rezoned to commercial, would there be a fee? The answer is yes. In this case, the net increase in trips generated by the new zone would determine the amount of the fee that would have to be paid. If the use of the property was rezoned to a lower intensity zone then no fee would be charged.

A question was raised regarding exemptions to the fee and how the WRCOG handled exemptions. Mr. Bishop responded that exemptions do forego revenue. However, if the cost of the exemption allows the county to leverage a much larger pool of revenue to fund needed improvements then it is worth doing. For example, if the cost of exemptions is $400 million yet it provides policymakers the justification to approve a $5 billion infrastructure program. Then, one can say that foregoing $400 million helped leverage $5 billion. Some would say that this is a sound utilization of public policy and public resources.

Upon completion of the presentation by Mr. Bishop and the brief discussion that followed, Mr. Abel introduced Mr. Brad McAllester, Executive Officer of Metro Long Range Planning and Coordination. Mr. McAllester reminded everyone that a set of draft Guiding Principles were distributed at the previous PAC meeting and mailed to all 89 jurisdictions in Los Angeles County for their review and comment. Mr. McAllester stated that comments received from the jurisdictions and the PAC would be included as part of a report that will be forwarded to Metro's Board of Directors in April 2007.
Mr. McAllester handed the meeting back to Mr. Abel who then invited everyone to break into three groups so the revised set of Policy Issues could be discussed among smaller groups to determine how much consensus exists among the PAC.

The Policy issues discussed were:

1. Fee Level: Countywide Minimum or Maximum versus Variations by Subregion
2. Fee Schedule or Revenue Target
3. Credit & Reimbursement Alternatives
4. Reductions for Redevelopment
5. Project Eligibility
6. Regional Matching Funds and Access to Financing
7. Multi-City Collaboration
8. Maintenance of Effort
9. Appeals Process

The meeting was adjourned and the PAC was reminded that the next meeting is scheduled for April 25, 2007 at 9 am at the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce.
PAC Policy Issues Breakout Sessions  
March 28, 2007  

1. Fee Level: Countywide Minimum or Maximum versus Variations by Subregion

This policy issue considers whether to have all jurisdictions in Los Angeles county charge a countywide minimum fee, a maximum fee, or charge a minimum or maximum fee that varies by subregion or economic grouping. Regardless of whether it is a countywide fee or a sub-regional fee, the fee amount would be based on a specified cost per average daily trip. A fee schedule would be based on the cost per trip multiplied by a trip generation rate by land use type.

Group 1: Many group members believed there is a need to have a minimum subregional fee and within the subregion it should be uniform. But individuals stated that it was important to redefine what the sub-regional boundaries are. For example, the coastal region can make a strong case for it being a subregional area because they may have more in common than how the COG sub-regional boundaries are drawn. There was wide spread agreement on not having a maximum fee. Specific remarks included the following:

- North County may wish to have a fee by subregion with a minimum.
- Likes a uniform countywide fee but the county is so diverse.
- May need to redefine subregions.
- Subregional fee addresses differences between growing and built-out subregions.
- You could adopt no fee up to maximum
- Have to have a minimum or you don’t have a program
- Within a subregion it needs to be uniform
- Minimum countywide and allow subregions like Santa Clarita area to go higher.

Group 2: Group members expressed a range of opinions on a single countywide fee for all cities because of the diversity of the cities in the county. However, there seemed to be some agreement among some members on having a subregional fee with uniformity within the subregion. Specific remarks included the following:

- Cities need to work with neighboring cities to look beyond their own boundaries because congestion does not respect geographical boundaries.
- Schism among members on countywide vs. subregional.
- WRCOG – made presentations to all cities. Strip away boundaries.
- (Bishop) How did WRCOG handle the push-back?
  - He was available 24/7 to those cities or stakeholders that needed to discuss the program
  - Also showed trip generation to show others where trips were being generated and going to.
• (Torrance, Ted) In their communities existing deficiencies account for 95% and the future needs make up 5%. It is the reverse of what happens in the North County. Can't compare Hawaiian Gardens to Santa Clarita.

• WRCOG Bishop – Had similar dynamics. Some built out – others not. Zones enables cities to group themselves

• How big do we want this program to be? Should it be one countywide fee or should it be a subregional fee?

• Covina – The I-405 decision at the Metro Board level impacted San Gabriel Valley wanting to do regional vs. subregional.

• Question to WRCOG – Why did the COG do this and not Riverside County?

Bishop – Because the county was sub-divided into COGs already. Coachella has a fee already

• LADOT – Can't keep doing what you've always done—Can't expect something different from doing the same thing.

• Need to do countywide because we are already doing things city by city and subregion by subregion.

Group 3: There was extensive group discussion on the importance of establishing a project list that would be used as the basis for determining an appropriate fee level. Most felt that the potential for creating a project list of regional significance was greatest by working within each subregion or some other subcounty grouping. Group members had strong opinions on the issue of existing deficiencies limiting the justification for collecting fees. Many of the group did not understand or agree with the premises that this fee is only intended and legally able to fund projects as part of mitigation for new development. The concern among the group is that without addressing the existing deficiencies there is no point in implementing the fee and developing new infrastructure projects. The group felt in many cases these new infrastructure projects could even exacerbate the existing deficiencies creating a bigger problem. Specific remarks included the following:

• City of Long Beach felt that a countywide fee was not practical or fair. From their perspective, both individual cities and subregions are all unique and have very different needs and resources. Ideally, the Nexus Study would establish the documentation needed to set a justifiable fee for each city. Setting the fee at the subregional level may be necessary to establish regional projects and encourage collaboration.

• Los Angeles County voiced concerns of the fee being equitable across the county. From their perspective, having different fees in different jurisdictions would create an inequitable competitive situation for cities. There was a discussion on the ability of the Nexus Study to define the scale of cities and group them with other cities that have similar competitive characteristics. Some in the group felt that the Nexus Study would be the perfect vehicle to create the justification of these groupings and others felt that it would be problematic to label cities with any inference to scale or economic potential.

2. Fee Schedule or Revenue Target

This policy choice involves either (1) requiring all jurisdictions to adopt a common fee schedule or (2) giving each jurisdiction a revenue target. The first approach is more prescriptive by determining the fee schedule across all land uses that each jurisdiction would adopt. The second approach offers more flexibility by allowing jurisdictions to allocate the fee burden across land uses as they
see fit, subject to nexus requirements, and to use alternative funding sources to reduce the fee burden on new development.

**Group 1:** Group members expressed some agreement to develop a fee schedule because it may be easier to understand. Specific remarks included the following:

- The revenue target per jurisdiction may bias one land use over another.
- Fee schedule may be easier to understand
- Southbay may prefer fee schedule
- Concerned with how a revenue target would trickle down to development

**Group 2:** There was little agreement among group members on this issue. Members asked if there could be a hybrid approach such as a fee schedule with a subregional target. Several comments were made in favor of a schedule because this provided uniformity and no one jurisdiction gained an advantage over another because of favoring one land use over another as would happen in a revenue target approach. Similar statements were made regarding a revenue target approach that it would create inequities on cities that were on the fringes of the program. On participant stated that flexibility is important and whichever method provided that flexibility should be favored over the other. Specific remarks included the following:

- Covina – Revenue makes more sense.
- WRCOG has a fee schedule.
- Like uniformity across all land uses.
- This way no one has an “advantage”.
- LADOT – Provide flexibility
- Covina question: Is it possible to have a fee schedule with subregional revenue target?

**Group 3:** Some group members felt there was no way to establish a revenue target without listing the projects the target revenue would fund. Specific remarks included the following:

- Pessimistic that a project list could be established with sufficient buy-in to have individual jurisdictions adopt the program.
- Concerns that regional projects do not have direct benefits to large numbers of cities that would still be expected to collect the fee.

3. Credit & Reimbursement Alternatives

This policy issue involves the degree to which developers receive credits and reimbursements based on their decision to build and dedicate an improvement, versus the capital project priorities of the jurisdiction granting the credit and/or reimbursement.

Policy issues regarding credits/reimbursements include whether incentives that should be offered for private development to build and dedicate improvements otherwise funded through the fee program, including dedication of right-of-way or other project components. Some points to clarify include whether these in-lieu dedications would be credited against fee obligation, how a developer could be reimbursed for improvements that are greater than a city’s fee obligation, and how repayment schedules and interest earned on outstanding balances would be addressed.
Group 1: Overall the group discussed the practical implementation issues of this policy issue. For example, a group member noted that in one jurisdiction credit is given to developers but in the form of a letter stating the amount of the credit rather than cash. The developer is then able to sell it to another developer or use it towards any other future development. Others stated this method of credit would not resolve the impacts of new development because you are basically selling the congestion problem. However, the geographical distance between the buyer and seller of the credit would make a difference in how this issue is managed. Specific remarks included the following:

- Doesn’t see the benefit of a credit buy/sell program if the area around the buyer of the credit still has a congestion problem
- Distance makes a difference.

Group 2: Many group members agreed that credit and reimbursements should be built into the program because it is very likely that some developers may see it in their interest to build a transportation improvement that exceeds the amount of their fee and should be eligible for some form of credit or reimbursement. Specific remarks included the following:

- How about credits for local fee programs?
- Sometimes cheaper having a developer pay for structure.

Group 3: Specific remarks included the following:

- The brief discussion of credits and reimbursements resulted in consensus that they are essential to getting the cities to adopt the fee program. Without them the program has no chance to survive city approval.
- The group also discussed how this could potentially negatively affect MTA’s total distribution of funds.

4. Reductions for Redevelopment

The PAC was informed about various statutory exclusions mandated by the Congestion Mitigation Program (CMP). These would exclude the following types of new development from paying fees: 1) low and very low income housing; 2) high density residential or mixed use within quarter-mile of a rail station (i.e., transit oriented development); 3) replacement of structures destroyed by natural disasters, 4) development subject to a development agreement prior to July 10, 1989; and 5) any project or federal, state, or county agency that is exempt for local jurisdictions zoning regulations.

This policy issue, however, involves reducing or waiving the fee for new development that is being subsidized through redevelopment investments. This reduction could amount to elimination similar to the five statutory exemptions described above. Nevertheless, its intended benefit to development that would only occur with assistance from redevelopment investment may require criteria that would limit this reduction or waiver to qualified redevelopment projects.

Group 1: Many of the group members did not think that redevelopment projects should be exempt from the fee. A local jurisdiction has the discretion to waive the fee on specific projects if necessary but should be required to backfill the lost fee revenue from other sources. The group also discussed the CMP exemption for development near transit stations and many members felt there should not be an all out exemption for high density and mixed use development around rail stations, but a reduced fee amount may be acceptable. Specific remarks included the following:
• Waive the fee but replace the amount.
• There should not be exemption for high density and mixed used around rail stations- maybe reduced.
• Should be some exemptions for redevelopment- needs to be narrowly defined.
• Rail station exemptions should be expanded.
• Redevelopment should pay the transit portion.

Group 2: Many group members agreed that credit or a reduction in the fee amount should be provided but not waived completely. Specific remarks included the following:

• Give credit for encouraging Smart Growth. (not waive fee totally).
• Development area (non CRA area vs. Direct Subsidies to spur economic development (non-CRA area).
• If development project does not add trips to previous use – therefore no fee.

Group 3: Specific remarks included the following:

• Very limited discussion on this topic, in general no real negative reaction to exempting certain justified development from the adopted fee.

5. Project Eligibility

This policy issue involves how to define eligible regional improvements. It has been proposed that eligible projects would include projects on State highways, regionally-significant local arterials and transit capital improvements. For arterial projects, the use of Metro’s Countywide Significant Arterial Network has been proposed as a starting point, pending further discussions with cities. The policy issues regarding program eligibility include whether the above definition is adequate. In particular, in looking at the arterial system, the policy issue may be whether a process is needed for recommending additional regionally-significant arterials to the regional network and whether specific criteria should be used for adding regionally-significant arterials.

Group 1: Most group members expressed agreement that project eligibility should include regional arterials and state highways.

Group 2: Many group members would like to see the preliminary transportation network be accommodating to each local jurisdiction’s view of what constitutes a local project with a regional benefit. Group members were aware that a certain commitment from every jurisdiction to look beyond their borders to partner with other neighboring cities. They expressed the need to be willing to look at a lower level in terms of streets (lesser arterials) because new development may impact streets that previously would have never been considered streets for expansion. Specific remarks included the following:

• Could a neighboring city block another city from developing a transportation project simply by choosing not to do anything about it and holding a city hostage?
• How will it be handled if projects do not get built once the fee program is implemented and it shows on a project list which projects will get built?
• What is the regional network?
• LADOT - the preliminary network should not be the final network.

• CS – Should we be accommodating?

• LADOT – Combination (interchange) in network?

• Gateway – Need to look at lower level as well (not just arterials but the connector streets to the arterials.)

• LADOT – Need a certain commitment from everyone to look beyond city and look to partner with other.

• LADOT – Would a project be eligible if one city needs it, but the other adjacent city says no?

• Answer - This would need to be worked out.

• What criteria will be used to determine the radius of growth? (LADOT and Signal Hill)

• Eligibility based on impact of new development? (LADOT and Signal Hill)

• How will it be handled if projects don’t get built once the fee and project list get approved?

**Group 3:** The discussion of project eligibility was focused on how projects would be selected and the potential of project selection based on subregions versus city by city. Specific remarks included the following:

• Concerns about how cities that are close to built-out would participate with selecting projects of regional significance.

• Any project list would be overshadowed by the existing list of deficiencies in each city and subregion, making it difficult to sell.

• The example provided by WRCOG was idealistic because the public works directors that collaborated were from cities with very similar characteristics and needs.

• Los Angeles County was very different and that even within subregions there is wide variation of city characteristics, including development potential, resources and infrastructure.

**6. Regional Matching Funds and Access to Financing**

Regional funds for highway projects and the amount of funds going to future Call for Projects by mode are addressed through the Long Range Transportation Plan. This Long Range Transportation Plan is currently being updated for Metro Board action late in 2007. It is possible that in future Call for Projects processes, that a portion of the Call could be reserved for Congestion Mitigation Program matching funds. It is also possible that incentive points could be provided throughout the Call, for projects included in local jurisdiction Congestion Mitigation Programs. Opportunities to finance mitigation projects (such as the Statewide Community Infrastructure Program “SCIP”) will also be explored, as well as whether limited opportunities might exist to advance regional funding to cities through bonding mechanisms. It is also possible that if the study proceeds to the next step of working with cities to identify potential projects, that other matching funding sources may become evident from a variety of regional and local sources. As a result, it is likely that this issue will continue to evolve as the study progresses.
Group 1: Some group members felt that there are already incentives to raise local matching funds to access funding programs such as the Call-For-Projects. The impact fee would simply provide another tool to raise those matching funds. Most group members recognized that the fee program would not provide an advantage for built out areas. Specific remarks included the following:

- Eligibility or better priority with Call?
- Not an advantage for built-out areas.
- You shouldn't hurt those that can't outmatch.

Group 2: There was not much discussion about this because they felt that the regional funding is not in their area of influence.

Group 3: Limited discussion of this topic may have indicated that matching funds could be viewed as a way to force city participation. They also saw it as a way for MTA to control how the money is spent discouraging city priorities for MTA approved projects.

7. Multi-City Collaboration

This policy issue is more of an objective. Cities may find that pooling mitigation fees for use on a project of mutual benefit may result in the ability to implement a larger project that no one city could afford, and which may have more significant mobility benefits. For example, there may be instances where projects go through a number of cities and improvements would benefit all. Likewise, there may be instances where a project is in one jurisdiction, but may provide improved access to the regional system thereby providing a mutual benefit to all. Such projects would provide obvious opportunities for multi-city collaboration, and it may be desirable to establish a program policy that encourages multi-city collaboration.

Group 1: Most group members expressed agreement that multi-city collaboration should be an objective of the fee program but that there should be no requirements for such collaboration. Group members in general thought that there are already enough incentives to achieve multi-city collaborations. Specific remarks included the following:

- How could we encourage?
- We don't need additional incentive. It is already there.
- The role of the county will be important.
- Leave as an objective but don't force it.

Group 2: Most group members’ consensus was when there is money on the table it brings cities together to work on things. Another comment was made that if each city collected the fee and kept it, that they would not collaborate with others rather the city felt that they would only spend it on their local projects. Specific remarks included the following:

- When there is money on the table it brings cities together to work on things.
- If each city collected the fee and kept it, it won't spend it with other cities on regional need.
- Portion in a common pool.

Group 3: Limited discussion may have indicated that while a noble and worthwhile goal, it would be very hard to see it materialize outside of using some type of subregional mechanism.
8. Maintenance of Effort

Cities have expressed concern that if a mitigation fee program was enacted, that the Metro Board should continue to fund Board adopted regional funding commitments. At the suggestion of various cities, Guiding Principles have been drafted for Metro Board consideration in April. One of those principles addresses the issue of maintenance of effort, stating that “fees are to augment other regional funds, not replace or redirect them”.

Group 1: Members commented that cities are not receiving their fair share of funding. Thus, the status quo is inequitable and maintaining the status quo is not to any jurisdiction’s benefit. Specific remarks included the following:

- Need to establish equity (Return to source) (Tom Horne).
- We need to make sure what gets paid for gets built.

Group 2: There was not much discussion on this issue.

Group 3: Many group members were very concerned that the MTA would not live up to their obligation and use this fee to essentially pay for its misappropriation of funds. Most group members agreed that across the board including, cities, county and MTA, maintenance of effort was critical to achieve city and county buy-in. Group was looking for a mechanism to ensure the maintenance of effort was there in the end.

9. Appeals Process

It is important to define and clarify all of the possible contingencies that may arise in designing and implementing this fee program. Nevertheless, it may be helpful if there is a mechanism to address issues not anticipated in the proposed guidelines. In order to maintain consistency and assure a more fair and balanced approach to resolving future issues as they arise, a Review Panel could be proposed to arbitrate any dispute of interpretation of the Program Guidelines or help make policy when the program Guidelines are silent on any issue. The current Congestion Management Program appeal process includes a panel consisting of cities, a transit operator, regional agencies, Caltrans, and environmental and business representatives that may be a model that could be used for the Congestion Mitigation Fee program.

Group 1: Most group members recommended setting up a TAC of the subregional group that could handle the appeals process.

Group 2: There was not much discussion on this issue.

Group 3: Many group members agreed that an appeals process was mandatory and important to a workable fee program.
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Funds Availability PowerPoint on FTA Bus & Bus Facilities Discretionary Program (Section 5309)
FUNDS AVAILABILITY

FTA Bus & Bus Facilities Discretionary Program (Section 5309)
Announced March 23, 2007

$438 M available nationwide

Applications due to FTA May 22

Metro will prepare application for LA County

No blanket pre-award authority
FTA PRIORITIES

• Fleet replacement
• Fleet expansion
• New or renovation of facilities to support service increase
• Clean fuel vehicles
• Intermodal facilities
SELECTION CRITERIA

- Cost effective strategic investment
  - No other funds are available
  - Average fleet is at or close to 75% useful life or 9 yr avg for 12-yrs useful life
  - Significant impact on service delivery
SELECTION CRITERIA

- Planning/prioritization
  - Consistent with the SRTP/LRTP/local capital improvement plan
  - Local support
    - Local match commitment, letter of support from project partners or intercity bus operators
  - Demonstrated needs
  - Coordination with other transit operators
SELECTION CRITERIA

- **Readiness**
  - Environmental work initiated or completed
  - PE Completed, final design underway
  - TIP will be amended upon project award
  - Quick implementation (options available)

- **Applicant’s capacity for successful implementation**
APPLICATION PROCESS

- Distribute templates
- Request new applications by May 14
- Applications must address one or more of FTA’s priorities
- Applications to SCAG May 18 and FTA May 22
APPLICATION PROCESS

- FTA announcements by July 2007
- SCAG to amend TIP to include projects/funds awarded
- Successful applicants to submit formal application to FTA in TEAM
- FTA to award grants September 2007
NEXT STEPS

• Make application templates available on Metro’s Website or via e-mail

• Collect applications by May 14

• Application to SCAG May 18
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Letter to City Managers on FTA Bus and Bus Facilities Discretionary Grant Program
Metro

April 25, 2007

TO: CITY MANAGERS

FROM: FRANK FLORES EXECUTIVE OFFICER, PROGRAMMING AND POLICY ANALYSIS

SUBJECT: FUNDING AVAILABILITY UNDER 2007 FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION BUS AND BUS FACILITIES DISCRETIONARY GRANT PROGRAM

Copies: Planning Directors, Public Works Directors, Transportation Directors, and Municipal Operators

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) is soliciting funding applications for bus capital projects to be requested under the fiscal year 2007 Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Bus and Bus Discretionary Grant Program (FTA Section 5309). Applications are due to LACMTA by May 14, 2007 and must be submitted in electronic format to Lowreg@metro.net. Under this program, a non-federal match of 20% of the total project cost is required. Agencies submitting applications for funding should document the sources of non-federal match for their proposed project(s).

BACKGROUND

On March 23, 2007, the FTA announced that $438 million in Bus and Bus Facilities Discretionary funds are available to be awarded nationwide by September 2007. The notice describes eligible activities, eligible applicants, funding priorities, and selection criteria related to the Section 5309 grant application.

The FTA will accept only applications from designated recipients of Section 5307 formula funds. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is the designated recipient for the Los Angeles/Long Beach Urbanized Area (UZA) Section 5307 funds, and the LACMTA is the designated recipient of the Santa Clarita UZA Section 5307 funds. To comply with the FTA application process, SCAG, the FTA, and the LACMTA agreed that the LACMTA would be the lead agency in collecting and submitting the funding applications on behalf of the agencies located in the County of Los Angeles. As such, the LACMTA requests that agencies submit their request for funding, consistent with the FTA application requirements, by May 14, 2007.

APPLICATION PROCESS

Due to the limited amount of time available to coordinate and prepare a complete countywide application package, the LACMTA will make available an application
template for potential applicants to complete their individual funding requests. Funding requests must be submitted to LACMTA via e-mail at loweg@metro.net, by May 14, 2007. Only funding requests that address FTA priorities will be submitted to the FTA for funding. FTA funding priorities include: bus fleet replacement or expansion; facilities construction or rehabilitation to accommodate a new fleet of clean fuel vehicles; rural area strategic investments; purchase of clean vehicles; and intermodal terminal projects that include intercity bus providers.

Agencies requesting funding under this program must document and demonstrate that no other funds are available to fund their projects; that the project is consistent with regional and/or local planning activities or plans; that coordination has been obtained from other transit operators in the area affected by the proposed project(s); and that project funds will be obligated or the project will be implemented as soon as the funds are awarded. Agencies that are not direct recipients of FTA funds, also must demonstrate that they have the technical, legal, and financial capacity to manage and implement FTA-funded projects.

**NEXT STEPS**

Applications must be submitted electronically to the LACMTA by May 14, 2007 using the available template format attached. The application template may be downloaded from the Metro Website Projects and Programs: http://www.metro.net/projects_programs, FTA Section 5399 Discretionary Grant Program. Applications must be e-mailed to: Loweg@Metro.net.

From May 15th to May 20th, the LACMTA will enter the application requests via the FTA TEAM System using the information provided by each agency. Late or incomplete applications will not be submitted to the FTA. Applications received after May 14, 2007 will not be considered. After the LACMTA completes the application submission to the FTA, the LACMTA will inform agencies of the status of their applications.

The FTA expects to announce funding awards by July 2007. Funds may be awarded for the full amount requested or for a portion of the requested amount. Upon FTA award, each successful applicant will be responsible for following up with the FTA to obtain a grant contract. Successful agencies that are not FTA direct recipients may request the LACMTA to act as a pass-through grantee. For this service, the LACMTA requires an administrative fee of up to 5% of the federal award.

If you have any questions or require additional information related to this announcement, please contact Gladys Lowe at 213-922-2459 or via e-mail at loweg@metro.net.

**Attachment**

cc: Wayne Moore, SCAG
    Karin Tellis, FHWA/FTA Los Angeles Metro Office
APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION SECTION 5309 BUS AND BUS FACILITIES DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2007

Please complete and submit application by May 18, 2007 via e-mail to Gladys Lowe at Loweg@metro.net. Late applications will not be accepted.

Fill out the information as requested.

PART A. AGENCY INFORMATION

AGENCY NAME:

FTA Grantee ID Number:

Point of Contact:

Please briefly describe your agency and the services provided. Include city boundaries, areas served, etc.

Enter the Congressional Districts affected by your proposed project:
PART B. PROJECT INFORMATION (Include a separate Part B for each project as needed)

Project Title:

Select below FTA priority being addressed:

- Fleet replacement needs that cannot be met with formula funds
- Fleet expansion to allow for significant service increase and/or efficiency of operations
- Facility construction/renovation that supports increased service or introduction of clean fuels
- Strategic investments in rural areas where formula funding is inadequate
- Purchase of clean fuel vehicles
- Intermodal terminal projects that include intercity bus providers
- Other. Explain.

Project Description:

Describe service level, fleet age, fleet size, spare ratio, and planned service changes or other reasons that would support your request for funds. Demonstrate the need for applying for replacement or expansion vehicles and facilities, including projected ridership increases, service enhancements or modernization, and operating costs and revenues. For bus projects provide vehicle type, accessibility, fuel type, length, and useful life. Include reasons why this project cannot be funded with formula funds. Describe existing resources and whether SAFTEA-LU funds were received for the project.

Project Readiness:

Describe the environmental compliance activities underway or completed if applying for a construction project. Describe the procurement process to be undertaken or if a contract option would be executed. Indicate if the base contract was procured following FTA guidelines and if the options, if included, were evaluated as part of the base contract. Indicate any other pre-development or planning activities completed to date. Provide statement that project can be obligated and implemented immediately if selected.

Identify sources and amount of local match or overmatch:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract Award</td>
<td>Indicate if multiple contracts will be issued.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA Clearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Information:
You may include attachments to support your request, such as drawings, maps, letters of support from other transit operators, etc.

Please list attachments here and e-mail your attachments together with the complete application to loweg@metro.net. Attachments could be mailed as PDF, or MSWord.