Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Union Station Conference ROOM

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

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

3. Consent Calendar
   Action/Concurrence
   • Approval of Minutes
   Attachment 3: Draft May 2, 2007 Minutes
   Attachment 4: Draft May 9, 2007 Minutes

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

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

6. Proposition A Incentive Mini Call – Funding Recommendations
   Action
   10 min
   (Jay Fuhrman)

7. SCRRRA Annual Work Program
   Information/Possible Action
   10 min
   (Patricia Chen)
8. 2005/2006 Project Extension Status Reports
   Attachment 5: Extension Status Reports
   Projects List
   20 minutes

9. Timed Agenda 10:15AM:
   Call for Projects Deobligation Appeals
   Attachment 6: TAC Protocol
   Attachment 7: Recommended Project
   Deobligations
   90 minutes

10. 2007 Call for Projects
    Attachment 8: Memo to TAC - Sponsor
    Appeals and TAC Recommendations
    10 min

11. STIP Augmentation – Transit Capital
    10 min

12. Long Range Transportation Plan
    5 min

13. Countywide Congestion Mitigation Fee
    Feasibility Study
    5 min

    5 min

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 July 11, 2007 at 9:30 a.m. in
the Union Station Room.

** Budget Workshop**
June 6, 2007 at 1:30 p.m. in the Union Station Room
Attachment 1

Subcommittee May 2007 Agendas

- Bus Operations
- Local Transit Systems
- Streets and Freeways
- TDM/Air Quality
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Windsor Conference Room — 15th Floor

1. Call to Order
   1 minute

2. Approval of April 17, 2007 Minutes
   1 minute

3. Chair’s Report
   5 Minutes

4. Legislative Report
   15 minutes

5. Metro Fare Change Proposals
   10 minutes

6. Prop A Incentive Mini Call Update
   10 minutes

7. FY08 Funding Marks
   10 minutes

8. 15% & 1% Allocation
   90 minutes

9. New Business

10. Adjournment

Action
Dana Lee

Action
BOS

information
Dana Lee

Information
Raffi Hamparian/Marisa Yeager/
Michael Turner

Information
Michelle Caldwell - Metro

Information
Armineh Saint/Jay Fuhrman

Information/Discussion
Nalini Ahuja

Action
BOS
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, June 19, 2007 at 9:30 am in the Windsor Conference Room, 15th Floor of the Gateway Building.

REMINDER: IF YOU ARE PLANNING ON ATTENDING THE BOS/LTSS CALL FOR PROJECTS DISCUSSION AT 1:30, PLEASE BRING YOUR RAINBOW REPORT WITH YOU (MAILED 5/4/07). THERE WILL BE ONLY A LIMITED NUMBER OF COPIES AVAILABLE AT THE MEETING. THANK YOU.
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE

Gateway Plaza Room - 3rd Floor

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes - April 26, 2007
   (Attachment #1)

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

4. Prop. A Incentive Fundmarks for FY '08
   (to be handed out at meeting)

5. LACMTA Deficit Management Plan

6. TAC Call for Projects Appeals Process

7. ASI Update

8. CALACT Spring Conference

9. New Business

10. Adjournment

Action
Joyce Rooney, Chair

Action
Joyce Rooney

Approve
Jay Fuhrman, Metro

Approve
Susan Richan, Metro

Discussion
Joyce Rooney

Information
Joyce Rooney

Information
Arun Prem/Jano Baghdanian

Information
Thomas Uswal

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

2. Approval of Minutes
   Attachment 1: Draft April 19, 2007 Minutes
   1 min

3. Chairperson Report
   5 min

4. Metro Report
   5 min

5. Caltrans Report
   5 min

6. Status Reports on Extended Lapsing projects:
   I-710 Firestone, South Gate, ESGV SOM, LACDPW,
   Sepulveda – Lincoln to Centinela, City of LA
   15 min

7. Discussion, Review and Comment on:
   Draft 2007 Call for Projects Rainbow Report
   60 min

8. New Business
   5 min

9. Adjournment
   1 min

Action (SharonPerlstein)

Action (Subcommittee)

Information (Sharon Perlstein)

Information (Randy Lamm)

Information (Kirk Cessna)

Update (Agency Staff)

Discussion (Heather Hills,
Modal Leads)

Discussion (Subcommittee)

Action (Subcommittee)
The next meeting of the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee will be held on June 21, 2007 at 9:30 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 May 2007 Subcommittee Actions

Bus Operation Subcommittee:

May 15, 2007 meeting

A motion was approved that should the actual 5307 15% allocation be more than the anticipated amount of $27,173,237, Metro's Priority 2 project (Union Station) will be funded up to $2 Million dollars. Any excess funds remaining after funding Metro's Priority 2 project will be allocated to agencies according to a percentage of funds received, with the exception of Beach Cities. If the anticipated 5307 15% allocation is less that $27,173,237, then all agency amounts will be reduced by the percentage of funds received with the exception of Metro's Priority 1 project.

Due to a remaining balance of TE 1% funds, BOS will be considering another round of applications at the June 19 meeting. All applications for TE 1% funds are due to lcornejo@cityofmontebello.com by Tuesday, May 29 at 5pm.

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:

May 31, 2007 meeting

N/A

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:

May 17, 2007 meeting

A motion was approved to receive and file the Metro modal leads oral reports on the 2007 Call for Projects Rainbow report grading process.

TDM/Air Quality Subcommittee:

May 9, 2007 meeting

A motion was approved to accept the staff recommendations on TDM modal category.
Attachment 3

Draft May 2, 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 April 17th;
   - Discussed:
     - FTA funding on Bus and Bus Facilities Discretionary Grant Program;
     - Logistics for applying for the program;
   - Agreed on priorities for distribution of FY 08 15% Capital Discretionary Fund which will be allocated during the BOS meeting in May;
   - Received first draft of FY 08 Funding Marks which did not include any capital funding marks;
   - Next meeting is May 15th.

   LTSS (Joyce Rooney)
   - Last met on April 26th;
   - Received information on:
     - FTA funding on Bus and Bus Facilities Discretionary Grant Program;
     - Upcoming joint meeting with BOS on May 15th to review 2007 Call for Projects Rainbow report on Transit Capital mode;
   - Discussed:
     - Deficit Management Plan with emphasis on fare increase for seniors and disabled;
     - Concern regarding 300% increase for seniors and disabled;
     - Proposition A Incentive Reserve Funding Marks for FY 08;
• Recommended:
  - Cities who subsidize to consider changes in subsidies;
  - Cities to inform their Senior and Disabled Advisory committees and communities of
    the upcoming rate increase;
• Jay Fuhrman provided LTSS with a draft Mini Call report;
• Next meeting is May 24th.

Streets and Freeways (Sharon Perlstein)
• Last met on April 19th;
• Presentation by Caltrans on FHWA Delegation on NEPA Environmental Approval;
• Updates on:
  - Goods Movement efforts;
  - CMP Nexus Study;
• Report on:
  - Routes 57/60 Interchange Improvement Feasibility study;
• Next meeting is May 17th.

TDM/AQ (Robert Newman)
• Did not meet in April;
• Next meeting is May 9th.

3. Consent Calendar (Renee Berlin)

The Consent Calendar was approved on a motion by Joyce Rooney and seconded by Greg
Herrmann (League of California Cities - Arroyo Verdugo Cities). Steve Huang (League of
California Cities - South Bay Cities) and David Liu (League of California Cities - San Gabriel
Valley) abstained.

4. Chairperson’s Report (Renee Berlin)

Ms. Berlin wanted to call attention to Attachment 4 of the Agenda which includes the TAC
Appeals Protocols Guidelines on the roles and responsibilities of TAC members during the
2007 Call for Projects Appeal process.

Ms. Berlin welcomed new TAC members:
• Robert Brager representing League of California Cities - Las Virgenes Malibu COG;
• Dennis Kobata is the new BOS alternate member for David Reyno;
• Marianne Kim became the primary member representing the Automobile Club of
  California with Stephen Finnegan as the alternate;
• Special TAC meeting next Wednesday (May 9th) at 9:30 a.m. to review the 2007 Call for
  Projects Rainbow report;
• May 24th is the Metro Fare Hearing with the Board adopting a new fare structure after
  the hearing. Michelle Caldwell will be discussing that later in the meeting;
• Robin Blair has been promoted to Director of Central Area Team and Alan Patashnick
  has been promoted to Director of South Bay Area Team;
• K.N. Murthy, a senior Vice President of PBQ&D has been named Metro’s new Deputy
  Chief Capital Management Officer;
• The Budget Workshop for TAC and Subcommittees will be held on June 6th in the Union Station Room at 1:30 PM;
• U.S. DOT has announced the creation of the National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission, which was authorized by SAFETEA-LU. This is different from the 1999 Commission. This Commission was established to study highway and transit finance and develop recommendations within two years of its first meeting. It will specifically examine and make recommendations on the Highway Trust Fund and transit needs and revenues.

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

Mr. Hamparian discussed three topics. The first is the President’s veto on the War Spending Bill, and today the House will vote to override the President’s veto. The issue became palpable when James Oberstar said it will hurt air quality, because 4.5% of spending from SAFETEA-LU represents CMAQ funding. The Authorization Bill for Transportation sets priorities for states and creates funding formulas. The Chairman’s staff is trying to craft language to address the issue with respect to CMAQ.

The second topic is the Appropriations’ schedule. The Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee has set mid-May as a date of departure for work on the 10 Appropriations bills. He hopes to have all the hearing and markups completed by June with a hard deadline of July 4th.

The third item is that the House Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee had a hearing two weeks ago. Two individuals testified: Richard Capka (head of FHWA) and Simpson (head of FTA). Congresswoman Alicia Velarde stated that Los Angeles spends a large amount of state and local money on rail (63%) and what is the federal government’s plan to compensate? Ms. Velarde reminded the FHWA head, Mr. Capka, that he personally has a responsibility to deliver a response to the federal government on how they will reduce the diminishment in air quality. Finally, the Chairman of the Committee, John Goldberg, asked Mr. Capka about the funding shortfall that will occur with the Highway Trust Fund. Mr. Capka originally stated he had a plan, but then later stated he didn’t have specifics of a plan.

State Update (Michael Turner, Metro)

Mr. Turner discussed the State budget, general legislation and legislation to implement the Infrastructure Bond. With regard to the State Budget, a few weeks ago, there were reports regarding the status of the State Budget deficit, with a downward trend in the deficit close to $6 billion. There should be more solid information on May 14th when the Governor makes or changes recommendations from his January proposal. One factor that complicated this is the recent incident with the bridge in Northern California. There is $627 million in spillover revenue that looks like extra money to transit agencies and may be used to deal with the bridge in Northern California. With respect to legislation, there were 10 bills brought to the Metro Board this past month. Metro is focusing on the set of bills to implement the Bond. With respect to Goods Movement, there is a series of bills. Assembly Member Karnette has AB 1209, Senator Lowenthal has SB 9 and SB 19, and Assembly Member Nava has AB 995.
There are a number of other proposals on how to deal with the money. Metro's focus will be to ensure an equitable formula is adopted based on cargo volume since the growth and congestion is in Los Angeles. The State and Local Partnership portion of the Bond is $1 billion with a one to one match for local funds. Metro wants the program to be limited to sales tax as the local share. The Bill Metro is most concerned with is AB 1351 by Assembly Member Levine. There is $3.6 billion for transit that is allocated on the STA formula; the Speaker has a bill, AB 8901 that puts into place a way for the State to manage an allocation process through Caltrans with minimal involvement by the CTC. The final is with respect to transit security: one by Senator Parada and another by the Speaker and Assembly Member Richardson (AB 1350) which is $1 billion for transit security and disaster preparedness.

Mr. Turner stated that at the previous TAC meeting, Mr. DeChellis asked about AB 8992, which was the Bill by Assembly Member Brownley that would address the requirement for agencies to deal with storm water runoff issues. This bill has been put off until next year.

John Drayton (Metro) asked if there was any news on SB 650. Mr. Turner said SB 650 is a Bill that allows for the operation of 65 foot buses on dedicated Rights-of-Way. The Metro Orange Line and SR-15 are the only transit lines for which 65 foot buses would apply. This Bill addresses Metro's desire to run a longer bus on the Metro Orange Line to deal with high ridership volume.

6. Metro Fare Restructure (Michelle Caldwell, Metro)

Ms. Caldwell directed TAC member to Attachment 5 of the Agenda. Metro distributed a letter regarding its decision for the proposed fare restructure. On May 24th, the Metro Board will hold a hearing and take action on a two-phase fare restructuring. The first restructure is on July 1, 2007, and the second on January 1, 2009. An additional fare change is proposed in FY 2011, but Metro does not have the structure for the increase. These three fare changes will resolve Metro's structural deficit within five years, with a 38% fare box recovery ratio. With annual CPI fare changes, Metro will be able to operate solely on Formula Allocation Program (FAP) funds and fare box revenues. Metro staff has run 15 scenarios into a 10-year Deficit Reduction model. The model allows for a wide range of parameters to be modified, such as cutting service and cutting costs.

Metro originally tried to solve the deficit within three years, but the fare changes were too severe and too fast. This proposal will solve the structural deficit within five years.

Ms. Caldwell anticipates the Board will modify staff's proposal on May 24th with a modified proposal. She stated that Metro CEO Roger Soble will meet with Board members to review the staff proposals in preparation for the May 24th hearings. Metro staff is conducting Fare Forums at the Sector Governance Councils to obtain feedbacks. This feedback will be recorded by a court reporter and transcribed into the record at the May 24th Fare Hearing.

Metro has completed the first draft of the FY 08 Budget with some changes in the financial situation from last summer. Metro has decreased expenses by $12.5 million over the Ten-Year Forecast, and improved revenues by $20 million. This is because the FY 06 actuals were greater than that of the 10 Year-Forecast. Currently, Metro is looking at a deficit of $70 million, which is an improvement over the 10-Year Forecast of $104 million.
Metro will bring the Budget to the Board in June, instead of May. The documents are being prepared and the Budget will be left unbalanced. After May 24th fare restructuring decision, staff will complete the Board report and fill in the blanks in additional revenues to be budgeted for FY 08.

Magan Champaneria (City of Los Angeles) asked if there are criteria for restructuring the fare. Ms. Caldwell commented that the last time Metro raised its fares was in 1988. Metro staff used fare multiples upon which to base the fare increase. In other words, staff looked at the number of rides per pass, starting with the base fare and kept multiples. Regarding seniors and physically disabled, staff used Federal Guidelines of 50% of the other pass prices. Student fare increases are also based on the number of rides also.

Jim Lefton (City of Los Angeles) asked if Metro is looking to use service cuts or primarily fare changes to solve the deficit. Ms. Caldwell responded that the Five-Year Plan has a service reduction of 447,000 hours over the five-year period. Mr. Lefton asked if staff has estimated ridership loss and what elasticity is assumed? Ms. Caldwell said the Model includes a 4% reduction in ridership for every 10% fare increase. Mr. Lefton asked the estimated ridership loss? Ms. Caldwell did not have the number on hand. She added that the Model is very conservative, and in past, Metro usually gains back ridership in the following few months.

Mike Uyeno (City of Los Angeles) asked if the $70 million deficit is after the first round of fare changes. Ms. Caldwell stated the $70 million is before any fare restructuring. Ms. Caldwell added that when she ran the Models, she did not assume fare increases, backfilling with Proposition C 40%, or that the deficit is resolved. Mr. Uyeno asked if Metro will be in a deficit situation after the first round of fare changes. Ms. Caldwell said yes. Mr. Uyeno asked how Metro will cover that? Ms. Caldwell stated the Five-Year Deficit Strategy includes the use of fund balances, and this year Metro has begun receiving CNG tax credits in the amount of $1.7 million a month. These types of revenues will be used to backfill each year until the 38% is achieved. Mr. Uyeno wanted to confirm that the structural deficit is handled by limited time revenues? Ms. Caldwell stated it's a combination of service reduction, expense reduction, fare increases and the use of one time revenues.

Jano Baghdanian (LTSS) asked if some of the Metro contracting lines are still being analyzed. Ms. Caldwell stated it should happen in three years, and is highly unlikely that those at the Union will consider additional service contracts. He added that cities will be under tremendous pressure to provide additional subsidies to account for the fare changes. Ms. Caldwell commented that a portion of Metro Connections envisions reducing or eliminating service on non-productive lines.

Ellen Blackman (Citizen Representative on ADA) asked if Metro expects much of an impact by increasing the age at which a senior becomes eligible for a pass, and if it will have an impact on the Municipals? Ms. Caldwell stated it is difficult to know since Metro does not know how many times they use the pass; the change to age 65 is to be more consistent with other agencies and providers, such as LADOT.

Ms. Rooney asked about the impact on Access Services, Inc. (ASI) services? Ms. Caldwell stated that if you qualify, it will be your first choice. No Model was run to account for how
many senior, elderly and disabled riders would leave Metro for ASI. Ms. Caldwell could not answer the question from a financial standpoint.

Abdollah Ansari (City of Long Beach) commented that a transit dependent family would have an additional financial burden of about $100 dollars a month versus senior, disabled and Medicare of $20-25 a month. He asked if there was a study to support the increase in the Student's category. Ms. Caldwell stated the increase was aligned with the fares of other cities similar to Los Angeles. She added that Metro has no way to know the economic status of riders, other than through verbal surveys. Mr. Ansari commented that some of the other categories are cheap and boosting those areas would compensate for the increase in this specific area. Ms. Caldwell commented that she would be surprised if the proposal in that category is adopted by the Board.

Ms. Caldwell commented that Mr. Snoble believes that a fare increase is a better option than having poor services and people will pay more money for better, more reliable service.

David Feinberg (League of California Cities – Westside Cities COG) asked if Ms. Caldwell had the number for the rides on a monthly pass. Ms. Caldwell said it was 110.

7. CTC/Infrastructure Bonds (Tim Papandreou, Metro)

Mr. Papandreou reported that the CTC met in San Luis Obispo on April 25th and 26th. There were five key items covered: the Corridor Mobility Improvement Program, the Southern California Hearing for the 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Augmentation Funding, updates on the Draft Assumptions for 2008 STIP Fund Estimate, and some issues with the Regional Transportation Plans (RTP) trying to incorporate AB 32.

At the February 28th meeting, the CTC approved $1.19 billion in Proposition 1B Corridor Mobility Improvement Program and a following resolution stating everyone who applied needs to have a Fact and Fund sheet. Two weeks ago, John Barna, the CTC Executive Director, said he wouldn't sign the agreements since the discrepancies between the original application data and the subsequent "Project Scope, Cost, Schedule and Benefits Baseline Data Forms". Metro found the Fact and Fund sheets submitted in the February applications changed from those submitted in March. Larry Zarian, CTC Commissioner, Roger Snoble and Doug Failing, Caltrans District 7 Director, spoke with Barna to discuss the issues.

Metro Countywide Planning staff presented testimony in support of Metro's $477.4 million Los Angeles County 2006 STIP Augmentation submittal. This was broken down into three parts: $238.2 million for State Highway Account eligible projects, $106.5 million for PTA eligible and an advance amount of $132.7 million for additional PTA eligible projects above the County share should these funds become available. Metro's submittal included the I-5 North, the I-10 projects, I-710 Early Action Project, high ranking Transit Capital projects from the 2007 Call for Projects, the Extension of the Exposition Line to Santa Monica, the Crenshaw Corridor Study, and the Metro Light Rail Vehicle Expansion and Rehabilitation Program. The CTC staff recommendations should be released by May 18th with adoption at the June CTC meeting.

Mr. Papandreou commented there is some overview from David Brewer (CTC staff) as to where they are adding to the funding. He stated the State Highway Account funds have
been oversubscribed and the PTA funds have been undersubscribed. Agencies like Metro who applied for more PTA funding looks favorable. He added that the PTA funds are oversubscribed in the first two years of the STIP cycle, requiring shifting funds to the later years.

The CTC and Caltrans staff presented draft assumptions for the FY 08 Fund Estimate. Mr. Papandreou said there was no money. The key difference in this Fund Estimate is that all State Highway Account funds will be dedicated to the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP). Mr. Papandreou said the State Highway account money needs to go to the SHOPP. He added that most of the funding to deal with the bridge collapse in Northern California will come from SHOPP Emergency Reserves. Mr. Papandreou said they are assuming the PTA Spillover revenues will stay and won’t be cut and that Home to School Programs will not be funded with PTA funds. The CTC has recommended eliminating the Spillover. The Fund Estimate assumptions will be adopted at the June CTC meeting and in July a draft Fund Estimate will be released with adoption scheduled for August.

Caltrans’ Division of Planning will develop a framework to look at the areas of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) guidelines that need to be revised to incorporate the goals, visions and intent of the AB 32 Global Warming Solutions Act that became law in January 2007. The RTP guidelines have not been updated since 1999, with only a supplement in 2003. There is a working group trying to find ways to reform the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process. The end goal is to have consistency throughout the State in regards to the RTP guidelines. According to the Division of Planning and the CTC, they are hoping to accomplish this in the next 24 months, but the Attorney General says it needs to be done now. The Attorney General is calling on all RTPA’s to make a genuine effort to incorporate greenhouse gas emissions reduction strategies as part of their plans.

On the Infrastructure Bond side, the Trade Corridors Working Group is still meeting. In terms of CTC allocations, there was a $9 million allocation for the Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) funds for the San Fernando Valley North-South project. Metro is working on the environmental clearance of the extension of the Orange Line along the Canoga Right-of-Way. As part of this study, Metro is working with the City of Los Angeles to identify other corridors that may benefit from transit improvements such Sepulveda, Lankershim and Reseda Boulevards as possibly candidates; the study is anticipated to be completed in February 2008.

The City of Los Angeles had the Taylor Yard Bike Path project allocated. The Cities of San Gabriel and Santa Monica are scheduled to award their contracts by their extended deadline; the City of Calabasas should have already awarded their contract as of April 30th.

Mr. Papandreou stated the Commission is requiring performance measures and criteria for STIP submittals. There are 12 different outcomes of measurement they are expecting to see and although they are not requiring all 12, at least one should be examined. The Commission wants to see a mini summary of benefits with the allocations and commented that the Call for Projects requirements is more stringent than this. Any allocation requests require this starting July. The list of outputs will be sent to Ms. Pan for distribution to TAC members when it's ready.
The Self Help counties focused its discussion on the State and Local Partnership Program. He reported that there are issues with agreement on eligible matching funds. Currently, Metro's position is to limit projects to a minimum of $20 million and only to counties that have passed sales taxes for transportation improvements. The Group agreed to set the program for FY 2011. The disagreement is over whether to allow toll revenues to be eligible as part of a project sponsor's match. Mr. Papandreou anticipates Metro having a more defined position by the next Self Help Counties meeting.

Marianne Kim (Automobile Club of California) asked in regards to the Trade Corridor Working Groups, when the guidelines will be ready. Mr. Papandreou stated they were looking to have guidelines for the 2008 programming cycle and should be done with a draft by July 2007.

Evyonne Sells (South Coast Air quality Management District) asked a question regarding AB 32 and SAFETEA-LU? Mr. Papandreou stated AB 32 is the Global Warming Solutions Act and SAFETEA-LU provisions require RTP to address this issue.

8. SCAG RTP/RTIP SAFETEA-LU (David Rubinow, Southern California Association of Governments)

Mr. Rubinow stated that for SAFETEA-LU, SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) must be in compliance with all new requirements by July 1st. SCAG completed a Gap Analysis for the RTP and RTIP to determine where SCAG is in terms of the new SAFETEA-LU guidelines and what needs to be done to address any deficiencies. The RTP Gap Analysis was adopted by the Regional Council in March and the RTIP in April. The Gap Analysis documents were submitted to FHWA as Administrative Amendments to the respective plans and have not yet been approved; however, informal feedback has been received from FHWA that SCAG should be able to continue to file formal RTIP amendments after July 1st.

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

Ms. Hill stated that Metro is on schedule to mail and release staff's Preliminary Recommendations for the 2007 Call for Projects, also known as the Rainbow Report on Friday May 4, 2007; it is also being posted online on May 7th at 8:00 AM. There is a special TAC meeting on May 9th to review the recommendations. The timed appeals are scheduled for May 21, 22nd and possibly the 23rd. Ms. Berlin added that the Call for Projects is a zero sum gain and that all the money has been programmed, therefore if TAC were to recommend funding for a project below the line, funding would have to come from a project above the line.

Mr. Uyeno asked if Metro staff was able to program all the money in Transportation Demand Management (TDM) mode. Ms. Berlin responded that he will find out on Monday, May 7th when staff's Preliminary Recommendations are made public. Ms. Hills stated the Board approved the modal marks, total fund estimate and the supplemental funding marks at their April 2007 meeting. All 2007 Call for Projects Board reports since initiating the Call in August 2006 are available online.
Ms. Berlin added that at the end of each appeal day, motions and comments will be collected and by the next day, they will be available for review. Later that week, staff will be meeting to develop responses to TAC motions. At the June 6th TAC meeting, staff will provide responses to TAC motions. Starting July, TAC will be meeting on the second Wednesday of the month. At June 6th TAC meeting, TAC will also hear appeals for projects that are subject to deobligation as of June 30, 2007.

Ms. Hills reminded TAC that they must elect a member to represent TAC at the June Planning and Programming Committee for the Call for Projects Board Workshop.

Norman Emerson (Emerson and Associates) asked if the Rainbow report could be posted online on Friday, May 4th. Ms. Hills responded that staff’s Preliminary Recommendations are made public by 8:00 am Monday May 7th.

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

Ms. Hill stated Metro staff was scheduled to present its recommendations to the Board in the spring. It was noted that earlier in the TAC meeting Ms. Caldwell had informed the TAC of a public hearing in May 24, 2007 regarding Metro’s proposed fare changes. As Metro’s fare box recovery is a major financial assumption in the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Baseline that was presented and approved by the Metro Board in February 2007, the release date will most likely slip at this point. Metro staff must wait until a decision is made by the Board regarding the fare in order to proceed with the plan update.

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

Mr. Calix directed TAC members to Attachment 6 of the Agenda. They should find the latest Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting summary as well as Break Out Session Summaries. At the last two PAC meetings, Metro staff asked member to review the Guiding Principals. From then smaller groups were formed to obtain more input. The comments and feedback have been folded into the Guiding Principles currently being developed. Mr. Calix anticipates completing a draft of the Program Guidelines within the next three to six months to be distributed to PAC, TAC, cities and counties.

Mr. Calix informed TAC that at the last PAC meeting, Rick Bishop from the Western Riverside Council of Governments presented an overview of their program. They have collected over $100 million every year over the past four years. With these funds, they have built 14 projects and have another 20-39 in development and even more planned. Mr. Calix will send the PowerPoint presentation to Ms. Pan for distribution to interested TAC members. Bob McCleary from Contra Costa Transportation Authority also came to PAC to provide an overview. Both organizations have sub-regional programs in place as they work best for their respective areas.

LaDonna DiCamillo (Goods Movement Representative) asked if the PAC knows whether development fees create incentives for warehousing outside of the County. She added that Western Riverside has a development fee, but how does the fee apply to warehouses and goods coming from the Port and if it will create an incentive? Mr. Calix stated that the PAC is looking at all land uses, which includes some exclusion in the Guiding Principals. Some exclusions include government buildings and low income housing. In terms of incentives
for warehousing outside of the County, it has not been addressed at all. Ms. DiCamillo stated that you want the warehouses as close to the port as possible; Mr. Calix confirmed. Mr. Calix said he will discuss the issue with Metro’s consultant.

Ms. Hills informed TAC that the City of Industry has come into conformance with the Congestion Management Program (CMP).

12. FTA Section 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities Discretionary Program (Gladys Lowe, Metro)

Ms. Lowe wanted to emphasize that under the FTA Section 5309 program, there is $438 million available nationwide. Metro will be submitting the application on behalf of the Los Angeles County’s operators whose deadline for submission to Metro is May 14th. Metro is planning to submit the application package to SCAG on May 18th and to the FTA on or before May 22nd. Ms. Lowe added that a 20% match is required and certain priorities need to be addressed.

Mr. Uyeno asked if she recommended applying for projects that the City applied under the 2007 Call for Projects. Ms. Lowe stated that the City should wait until May 7th for the release of the Rainbow report before submitting the application for FTA Section 5309 program.

Mr. Lefton asked if there is a timeframe in which the money has to be spent? Ms. Lowe stated the projects have to be ready for obligation within a short period of time. The FTA anticipates awarding funds by September. One of the criteria for award is having a project ready-to-go.

Mr. Uyeno asked if it would be better from the region’s perspective to submit the best projects and take the money in pocket to distribute to the second tier projects. Ms. Lowe said that with the current timeframe, the planning is not feasible.

Ms. Berlin commented that sponsors may know what is in the Rainbow report on May 7th, but the Board is not acting on the Call until July. Mr. Uyeno said that they should submit everything and if funded in both categories, the funding will be given back to Metro to redistribute. Ms. Berlin and Ms. Lowe commented that the decision is up to individual sponsors.

Mary Lou Williams (Southern California Regional Rail Authority [SCRRA]) pointed out that on the application the deadline is May 18th. Ms. Lowe stated that was an error and the correct due date is May 14th to Metro. Ms. Lowe added that sponsors should use the template application, since applications need to be uploaded and compiled.

Mr. Baghdanian asked what Metro expects regarding answers to questions and attaching additional pages? Ms. Lowe stated that to address only what the FTA wants to see and to be brief and concise. Maps and letters of commitment would be an attachment.

Ms. Lowe said the FTA will most likely announce awards at the end of July and those projects awarded funding will be incorporated into the RTIP for approval into the FTIP sometime in August. Agencies that are awarded need to submit an application to the FTA for their own projects. Metro will not submit applications unless the agency is not a direct recipient of 5307 funds and only upon request by the agency.
13. Federal Urban Partnership Initiative (Gladys Lowe, Metro)

On April 30th, Metro submitted its Urban Partnership application and an application for funding under the ITS Program and Value Pilot Pricing Program. Ms. Lowe wanted to express thanks to all counties, cities, the Ports and everyone contacted. She anticipates hearing from the USDOT in June.

Ms. Berlin asked what kind of projects Metro submitted. Ms. Lowe said the majority of the submittals were technology for management of Freeways and Corridors. Metro also submitted a minor amount for a Value Pricing pilot project.

14. New Business

There was no new business.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m. A Special TAC meeting to review the 2007 Call for Projects Rainbow report will be held on May 9, 2007 in the Union Station Conference Room on the 3rd Floor, at 9:30 a.m.
# TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Sign in Sheet**

**May 2, 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>1. Marianne Kim/ Stephen Finnegan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (BOS)</td>
<td>1. Dana E. Rea/ Susan Lipman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. David Reyno/ Dennis Kobata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>1. Raja Mitwasi / Alberto Angelini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rose Casey/ Kirk Cegina</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. Abdullah Ansari/ Semi Gent</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>1. Mark Herwick/Clement Lau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Paul Maselbas/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>1. Greg Herrmann/Caitlin Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td>2. Desi Alvarez/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities COG</td>
<td>3. Robert Brager/Tom Gdala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes Malibu COG</td>
<td>4. Tom Horne/Mark Boziljan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td>5. David Liu /Dan Rix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
<td>6. Steven Huang/Victor Rollinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td>7. David Feinberg/Sharon Perlstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Cities COG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Name</td>
<td>Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE (LTSS) | 1. Pedro Bagadanian/Thomas Uwal  
2. Joyce Rooney/Bertha Tafoya |
| METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (Metro) | 1. Renee Berlin  
Renee Berlin/Fanny Pan  
Countywide Planning & Development  
2. John Drayton/Christopher Gallancs  
Metro Operations |
| SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY (SCRRA - Ex-Officio) | 1. Steve Lantz/Joanna Capelle |
| SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SCAQMD -- Ex-Officio) | 1. Mary Sells/Kathryn Higgins |
| SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG -- Ex-Officio) | 1. David Rubino/Annie Nam |
| GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio) | 1. LaDonna DiCamillo/Ron Guss |
| TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/AIR QUALITY SUBCOMMITTEE | 1. Mark Yamamoto/Phil Aker  
2. Robert Newman/Brooke Geer Person |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Bowman</td>
<td>city of mohawk</td>
<td>213 923-4459</td>
<td><a href="mailto:courage@metro.net">courage@metro.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladys Lane</td>
<td>arts</td>
<td>213 923-4459</td>
<td><a href="mailto:courage@metro.net">courage@metro.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Bellaere</td>
<td>city council</td>
<td>805 274-6856</td>
<td>jbellano@willowcom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Bice</td>
<td>metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Bowman</td>
<td>city council</td>
<td>(310) 956-2487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Matalanka</td>
<td>metro</td>
<td>(213) 222-3080</td>
<td><a href="mailto:petermikelkar@gmail.com">petermikelkar@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Kimm/Stephen Finnegan (A)</td>
<td>AUTO CLUB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Lee/Susan Ligman (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Reyno/Dennis Kobata (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl/Steve Webb/Joe Vizcarra (A)</td>
<td>CHP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raja Milwasi/Alberto Angleini</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Casey/Kirk Cass (A)</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>Warning!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Whitbread (A)</td>
<td>CITIZEN REP ON ADA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdollah Ansari/Humayun Gant (A)</td>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Leffon/David Reppinski (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haripal Var/Mike Uyeno (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gine Machia/Ron Oliver (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Herrick/Clarence Lai (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Masabias/Maged E-Rabaay (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick DeChallie/Shahr Afman (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Gonsalves/Cathy Cole (A)</td>
<td>ARROYO VERDUGO CITIES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desi Alvarez/Liza Rapo (A)</td>
<td>GATEWAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>Warning!</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Brager/Tim Golda (A)</td>
<td>LAS VIRGENES MALIBU COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMA Home/Mark Bogdan (A)</td>
<td>NORTH L.A. COUNTY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hsu/Dan Rix (A)</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL VALLEY COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Hudek/Victor Rollinger (A)</td>
<td>SOUTH BAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Feinberg/Art Iida (A)</td>
<td>WEST SIDE CITIES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jana Baghianian/Thomas Iwai (A)</td>
<td>LSS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Rooney/Bertita Talaya (A)</td>
<td>LSS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee Berillo/Fanny Pan (A)</td>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Drayton/Christopher Gallines (A)</td>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Lantz/Janine Capple (A)</td>
<td>SCCR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanna Snell/Kathryn Higgins (A)</td>
<td>SCQMD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Rupinow/Annie Hahn (A)</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaDonna O'Cinato/Ron Guza (A)</td>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Yamamoto/Phil Aker (A)</td>
<td>TDMAQ SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Newman/Brooke Gearerson (A)</td>
<td>TDMAQ SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SPECIAL MEETING – 2007 CALL FOR
PROJECTS PRELIMINARY STAFF
RECOMMENDATIONS

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. Chairperson’s Report (Renee Berlin, Metro)

Ms. Berlin announced that the purpose of today’s special meeting was to provide general overview of the 2007 Call for Projects Rainbow report. She further announced that individual project scores will not be discussed. Specific questions/comments on the projects will be handled on May 21st to May 23rd TAC Call for Projects Sponsor appeals and Sponsors who wish to appeal their score(s) need to contact Ilda Licon at (213) 922-2805 to schedule an appointment. Ms. Berlin stated that each TAC Subcommittee will be meeting over the next few weeks to review the Rainbow report for their particular mode in more detail. TDM/Air Quality Subcommittee will meet at 11:00 a.m., right after this meeting, in the Pasadena Conference room; Streets and Freeways Subcommittee 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; Bus Operations (BOS) and Local Transit Systems (LTSS) Subcommittees will have a joint meeting on May 15th to review the Transit Capital mode.

Ms. Berlin informed the TAC members that on May 14th, Metro will be mailing the Notice of Deobligation of Project Funding letters to existing Call for Projects sponsors with June 30, 2007 lapse date. TAC will be hearing appeals from those sponsors on June 6th. At the June 6th TAC meeting, three other projects still need to provide project status to TAC: City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, and City of South Gate.
She added that also on June 6th, Metro will hold its annual TAC and Subcommittee Budget Workshop at 1:30 p.m. in the Union Station Conference room.

Ms. Berlin announced Lt. Joe Vizcarra became the new primary member representing the California Highway Patrol with Sgt. Steve Shenian as the alternate.

Ms. Berlin directed TAC members to Attachment 1 of the agenda package, which are the TAC Appeals Protocol guidelines. Patrick DeChellis (County of Los Angeles) asked whether alternates can present appeals? Ms. Berlin stated that she would prefer that they don’t and asked if project managers were available? Mr. DeChellis asked what if the alternate and the project manager are the same person? Ms. Berlin asked if the staff underneath can make the presentation? Mike Uyeno (City of Los Angeles) asked what the problem was having an alternate present an appeal? Ms. Berlin stated it would present a conflict when it comes to vote. She added if the alternate does not participate in any aspect of the TAC discussion, recommendations and/or motion, it would be alright. She states that the TAC Protocol Guidelines would be revised accordingly.

3. Discussion, Review and Comment on: Draft 2007 Call for Projects Rainbow Report (Renee Berlin/Susan Chapman/Modal Leads, Metro)

Ms. Chapman gave an overview of the preliminary staff recommendations. Ms. Chapman gave credit to Tom Horne (League of California Cities – North Los Angeles County) who found an error in the total number of projects recommended for funding (formula error) on the cover page of the Rainbow report. Ms. Chapman announced the corrected numbers. Metro received a total of 407 applications; 164 projects are proposed to be funded in the regular six-year Call and 5 supplemental projects are also being recommended, with a total of 169 projects totally $450 million recommended. The recommendation is consistent with the funding mark adopted by the Metro Board in April 2007.

Regional Surface Transportation Improvements (Alan Patashnick, Metro)

Mr. Patashnick stated there were 120 applications submitted under the RSTI category with 43 projects recommended for funding (above the line). The 120 projects had inflated total project expenses of $11.6 billion with a little more than $6 billion in inflated total funding requests. Most of the dollars represented the 24 projects submitted by Caltrans with inflated project requests of $5 billion; the remaining 96 projects had inflated total project requests of $1 billion. Metro’s initial estimated funding mark under RSTI was $160 million; the current recommended funding mark is over $213 million, a 33% increase. The 43 projects being recommended include 6 bridge projects, 11 capacity or intersection improvement projects, 13 widening projects, 4 grade separation projects, 6 interchange improvement projects, 1 road extension and 2 ramp projects.

Within RSTI, Metro staff made recommendations on a sub category of Goods Movement projects. Mr. Patashnick reported that 9 Goods Movement projects are being recommended for funding: Port of Long Beach’s I-710/Gerald Desmond Bridge Gateway (Bridge Replacement); Port of Los Angeles’ I-110 Freeway/C Street Interchange Improvement, South Wilmington Grade Separation projects, and I-110/SR-47 & John S. Gibson/NB I-110 Ramp Access; County of Los Angeles’ Nogales Street (LA Subdivision) Grade Separation...
project; City of Commerce's Washington Boulevard Widening and Reconstruction project; City of Downey's Bellflower Boulevard at Imperial Highway Improvements, and Paramount Boulevard at Firestone Boulevard Improvements project; and City of Los Angeles' Olympic Boulevard and Mateo Street Goods Movement Improvements Phase II. The $213 million funding mark was achieved by transferring funds from other modes.

Michelle Mowery (City of Los Angeles) expressed concern with any RSTI projects severing bicycle access. She is curious whether it has been looked at. Ms. Mowery expressed particular concern with the Gerald Desmond Bridge not allowing bicycles. Mr. Patashnick responded that Metro is concerned with projects that sever bikeways and have put in conditional funding language stating bikeways should not be impacted. Mr. Patashnick stated more discussion is required on the Gerald Desmond Bridge, but bikeways should be accommodated if there is room.

Haripal Vir (City of Los Angeles) commented that Caltrans was not eligible for this Call for Projects. Ms. Berlin stated that Caltrans was eligible to apply in RSTI, but not in the Freeway mode. Mr. Vir asked if projects such as those including ramp improvements or auxiliary lanes are getting separate funding. Ms. Berlin stated that the auxiliary lanes are not eligible because they are on the freeway. Mr. Patashnick added that of the 24 Caltrans projects, 16 were freeway related and 8 projects were eligible in the RSTI mode with none recommended for funding. Mr. Vir said that Caltrans is receiving separate funding in a different category. Ms. Berlin said Caltrans funds are identified in the Long Range Transportation Plan (LTP) and separate programming action by the Board. Mr. Vir asked if the dollar amount could be shared. Ms. Berlin stated when the LRTP is released, the dollar amount will be known. Mr. Vir said that the money has been set aside. Ms. Berlin stated Metro is working on identifying funding in the emerging LRTP. She added the Board has established Caltrans' project priorities. Mr. Vir said he needed to know the source of funding for Caltrans since it affects the City of Los Angeles.

Mr. DeChellis asked Mr. Patashnick to repeat the 9 Goods Movement projects recommended for funding. Mr. Patashnick directed Mr. DeChellis to the list distributed to TAC members along with the Rainbow report. Mr. DeChellis asked if these projects will be submitted for Proposition 1B Goods Movement funding. Mr. Patashnick responded that the Metro Board needs to decide how it wants to address Goods Movement projects, through the Call or reserve the funds for matching Bond funded Goods Movement projects. Mr. DeChellis asked what the third paragraph in the transmittal memo means. David Yale (Metro) said these are the projects that Metro would fund through the Call in the absence of Proposition 1B. He added that if the California Transportation Commission (CTC) adopts its application process, the Board could decide to use the recommended funding amounts as a match to projects that succeed in the CTC process. Mr. Yale said this would make Los Angeles County projects more competitive in the statewide competition by providing part of their match. Mr. Yale stated that Metro can either fund the list seen on the handout or the list selected by the CTC. Mr. DeChellis asked if the list on Attachment 2 is the only list of projects for which Metro would provide funding. Mr. Yale said Metro would support any applicant in Los Angeles County for Trade Corridor funding. Mr. DeChellis asked if Los Angeles County's Nogales Street Grade Separation project was submitted under the Trades Corridor Goods Movement program and was successful, would it change the amount of funding available to the project. Mr. Yale said it may since the statewide amount of the Trade Corridor fund is $2 billion and if Los Angeles County does well in the program, it may
receive up to $1 billion. Mr. Yale stated that under this scenario, successful projects would get less in the Call for Projects than in the Trade Corridor fund. Mr. DeChellis asked what happens to the projects that are in the RSTI funded list, but are not Goods Movement projects. Mr. Yale responded they would be funded through the Call as they are not eligible to compete in the State process. Ms. Berlin clarified that Metro can use the $104 million to fund the projects on the list, or take the $104 million and use it as a match for the successful Goods Movement projects funded through the State process. Mr. Yale confirmed and added that Metro will write a letter to the CTC stating it will give 10% of the matching funds to successful Los Angeles County projects. Metro hopes its contribution would help the applicant compete better in the process. Ms. Berlin commented this is a subject that will be discussed at the June Board Call for Projects Workshop.

John Drayton (Metro) asked if we are looking at the Nogales project in the amount of $28 million, and if it was a successful competitor in the Proposition 1B funds, would the remaining $20 million not funded go to other projects within the list? Ms. Berlin said no; it would be used to provide the matching funds for the Goods Movement projects. Mr. Yale commented that a lot depends on the Goods Movement legislation and the CTC guidelines.

Paul Maselbas (County of Los Angeles) asked if projects not on the list receives Proposition 1B funds, will Metro prorate the reduction across all the projects. Ms. Berlin said that some projects may not apply for Proposition 1B funding.

Mr. DeChellis asked if the Metro Board will make a decision to either support the list on Attachment 2, or open it up to everybody. Mr. Yale responded that only successful applicants would get Metro funding in the Proposition 1B process.

Mr. DeChellis suggested if these projects are committed to receiving the Call for Projects money to benefit the County as a whole, should Metro require that they pursue Bond funds as it would bring $900 million to $1 billion more to the County. Mr. Yale commented it is not a bad idea to go after the Proposition 1B money. Mr. DeChellis asked if sponsors went after the Proposition 1B money, would the Call money be at risk. Mr. Yale said no. Shahrrad Amiri (Metro) commented that with the exception of Nogales and Gerald Desmond projects, all the Goods Movement projects on the list are fully funded. [Note: Of the 9 projects on the Goods Movement list, 6 are not fully funded: I-710/Gerald Desmond Bridge Gateway (Desmond Replacement), Nogales Street (LA Subdivision) Grade Separation, the 3 Port of Los Angeles projects and the City of Commerce's Washington Boulevard Widening and Reconstruction Project.] She asked if sponsors are going to replenish their local match. Mr. DeChellis said by going to the CTC for more funding, it allows Los Angeles County to bring in more money for local projects.

Signal Synchronization & Bus Speed Improvements (Randy Lamm, Metro)

Mr. Lamm stated that 44 applications were received under the Signal Synchronization & Bus Speed Improvement mode, totaling $179 million. Of this number 24 are recommended for funding totaling $83.9 million. Mr. Lamm stated the types of projects recommended for funding include those that synchronize the signals in corridors, fill in gaps, connect to the County's Information Exchange Network (IEN) and implement Bus Signal Priority. The scoring criteria included regional significance, benefit to transportation system, local match, cost benefit and support for transit. Mr. Lamm stated that the amount recommended for the
City and County of Los Angeles, respectively was reduced in proportion to the amount of
funding recommended for those jurisdictions in the supplemental funding modal category.

Mr. Lamm stated 60% of the recommended projects were sponsored by the City of Los
Angeles, 20% by the County of Los Angeles and 18% from other cities.

Mark Yamarone (TDM/AQ) asked what were the requirements for the local match? Mr.
Lamm said the minimum local match was 20% with approximately every 5% increase in
overmatch an additional two points would be received, up to a maximum of 10 points for up
to a 50% match.

Transportation Demand Management (Rufina Juarez, Metro)

Ms. Juarez informed TAC members that 24 applications were received and 12 were
recommended for funding in the amount of $6.7 million. Of the 12 recommended, 4
projects were Transportation Facility Amenities, 3 in the Parking Management program, 4
in the Technology or Innovative Base strategies, and 1 in the New and Unique
Demonstration projects to increase capacity.

Ellen Blackman (Citizen Representative on ADA) asked if signage applications include any
mention of Braille or large print signage for the disabled who are also transit users and
pedestrians? Ms. Juarez said no.

Ms. Mowery asked about the Monterey Park project? Ms. Juarez stated it was submitted
through TDM, but moved to the Bikeway Improvements mode and Lynn Goldsmith can
elaborate further.

Ms. Mowery asked why the pedestrian modal categories have a small pot of money? Ms.
Berlin stated that they could have been eligible either way. Mr. Blair added that depend
upon how a project is presented, it could qualify under three to four categories. He added
there is an overlap between categories and some projects may have been moved two to three
times. Mr. Rojas commented the Monterey Park application was originally a TEA
application and then switched to TDM.

Mr. Yamarone asked if there are excess of TDM modal category dollars, why not fund more
projects? Mr. Blair stated that each project was placed in the category that was most
appropriate.

Bikeway Improvements (Lynn Goldsmith, Metro)

Ms. Goldsmith stated that Metro received 36 applications of which 24 were funded. She
commented that 60% of the projects implement a component of the Metro Bicycle Strategic
plan, while 40% address connectivity issues. Ms. Goldsmith reminded TAC that the
Strategic plan goals included: improve access for bikes to transit, fill gaps in the network, try
innovative practices, and provide bike parking, education, and directional signage. Regional
significance and project need were looked at and projects scored based on whether they met
Metro goals. Some projects added miles, while others, improved on-street conditions for
cyclists and innovations.
Projects that were not funded lacked justification or demonstration of need, were beautification of a Right-of-Way, paralleled existing route(s) or could not be justified at this time due to demand.

Kent Strumpell (Los Angeles County Bike Coalition) commented that the TDM money should be spent in non-motorized modes to get vehicles off the road. He stated that in general when funds are moved among modal categories such as moving TDM dollars, the funds should go to projects that fulfill transportation reduction.

Pedestrian Improvements (Robin Blair, Metro)

Mr. Blair stated that 26 of the 63 applications received were funded totaling $40 million in improvements. He stated that some applications were for very large projects exceeding $100 million. Funding recommendations focused on higher activity areas. Staff looked at the net effect of existing conditions versus improvements and the likelihood of usage. Mr. Blair commented that this was the first time that the majority of projects funded were overmatched.

Ms. Blackman asked a question regarding accessibility and signage for people with vision disability? Mr. Blair stated that everything is ADA compatibility. He stated it may be helpful to meet to establish a standard.

Transit Capital (Scott Page, Metro)

Mr. Page stated that 22 of 59 eligible Transit Capital projects (totaling $352 million) were funded. Regarding bus purchases, Mr. Page said there was a countywide need to improve air quality and instead of fully funding one Operator for all requested buses, Metro staff spread funding across multiple Operators. Applications requesting buses for service expansion were scored based on existing need and supporting documentation showing areas and times of overloads.

Mr. Uyeno asked how much of the $450 million in the Call represented the STIP Augmentation dollars. Mr. Yale responded it is $26.4 million for the total call. The first $11.4 million shown in this modal category was recommended for STIP Augmentation dollars. Another $15 million will be available in the 2008 STIP cycle. Mr. Uyeno asked if the amount available for the Call is the trickledown from the STIP Augmentation. Mr. Yale said the $11.4 million is the direct trickledown from the Proposition 1B Bond.

Transportation Enhancement Activities (James Rojas, Metro)

Mr. Rojas informed TAC that 14 of 47 applications received are being recommended for funding. He added that the funding line was drawn in the wrong place and should have been drawn after project 14. Metro staff looked at regional significance, project need, local match, cost benefit and land use compatibility in evaluating applications. Mr. Rojas and his team visited all 47 sites to see the urban design details in each area. With only $11 million available to fund projects, staff looked at projects that had a lot of regional significance in their design.
Supplemental Call (Renee Berlin, Metro)

Ms. Berlin reminded TAC of the one time opportunity offered to sponsors of local projects whose first program year was FY 08 or FY 09 to apply for dollars to meet shortfalls. In January, the Metro Board programmed $85.3 million to sponsors whose first program year was FY 07 or earlier. The projects were evaluated based on project readiness, ranking on the original application and local match above what was previously submitted. Metro received 13 applications; of this number, 7 were deemed ineligible, 6 had the wrong programming year and 1 project had a scope augmentation. Metro is recommending 5 City of Los Angeles ATSAC projects totaling $8.1 million for supplemental funding.

Mr. DeChellis asked how the local match points were calculated. Ms. Berlin stated if the same percentage of local match was provided as the original application, no points were awarded.

David Feinberg (League of California Cities – Westside Cities COG) asked if project pre-approval is possible? Ms. Berlin stated for locally funded projects, Metro will give sponsors a Letter of No Prejudice to spend their local match. For Federal and State funds, sponsors may receive a Letter of No Prejudice to spend the portion of the local match above what is requested to match the grant. Mr. Blair said it is better for sponsors to request early allocations/obligations and ask project managers of their funds. Mr. Yale added that to the maximum extent possible, Metro will try to accommodate requests, but unless no circumstances should sponsors proceed without receiving authorization.

Mr. Feinberg asked at this point sponsors don’t know the color of money assigned to their projects. Mr. Yale concurred. Robert Newman (TDM/AQ) asked when sponsors will be notified? Mr. Yale responded at the earliest August, with notification mailed in September.

Mr. Uyeno asked for projects that received less funding than requested, did project managers check with sponsors to determine whether the projects were still viable? Ms. Berlin said yes.

Mr. Uyeno asked how funding for Caltrans freeway projects came into play. Mr. Yale stated Metro’s approach is to identify freeway funding through the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Ms. Berlin commented the Board has established a priority list and until the draft Plan is completed, we do not know how much funding will be available and how many projects can be funded.

Mr. Uyeno asked how Metro identifies the amount of money available to spend on the list. Ms. Berlin said it is based on funding types and cost increases. Mr. Uyeno commented that local jurisdictions do not know what happens with Caltrans issues which drives how much money is available to the Call. Mr. Yale stated it is a LRTP issue. Ms. Berlin added that sponsors will be able to provide public comment and the City can submit their comments in writing during the LRTP public comment period.

Mr. Uyeno asked if the LRTP only determines the priority of projects. Mr. Yale said no, and added Metro is using the LRTP to sketch out a schedule that may be achieved.
Mr. Uyeno said there is a subset of the projects whose funding and priorities are determined in the LRTP. He added there are other projects that are prioritized, but no funding has been determined. Mr. Yale said Metro uses cost estimates for those.

Mr. Uyeno said there is a big pot of money from RSTP, CMAQ, STIP, STIP Augmentation, and Proposition C. He asked how it was decided how much goes to freeways and how much is left for the Call. Mr. Yale said that is an answer that needs to be addressed during the LRTP discussion. Mr. Yale said there is new money on the table for which the decision has not been made. A staff recommendation is being developed now and then the Board will authorize Metro staff to release the recommendation for discussion. Mr. Yale understands the need for a more transparent process.

4. New Business

There was no new business.

5. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 a.m. The next Special TAC meeting on the 2007 Call for Projects Sponsor Appeals will start on May 21, 2007 in the Union Station Conference Room on the 3rd Floor, at 9:30 a.m.
# TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

*Sign in Sheet*

*May 9, 2007*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>1. Marianne Kim/ Stephen Finnegan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (BOS)</td>
<td>1. Dana Lee/Susan Lipman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. John Kobata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Reyno/Dennis Kobata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL</td>
<td>1. Lt. Joe Vizcarra/Sg. Steve Shenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>1. Raja Mitwasi /Alberto Angelini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rose Casey /Kathrynna</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 /J. Cant</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 Ueno</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>1. Mark Herwick/Clement Lau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Paul Maselli/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>1. Greg Herrmann/Cathie Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td>2. Desi Alvarez/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities COG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes Malibu COG</td>
<td>3. Robert Brager/Tom Gdala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td>4. Tom Horne/Mark Rozgan</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>
</tbody>
</table>
| LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE (LTSS) | 1. A. Baghdarian/Thomas Uwal  
|                                           | 2. J. Rooney/Bertha Tafoya |
| METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY     | 1. R. Berlin  
| (Metro)                                  | Renee Berlin/Fanny Pan  
|                                          | Countywide Planning &  
|                                          | Development            |
|                                          | 2. J. Drayton/Christopher Gallanes  
|                                          | Metro Operations       |
| SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL        | 1. S. Lantz/Joanna Capelle |
| AUTHORITY (SCRRA - Ex-Officio)           |                           |
| SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA                      | 1. E. Sells/Kathryn Higgins |
| MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SCAQMD - Ex-Officio)|                           |
| SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF       | 1. D. Rubinow/Annie Nam  |
| GOVERNMENTS (SCAG - Ex-Officio)          |                           |
| GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE            | 1. L. DiCamillo/Ron Guss |
| (Ex-Officio)                             |                           |
| TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/        | 1. M. Yamatona/Phil Aker  |
| AIR QUALITY SUBCOMMITTEE                 | 2. R. Newman/Brooke Geer  |
|                                          | Person                   |
## TAC Audience Attendance
### May 9, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norman Emerson</td>
<td></td>
<td>(818) 601-2794</td>
<td><a href="mailto:n-emerson@att.net">n-emerson@att.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Hansen</td>
<td></td>
<td>805-653-5397</td>
<td><a href="mailto:giansew@willdan.com">giansew@willdan.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulgencio Asuncion</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>213-922-3025</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fasuncion@metro.net">fasuncion@metro.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Kapsinski</td>
<td>MTL</td>
<td>213-922-1412</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kapanskik@metro.net">kapanskik@metro.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irwin Chodore</td>
<td>LADOT</td>
<td>(213) 972-5027</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Irwin.Chodore@citycity.org">Irwin.Chodore@citycity.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Meek</td>
<td>LADOT</td>
<td>972-5027</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Paul.Meek@citycity.org">Paul.Meek@citycity.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Obin</td>
<td></td>
<td>972-4982</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michael.obin@citycity.org">michael.obin@citycity.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Bellomo</td>
<td>City.EL</td>
<td>805-275-6856</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jbellomo@willdan.com">jbellomo@willdan.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Weiss</td>
<td>Westlake Village</td>
<td>805-659-0017</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mweiss@interiorthpg.com">mweiss@interiorthpg.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Grier</td>
<td>CTA-LA</td>
<td>213-972-1712</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jgrier@cta-tla.org">jgrier@cta-tla.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Cohen</td>
<td>CTA-LA</td>
<td>213-473-7002</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jennifer.cohen@cta-tla.org">jennifer.cohen@cta-tla.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borja Leon</td>
<td>City LA</td>
<td>213-978-3061</td>
<td><a href="mailto:borja.leon@lacity.org">borja.leon@lacity.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Soklik</td>
<td>MWH Group</td>
<td>213-486-6760</td>
<td><a href="mailto:asoklik@mwh.com">asoklik@mwh.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsen Manoyelian</td>
<td>LADOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Kobata</td>
<td>BOS/TIS</td>
<td>310-618-3029</td>
<td><a href="mailto:DKobata@TURRNST.COM">DKobata@TURRNST.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Lipman</td>
<td>BOS</td>
<td>413-295-6302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descheidt</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>213-922-3039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Fleming</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>213-922-4952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Strumpell</td>
<td>LACO</td>
<td>310-215-0144</td>
<td><a href="mailto:KentStrump@AOL.com">KentStrump@AOL.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James O'Shea</td>
<td>MWX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Gainor</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 5

2005/2006 Project Extension Status Reports
Projects List
### 2005 / 2006 Project Extensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6390</td>
<td>LA City</td>
<td>Sepulveda Blvd. From Centinela Ave. to Lincoln Blvd. Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2314</td>
<td>LA County</td>
<td>East San Gabriel Valley SOM Pilot Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6347</td>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>I-710 Firestone Blvd. Interchange Reconstruction Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 6

TAC Protocol
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.

- If TAC members and/or Alternates participate in the appeals process by presenting a particular project(s), that same TAC member and/or Alternate cannot participate on any TAC discussion, recommendation and/or motion pertaining to the Call for Projects.

- 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 7

Recommended Project Deobligations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proj ID #</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Prog Year</th>
<th>Total Prog $</th>
<th>FIS/Oblig/Alloc $</th>
<th>Balance $</th>
<th>Fund Orig Lapse Date</th>
<th># of Years Extended</th>
<th>Recom Deob $</th>
<th>Reason for Deobigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8024</td>
<td>ALHAMBRA</td>
<td>GARFIELD AVENUE WIDENING AT GLENDON WAY</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>12/30/2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>Need to execute MOU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6297</td>
<td>COMPTON</td>
<td>COMPTON TMOC &amp; RETROFIT OF CITY TRAFFIC SIGNAL SYSTEM</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>06/30/2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>Did not meet tapping policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5246</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>NORTH HOLLYWOOD STREETScape IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>STIPTEA/TEA</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>12/30/2002</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>Need to execute LOA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6296</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>WESTCHESTER TRANSPORTATION MGMT. ENHANCEMENTS (ATCS)</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,004</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>06/30/2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>Did not meet tapping policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6300</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>CITY/COUNTY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT INTEGRATION</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>06/30/2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>Did not meet tapping policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6406</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>ARBOR VITAE ST. - LA CIENEGA BLVD. TO AIRPORT BLVD.</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>06/30/2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>Did not meet tapping policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6418</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>SEPULVEDA BLVD/BURBANK BLVD. WIDENING</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>06/30/2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>Did not meet tapping policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6419</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>NATIONAL BLVD. FR. SAWTELLE BLVD. TO SEPULVEDA BLVD.</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>06/30/2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>Did not meet tapping policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6424</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>SEPULVEDA BLVD. BTWN. VENTURA BLVD. &amp; GREENLEAF ST.</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>06/30/2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>Did not meet tapping policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6425</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>SEPULVEDA BLVD. &amp; BIKE LN. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7,349</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,349</td>
<td>06/30/2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,349</td>
<td>Did not meet tapping policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7234</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>OVERLAND AVE. BRIDGE WIDENING OVER RTE 10 FWY</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2,799</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2,688</td>
<td>06/30/2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>Did not meet tapping policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj ID #</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Prop Year</td>
<td>Total Prog $</td>
<td>FIS/Oblig Alloc $</td>
<td>Balance $</td>
<td>Fund Lapse Date</td>
<td># of Years Extended</td>
<td>Recom Deob $</td>
<td>Reason for Deobligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8069</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>BARRAMCOHUENGIA CORRIDOR TRANSPORTATION IMPR PHASE IV</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/30/2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>Need to execute MOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8318</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>LA CITY AND SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES BICYCLE MAP</td>
<td>LTF</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>06/30/2005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>Did not meet lapping policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77743B</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>HARBOR FREEWAY TRANSITWAY EXTENSION</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6/30/2002</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Did not meet lapping policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>HARBOR TRANSITWAY ARTERIAL HOV CONNECTION WIDOWNTOWN LA</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>4,124</td>
<td>3,121</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>06/30/1998</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>Did not meet lapping policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2315</td>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>POMONA VALLEY TRAFFIC SIGNAL FORUM IMPROVEMENT PROJECT</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>5,651</td>
<td>3,774</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>06/30/1998</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>Did not meet lapping policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2316</td>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>SELAC-TRAFFIC SIGNAL SYNCHRONIZATION CORRIDORS PROJECT</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>24,819</td>
<td>15,826</td>
<td>8,993</td>
<td>06/30/1998</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8,993</td>
<td>Did not meet lapping policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2356</td>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>SOUTH BAY SIGNAL SYNCHRONIZATION &amp; BUS SPEED IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>16,075</td>
<td>9,219</td>
<td>6,856</td>
<td>06/30/1998</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6,856</td>
<td>Did not meet lapping policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4221</td>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>GATEWAY CITIES TRAFFIC SIGNAL CORRIDORS PROJECT, PHASE II</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>9,286</td>
<td>5,714</td>
<td>06/30/2002</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,714</td>
<td>Did not meet lapping policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4242</td>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>SOUTH BAY SIGNAL SYNCHRONIZATION IMPROVEMENTS, PHASE III</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>5,701</td>
<td>3,799</td>
<td>06/30/2002</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,799</td>
<td>Did not meet lapping policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6264</td>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>EL SEGUNDO AREA ITS</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,559</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>06/30/2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>Did not meet lapping policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj ID #</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Prog Year</td>
<td>Total Prog $</td>
<td>FIS/Oblig/Alloc $</td>
<td>Balance $</td>
<td>Fund Orig Lapse Date</td>
<td># of Years Extended</td>
<td>Recom Deob $</td>
<td>Reason for Deobligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6292</td>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>SOUTH-BAY FORUM TRAFFIC SIGNAL CORRIDORS</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>6,527</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>5,880</td>
<td>06/30/2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,880</td>
<td>Did not meet lapsing policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6294</td>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL VALLEY FORUM TRAFFIC SIGNAL CORRIDORS</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>9,024</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>7,442</td>
<td>06/30/2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,442</td>
<td>Did not meet lapsing policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4243LK</td>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL CAG (WEST SAN GABRIEL VALLEY SIGNAL) ALSO PROJECT # 4244, 4245</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>13,067</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,067</td>
<td>06/30/2002</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13,067</td>
<td>Did not meet lapsing policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4094</td>
<td>LA COUNTY (FORMERLY METRO)</td>
<td>EL PUEBLO PEDESTRIAN IMPROV.</td>
<td>PC10</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>06/30/2002</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>Did not meet lapsing policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6261</td>
<td>LA COUNTY (FORMERLY PALMDALE)</td>
<td>NORTH COUNTY/ANTELOPE VALLEY TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>06/30/2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>Did not meet lapsing policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6322</td>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>DOWNTOWN SHORELINE DR. TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SYSTEM</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>06/30/2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>Did not meet lapsing policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8331</td>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>LONG BEACH WAYFINDING/TRANSIT CONNECTION PROGRAM</td>
<td>LTF</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>06/30/2005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Did not meet lapsing policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8211</td>
<td>MONROVIA</td>
<td>OLD TOWN PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>STIPTEA</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>12/30/2007</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>Did not meet lapsing policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6345</td>
<td>MONTEBELLO</td>
<td>BEVERLY BLVD. WIDENING PHASE III</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3,885</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,885</td>
<td>06/30/2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,885</td>
<td>Did not meet lapsing policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8147</td>
<td>PALMDALE</td>
<td>SIERRA BREVIEW RAILROAD OVERCROSSING</td>
<td>STIPTEA</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>12/30/2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>Need to execute MOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6327</td>
<td>SANTA MONICA</td>
<td>OCEAN AVE. SIGNAL SYSTEM</td>
<td>PC25</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>06/30/2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>Did not meet lapsing policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 8

2007 Call for Projects Sponsor Appeals
TAC Recommendations
May 30, 2007

TO: METRO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

FROM: RENEE BERLIN, CHAIR

SUBJECT: 2007 CALL FOR PROJECTS SPONSOR APPEALS and TAC RECOMMENDATIONS

Attached are the May 22, 2007 TAC actions regarding the 2007 Call for Projects preliminary staff recommendations. These recommendations were formulated based on project applicant appeals.

Please review the attached and be prepared to take action confirming that these are TAC's recommendations. These recommendations will be presented to the Metro Board at their June 20, 2007 Call for Projects Workshop. As elected by TAC on May 22nd, Abdollah Ansari (City of Long Beach) will be present to respond to any questions from the Metro Board.

At July 11, 2007 TAC meeting, staff will present its final recommendations based on input and direction received at the June 20th Metro Board Workshop. At this meeting, TAC will take final action on the 2007 Call for Projects.

TAC's final recommendations will be incorporated into the report which will be presented to the Metro Board Planning and Programming Committee on July 18, 2007 and the full Board on July 26, 2007.

Attachment
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is a statutorily required advisory group that consists of thirty-one (31) representatives from a variety of public and private organizations including the League of California Cities, the State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the County of Los Angeles, the City of Los Angeles, and other transportation services providers and jurisdictions. The TAC is charged with providing Metro staff with technical advice regarding a variety of issues. A list of the TAC members is provided at the end of this attachment.

TAC ACTIONS REGARDING STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

The TAC met to review Metro staff’s preliminary TIP Call for Projects recommendations on May 22, 2007. As part of this review, TAC heard presentations by project sponsors who wanted to appeal or provide input on their project(s) rankings. TAC heard presentation from 13 project sponsors on 38 projects. After considerable discussion, TAC took preliminary actions on the modal categories as follows:

I. Regional Surface Transportation Improvements (RSTI) Category

**TAC Recommendation:** Approved the preliminary staff funding recommendations for this category and defer funding for those Goods Movement projects with total project cost in excess of $10 million until such time as the Proposition 1B criteria are approved and have Metro staff work with the Goods Movement project sponsors to apply for those projects through the State process. Should the Goods Movement project(s) be successful through the State process, Metro 2007 Call for Projects funding in proportional share shall be reprogrammed through the 2007 Call for Projects based on further input from TAC.

**Staff response:** Staff does not concur with the TAC recommendation; maintain preliminary staff funding recommendations for the Goods Movement projects in the 2007 Call for Projects, unless the Metro Board provides direction that Metro Call for Projects funds proposed for these projects should be reserved to provide local match to successful Proposition 1B candidate projects. Metro staff believes that the Call for Projects funding will be used as part of the one-for-one match for successful Bond funded projects. Metro staff will work with applicants as appropriate to make their State applications more competitive to maximize funding for the region.
Project F1144, County of Los Angeles, Avenue L & K from 40th to 55th Streets West Road Widening

Staff Technical Correction: Based on information provided by the sponsor during the appeal to TAC, staff made a technical correction. The score under the local match section should be 10 points instead of 8 points bringing the total score of the project to 59 points.

II. Signal Synchronization and Bus Speed Improvements Category

TAC Recommendation: Approve the preliminary staff funding recommendations for this category and defer funding for those Goods Movement projects with total project cost in excess of $10 million until such time as the Proposition 1B criteria are approved and have Metro staff work with the Goods Movement project sponsors to apply for those projects through the State process. Should the Goods Movement project(s) be successful through the State process, Metro 2007 Call for Projects funding in proportional share shall be reprogrammed through the 2007 Call for Projects based on further input from TAC.

Staff response: Staff does not concur with the TAC recommendation; maintain preliminary staff funding recommendations for the Goods Movement projects in the 2007 Call for Projects, unless the Metro Board provides direction that Metro Call for Projects funding proposed for these projects should be reserved to provide local match to successful Proposition 1B candidate projects. Metro staff believes that the Call for Projects funding will be used as part of the one-for-one match for successful Bond funded projects. Metro staff will work with applicants as appropriate to make their State applications more competitive to maximize funding for the region.

III. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Category

TAC Recommendation: Approved the preliminary staff recommendations for this category.

Project F1728, City of Santa Monica, Santa Monica Real Time Beach Parking Signs

Staff Technical Funding Correction: Based on information provided by the sponsor during the appeal to TAC, due to a technical error in the application, preliminary staff funding recommendation was less than what staff intended to fund. Staff intended to fully fund the project. Therefore, $533,000 is the recommended funding amount.
IVa. Bikeway Improvements Category

TAC Recommendation: Approved the preliminary staff recommendations for this category.

IVb. Pedestrian Improvements Category

TAC Recommendation: Approved the preliminary staff recommendations for this category.

V. Transit Capital Category

TAC Recommendation: Approved the preliminary staff recommendations for this category.

VI. Transportation Enhancements Category

TAC Recommendation: Approved the preliminary staff recommendations for this category.

VII. Supplemental Call Category

TAC Recommendation: Approved the preliminary staff recommendations for this category.

VIII. Other Motions

TAC Recommendation: Elected Abdollah Ansari (City of Long Beach) as the TAC representative at Metro Board workshops and meetings pertaining to the Call for Projects.

Staff response: Staff concurs with the TAC recommendation.