Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Union Station Conference ROOM

1. Call to Order/Roll Call
   Action (Alan Patashnick, Fanny Pan)

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

3. Consent Calendar
   - Approval of Minutes
   - Attachment 3: Draft November 14, 2007 Minutes
   Action/Concurrence

4. Chairperson’s Report
   - 5 min
   - Information
   (Alan Patashnick)

5. Congestion Pricing Feasibility Study
   - Attachment 4: Board Report: Los Angeles County Congestion-Reduction Demonstration Initiative Proposal
   - 10 min
   - Update
   (Ashad Hamideh)

6. Legislative Update
   - Federal
   - State
   - 10 min
   - Information
   (Raffi Hamparian)
   (Michael Turner)
7. Call for Projects with June 30, 2008 Lapse Date Information  
   Attachment 5: List of Call for Projects with  (Fanny Pan) 
   June 30, 2008 Lapse Date  
   5 min

8. Long Range Transportation Plan Update  
   5 min  (Heather Hills/Rena Lum)

9. Countywide Congestion Mitigation Fee Update  
   Feasibility Study  (Robert Calix)
   5 min

10. New Business

11. 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 January 9, 2008 at 9:30 a.m. in the Union Station Room.
Subcommittee November 2007 Agendas

• Bus Operations
  ➢ No meeting in November

• Local Transit Systems

• Streets and Freeways

• TDM/Air Quality
  ➢ No meeting in November
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE

Board Overflow Room – 3rd Floor

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes – September 27, 2007
(to be handed out at meeting)

3. FY ’07 NTD Reporting – Audit Status

4. FY ’08 NTD Reporting – Proposed Workshop

5. Universal Fare System Update

6. Access Services Incorporated (ASI) Update

7. Mini Call MOU Status

8. LTSS Membership/Elections

9. Transit Corridor Studies

10. Reschedule December LTSS Meeting

11. New Business

12. Adjournment

Action
Joyce Rooney, Chair

Action
Joyce Rooney, Chair

Information
Jay Fuhrman, Metro

Information
Jay Fuhrman, Metro

Information
Jay Fuhrman/Kelly Hines, Metro

Information
Andre Colaiacce, ASI

Information
Jay Fuhrman, Metro

Discussion
Joyce Rooney

Presentation
Anthony Loui, Metro

Action
Joyce Rooney

Joyce Rooney

Joyce Rooney

Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Metro
Agenda

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

GATEWAY Conference Room, 3rd, Floor

1. Call to Order
   1 min

2. Approval of Minutes
   Attachment 1: Draft October 18, 2007 Minutes
   Attachment 2: Sign in Sheet/Attendance Sheet
   1 min

3. Chairperson Report
   10 min

4. Metro Report
   • December Streets and Freeways Meeting
   Attachment 3: 90 Day Rolling Agenda
   10 min

5. Caltrans Report
   15 min

6. Congestion Pricing Feasibility Study
   10 min

7. Legislative Update
   15 min

8. CTC Recap
   10 min

9. 2008 TIP Deadline
   5 min

Action (Sharon Perlstein)

Action (Subcommittee)

Information (Sharon Perlstein)

Information (Randy Lamm)

Information (Kirk Cessna)

Update (Ashad Hamideh)

Information (Michael Turner, Raffi Hamparian)

Update (Tim Papandreou)

Information (Avital Shavit)
10. 2008 Los Angeles County Transportation Improvement Program
Attachment 4: November 2007 Board Report
Item 8
10 min

Information (Toye Oyewole)

11. STPL Lapsing balances
5 min

Update (Herman Cheng)

12. Annual State BTA Grant Bicycle Plan Requirements
10 min

Information (Lynne Goldsmith)

13. 2007 System Preservation Survey Update
Attachment 5: Normalized Backlog
10 min

Information (Randy Lamm)

14. New Business
5 min

Discussion (Subcommittee)

15. Adjournment
1 min

Action (Subcommittee)

The next meeting of the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee is scheduled for December 20, 2007 at 9:30 AM in the Union Station Conference Room, 3rd Floor. Please contact Randy Lamm at (213) 922-2470 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 October 2007 Subcommittee Actions

Bus Operation Subcommittee:
Cancelled November meeting

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:

November 7, 2007 meeting

Combined November/December meeting to be held December 5th, which was a special NTD Reporting Workshop

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:

November 15, 2007 meeting

No Action

TDM/Air Quality Subcommittee:

Cancelled November meeting
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 meeting on October 16th;
- Discussed:
  - Transit portion of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP);
  - Access Services, Inc. (ASI) bylaw changes;
  - Allocation of funds to transit agencies under Prop 1B and the discrepancy of opinion on how that formula should be applied;
- Elections of the 2008 BOS Board were held:
  - Dana Lee (Long Beach Transit), Chairperson
  - David Reyno (Foothill Transit), Vice Chairperson
  - Martha Eros (Arcadia Transit), Secretary
- November meeting cancelled;
- Next meeting on December 18th.

LTSS (Joyce Rooney)

Alan Patashnick (Metro) reported that Joyce Rooney was unable to attend today's meeting.

Streets and Freeways (Sharon Perlstein)
- Last meeting on October 18th;
- Presentation and discussion on FHWA’s decision to transfer the management of environmental clearances to Caltrans for projects receiving Federal Highway funds;
• Received updates on:
  o 2008 TIP Adoption;
  o 2007 Call for Projects;
  o Long Range Transportation Plan;
  o CMP Mitigation Fee;
• Next meeting on November 15th.

TDM/AQ (Mark Yamarone)
• TDM/AQ did not meet in October;
• Next meeting originally scheduled for November 21st will most likely be rescheduled for a later date because of the Thanksgiving holidays.

3. Consent Calendar (Alan Patashnick)

The consent calendar which included minutes from the October 10th meeting was approved on a motion by Marianne Kim (Automobile Club of California) and seconded by Robert Brager (League of California Cities - Las Virgenes Malibu COG), Desi Alvarez (League of California Cities - Gateway Cities COG), Paul Maselbas (County of Los Angeles), and Mark Yamarone (TDM/AQ) abstained.

4. Chairperson’s Report (Alan Patashnick)

Mr. Patashnick reported that:
• Ferdy Chan replaces Ron Olive as a TAC alternate for the City of Los Angeles;
• Lt. Damian McDermott replaces Lt. Joe Vizcarra as the TAC primary representative for the California Highway Patrol;
• Metro Board Chair, Pam O’Connor, will conduct her second internet chat on December 12th at noon. The Chat will focus on sustainability issues and in particular, how individuals can partner with Metro to reduce their carbon footprint as well as trim their gas consumption. The internet forum can be accessed at www.metro.net/chat;
• Mobility 21 took place on November 5th at the Ontario Convention Center with over 400 in attendance;
• Metro is replacing www.mta.net/ with www.metro.net/. Beginning November 30th, www.mta.net will no longer be available;
• For the November Board Cycle, staff recommends:
  o increasing the Life-of-Project (LOP) budget for the Expo Phase 1 LRT Project by $145 million;
  o providing an additional $112.3 million for the Alameda Corridor East (ACE) project, contingent upon:
    ▪ ACE encumbering the current funding already committed by Metro;
    ▪ ACE providing 83 percent in matching funds from other sources for each of the contracts in which Metro is to participate using the $112.3 million in supplemental funds;
  o providing $14.6 million in Proposition C 10% funds for the Metrolink Eastern Maintenance Facility;
• Metro’s Finance and Budget Committee will present the FY07 Year End Financial Performance Report at their November 15\textsuperscript{th} meeting;

• Metro Board Recap:
  o Presentation by Tyler Duvall, U.S. DOT Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy, regarding Congestion Pricing policies and strategies;
  o Amended Scope of Work and Financial Plan was approved for the Compton Martin Luther King Jr. Transit Center Expansion Project;
  o Extension of the existing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to June 30, 2010 for the Compton Martin Luther King Jr. Transit Center Expansion Project;
  o CEO asked to provide a report within 90 days detailing all bus service, including that of municipal operators, that duplicates or competes with existing rail service or major bus lines;

5. Legislative Update

Federal Update (Raffi Hamparian, Metro)

Mr. Hamparian stated that the Transportation Appropriations Conference Report was agreed upon by House and Senate negotiators late last week. Unofficial results indicate that the Los Angeles area will receive approximately 13 earmarks for bus operators, $80 million for the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension project, and $16.1 million for the Metro Small Starts Program. Chris Dodd, Chairman of the Banking Committee, requested language in the Bill prohibiting the FTA from enacting new rules for the New Starts Program. Furthermore, language prohibiting the FTA from taking more than 10% from Section 5309 Bus Discretionary funding appears to be a response to last year’s Urban Partnership Program being largely funded by bus dollars. Lastly, the President has indicated that he will veto the Bill because it is considerably higher than what the Administration budgeted.

Mr. Hamparian stated that the Urban Partnership Program is now being referred to as the Congestion Reduction Demonstration Initiative Program. Applications for Congestion Pricing proposals are due December 31, 2007 and agencies are recommended to submit their applications in conjunction with their State DOT. The amount of funding available for the program is still unknown, but Los Angeles should be a top contender provided the proposal submitted meets program guidelines. As the U.S. DOT describes it, “The department expects to award funding only for those proposals that integrate innovative transit strategies, new transportation technologies and direct highway pricing during congestion periods”.

Mike Uyeno (City of Los Angeles) asked if the Authorization Bill earmarks would be lost in the event that the Appropriations Bill does not pass. Mr. Hamparian replied that in the past, several of the larger earmarks were still honored, but that many of the other authorized earmarks were not funded. Mr. Hamparian added that without an Appropriations Bill, the ability to appropriate money from other programs becomes less problematic.
State Update (Michael Turner, Metro)

Mr. Turner reported that the State’s budget, having just passed in August, is already running a deficit. Furthermore, a report recently released by the LAO (www.lao.ca.gov) forecasts next year’s deficit at approximately $8 billion. As a result, the Governor has indicated that a 10% cut across all State programs will be included in January’s Budget proposal. This budget cut implies that funds will once again be appropriated from the Public Transportation Account (PTA). Also, Metro is concerned that the State’s projection of spillover is too low considering current gas prices. Another concern involves a provision being looked at for the next budget cycle that requires half the spillover to go to the general fund and half to the PTA. Finally, the present and future budget crises have resulted in a number of lawsuits that Metro will track closely as the debate continues.

Mr. Turner stated that as part of Metro’s Legislative Program, various alternative funding strategies are being considered. For example, the State law which allows an additional half cent sales tax to be placed on the ballot needs to be revised. Also, the Bay Area’s ability to implement a regional gas tax may be considered for this region with the exception that the vote threshold be reduced below the two-thirds requirement.

Mr. Turner discussed alternative tools outside of revenue generation such as Congestion Pricing. Congestion pricing is listed under revenue generation in the program. It was placed there for convenience, and is not really a way to raise revenue, but more a tool to manage and increase mobility. There are individuals in the planning department who are concerned about the placement, but Mr. Turner assured TAC that it is not a tool to raise revenue and that it needs to be made clear to the Metro Board. Congestion Pricing is in the legislative program that will go to the Metro Board at the end of November. At this point it is very conceptual, but there will be a lot more details that come before the Board, primarily from the planning department because they are the experts.

Regarding Goods Movement funding from the bonds, there is $2 billion dollars available for Goods Movement projects. The State has been struggling with the allocation, the Secretary of Business, Transportation, and Housing recommended a process for the allocation, which the CTC has been working through, but not necessarily completely implementing. The Southern California region has put together a group with everyone involved in the efforts, from the Ports to agencies representing areas to the Arizona/Nevada border.

A recommendation has been developed on how the funds should be allocated. First and foremost, the region needs its fair share, which has been identified as 85 percent of the money. To put it into context, when the Bond was put together there was $19 billion dollars. There was money put into the Bond to directly compensate those that thought they would get money. The STIP went from $1 billion to $2 billion; the street and road repair money went from $1 billion to $2 billion; State Route 99 (a key Goods Movement artery in the Central Valley) received $1 billion. Therefore, there is no reason to be shy about asking for 85 percent of the funds. Mr. Turner pointed out that for those who have driven on the freeways in the county and have almost gotten killed by a truck to tell him that the region should not receive 85 percent of the funds. The San Diego and Bay areas are no where comparable to this area. He reported that the Bay area and San Diego are collectively asking for 65 percent of the money. The LA Times recently wrote an article supporting the
85 percent allocation and cited a number of statistics, similar to Metro statistics, as to why the county should receive the money. There is a big dispute regarding this and the CTC is trying to work through it. There is a meeting scheduled in Sacramento on November 27, 2007 where they will discuss options: approving the guidelines or a process. Metro is continuing to maintain that the county should get the money.

Mr. Patashnick asked if there is a complete disregard of the facts. Mr. Turner responded that there is a complete disregard of the facts; disregard for the context in which the bond was developed; disregard of what the Bond language states. This was encountered during the Quarter Mobility Improvement program, where it was clearly a congestion relief program and it was supposed to go to areas with high congestion. Congestion on Highway 49 in Nevada County is considered just as important as congestion on I-405. Mr. Turner stated although he is not sure how many people drive on Hwy 49, but that the 300,000 people who drive on the I-405 would disagree with the classification.

Marianne Kim asked if the 85 percent mentioned earlier was for Los Angeles County alone. Mr. Turner explained that it was 85 percent for Southern California. In this case, Southern California does not include San Diego. San Diego may want to become part of the group, and it would be great to have them.

Jerry Chan (City of Los Angeles) made a comment regarding the previous statement about Hwy 49 and I-405. Mr. Turner responded that the region would be happy with $1.7 billion dollars. Mr. Chan asked if the state budget will impact the funding on the 2007 Call for Projects. Mr. Turner stated that when the state was considering its budget, the Board paused in the Call process because what was occurring at the state level. The State enacted a budget which essentially allows the CTC to fund the first year cash flow needs for the projects that were pending. The State has yet to come back to fulfill the continuing cash flow of the projects and they did not allow any capacity for new projects. Projects that were lined up to go to the CTC will no longer go to the CTC. There was an allocation plan the CTC created that stated not to look for any new allocations. With a number of projects in the county that could have moved forward had the state funded transportation, it remains to be seen how the Metro Board addresses this issue. There is, however, language in the Call Board report that acknowledges the continuing problems at the state level and indicates that the Board may have to revisit what happens with the Call.

Paul Maselbas asked for information about Proposition 91. Mr. Turner explained that Proposition 91 is a measure on the February ballot. It was created by the coalition that put Prop 1A on the ballot. There was a group of transportation agencies along with other agencies around the State that started meeting in Sacramento regarding the loopholes in Prop 42 and various ways for closing them off. The private sector started to qualify an initiative that would have completely closed off the legislature’s ability to suspend Prop 42. It is a tactic continuously used by running an extreme initiative trying to say to the legislature that unless you create something that can be agreed upon, then our response is to place something extreme on the ballot. The qualifying process went forward. The legislature put Prop 1A on the ballot, which was a modified Prop 42 protection. As that was happening, sponsors of Prop 91 were trying to qualify the initiative in order to prove to the legislature that they had the support to do it. They were turning in signatures from counties to demonstrate that there was support. When an initiative is qualified, signatures are not counted, but instead a validation rate is established and then the signature rate can
be extrapolated. They were just below the signature limit to qualify, but the qualification rate was higher than they expected so Prop 91 is on the ballot. The sponsors of that initiative are writing a ballot argument against it, but probably no opposition campaign. Teachers are funding an opposition campaign. The Southern California Transit Advocates are in support.

Mr. Maselbas stated that in the Governor’s January budget there is no proposal to borrow Prop 42 funds so as not to draw attention to Prop 91. Mr. Turner agreed that he had heard that. That is why it is important to remember the budget process. The LAO did their thing; the governor released his draft budget in January. The real budget process starts after the May revision. At that time, the State gets its final fiscal numbers and the legislative process starts to happen. It also falls after the February 1st election. Mr. Maselbas asked if Metro was going to take a position on Prop 91. Mr. Turner responded that most likely not. Metro supported Prop 1A; it might be inconsistent to support Prop 91. Mr. Maselbas followed up if there would be any negative ramifications for Metro. Mr. Turner answered that the problem would be if Prop 91 passed, it puts pressure on other funds and makes it more difficult to keep the transportation account funds. The PTA does not have the same protection as Prop 42 and the STTP. That is a problem, and it could be something that the lawsuit could fix. If Prop 42 funds are not available, then the PTA funds are in Jeopardy.

6. Proposition 1B Signal Synchronization Program (Renee Berlin/David Yale, Metro)

Ms. Berlin stated that the City of Los Angeles is targeted to receive $150 million for Signal Synchronization projects as part of the Proposition 1B Highway Safety, Rehabilitation and Preservation Account Traffic Signal Synchronization program. Staff is recommending that the Metro Board approve a request by the City to exchange $18 million in Signal Synchronization projects previously approved through the Call for Projects to fund eligible replacement signal projects to be submitted by the City. Contingent upon receiving its full $150 million from Proposition 1B, the City has agreed to return $25.5 million in Call funding. The deobligated funds will then cover the $5 million advanced from the 2009 Call for Projects and programmed through the 2007 Call for Projects to fund the City of South Gate’s I-710 Early Action Program – Intersection Improvement project as well as provide $20.5 million for use in future Calls for Projects. The City has submitted a list of replacement projects which Metro staff will evaluate to determine their eligibility for Call funding.

John Drayton (Metro) asked if the recommendation provides $18 million in return for $25 million and results in a $7 million net benefit. David Yale (Metro) replied that the net gain is actually $25.5 million because the $18 million is not additional funding, but rather an exchange of Call projects previously approved.

Metro staff recommendations were approved on a motion by Abdollah Ansari (City of Long Beach) and seconded by Robert Newman (TDM/AQ).
7. 2008 Los Angeles County Transportation Improvement Program (David Yale/Toye Oyewole, Metro)

Mr. Yale stated that staff is recommending the Metro Board approve programming of up to $591.2 million for the Los Angeles County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) portion of the 2008 State Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as well as programming $940 million of Proposition 1B Public Transportation Modernization Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (Transit Modernization) Bond funds.

Mr. Yale referred TAC members to a handout which divided the $591 million of STIP programming into two tiers. Tier I represents $57.3 million of funding that is reasonably expected to be received. Tier I includes $33 million for the I-5 Carpool lanes project and $24.3 million for Metro Planning, Programming and Monitoring. Tier II represents $333.9 million for I-5 and 10 Carpool lanes projects and $200 million for the Crenshaw Corridor Transportation Improvement project.

Mr. Yale stated that although Tier II projects are not anticipated to receive funding through the STIP, the projects are being funded by other sources in Metro’s Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and should move forward on their optimal schedule.

For the Transit Modernization Proposition 1B funding, Mr. Yale referred members to a second handout listing projects which Metro would program the $940 million. The $940 million comprises both the Los Angeles revenue and population shares of the Bond funding.

Mr. Chan asked if the $15 million for the Wilshire Bus Rapid Transit project included acquisition of buses. Mr. Yale replied that funding applied to roadway improvements only. Mr. Yale added that the Transportation Appropriations Bill’s $16.1 million for Metro’s Small Starts program has an impact on this project. Mr. Chan asked whether the project would be delayed if the President vetoed the Appropriations Bill. Mr. Yale stated that he would check on that possibility and report back to concerned parties at a later date.

Larry Stevens (League of California Cities - San Gabriel Valley COG) asked how the projects programmed to receive Proposition 1B Transit Modernization funding were selected and prioritized over other projects in Metro’s LRTP. Mr. Yale responded that there was not a recognized list of prioritized projects, but that each project programmed here was carefully measured for the 2001 LRTP.

Dana Lee (BOS) stated that the Municipal Operators disagree with how the population share of the Proposition 1B Transit Modernization funds is to be allocated. Ms. Lee asked how, in the event that the Metro’s share of the Proposition 1B funding changes, would Metro prioritize the list of projects. Mr. Yale replied that staff would have to consider other funding sources throughout the LRTP in order to identify possible means for addressing any funding shortfalls. He added that the current list of projects was developed assuming current Proposition 1B funding allocations.

Metro staff recommendations were approved on a motion by Haripal Vir (City of Los Angeles) and seconded by Mark Yamarone (TDM/AQ). Dana Lee (BOS) and Larry Stevens abstained.
8. Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan (Michelle Smith, Metro/Sam Morrissey, WSA) Handout

Ms. Smith stated that two years ago Metro in conjunction with the county transportation commissions of Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura, along with SCAG and Caltrans procured the services of Wilbur Smith Associates, Inc. to develop a Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan (Action Plan). Since then, a series of stakeholders meetings have been held, surveys have been conducted and Technical Memorandums produced for public review, to help build the Action Plan. Today, staff is pleased to report that final edits to the draft Action Plan are currently underway. Staff expects a copy of the draft Action Plan to be available on the project website (www.metro.net/mcgmap) prior to the end of the year. A series of County Workshops will be scheduled in December and January and possibly one final Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) meeting will be scheduled in January to get more feedback on the Action Plan.

This morning, Sam Morrissey of Wilbur Smith & Associates will present highlights of the Draft Action Plan Executive Summary (that is being circulated for comments).

(The Presentation:) Mr. Morrissey stated that the Action Plan is consistent with the Final Statewide Goods Movement Action Plan released in January 2007. The Action Plan is the master plan for Goods Movement in southern California and is intended to be used as a guide in preparation of state, regional, and local transportation plans.

The Action Plan represents a partnership between county, regional, and state transportation agencies resulting in ongoing collaboration with State and Federal agencies. The partner agencies plan, fund, maintain, operate, construct and implement multi-modal transportation projects. Other organizations such as the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach have the authority to plan and construct transportation facility improvements within their respective jurisdictions while the South Coast Air Quality Management District develops and implements plans to improve the region's air quality. Decisions regarding land use, arterial improvements and the permitting of warehousing and trans-loading centers are made by local municipalities. To this extent, the Action Plan respects and recognizes agency roles and responsibilities.

The Action Plan covers a seven county region within southern California including Ventura, Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Riverside, Orange, San Diego, and Imperial. Today's presentation will focus primarily on Los Angeles County.

The Action Plan introduces a simultaneous and continuous improvement concept which includes three key components: mitigation, capacity and investment. Mitigation involves addressing both environmental and community impacts associated with Goods Movement. Mitigation is necessary for new and expanded capacity of the Goods Movement system. Added capacity allows for improved operations and performance by users of the system. Users, in this case being private industry freight users. Improving capacity will then allow users to invest further in the system and fill the funding gaps currently hampering required mitigation.
Mr. Morrissey identified four core mandates within the Action Plan that address the Environment, Mobility, the Economy, and Funding. All four mandates were developed through stakeholder outreach. Regarding the environment, direction was given to avoid, reduce, and mitigate environmental, community, and health impacts. For Mobility, the goal is to promote the safe and efficient movement of all transportation modes and reduce congestion. Regarding the economy, the goal is to ensure the economic well-being of the region and the state. Finally, the funding mandate calls for securing the region's fair share of public and private funds for investment in the freight transportation system.

Stakeholder outreach also resulted in the development of six implementation principles for the Action Plan that include:

- Guidelines for state, regional, and local planning;
- A Simultaneous and continuous investment strategy;
- A cost distribution where users and beneficiaries of the Goods Movement system pay their fair share;
- Defining institutional structures as needed;
- Demonstrating a clear public benefit prior to the use of public funding;
- Separating goods movement infrastructure from sensitive receptors.

Mr. Morrissey stated that before the Action Plan can be implemented, a number of challenges need to be overcome. To provide context, he reported that the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach represent the largest port complex in the United States and the fifth largest globally. In 2005, the ports processed approximately 15.7 million twenty-foot equivalent units (TEU) while supporting approximately $256 billion in international trade for the United States. Furthermore, roughly 40% of the goods that move through the ports are destined for points outside the Southern California region.

The first challenge to overcome is mobility constraints. With regional VMT and freight rail traffic expected to double over the next 20 years, a resulting 5.4 million hours of daily delay is anticipated by 2030. This increased congestion raises concern over air quality and motorist safety.

The second challenge deals with the environmental affects of goods movement. In 2005, almost $19.5 billion in health care costs was attributed to goods movement in California. Furthermore, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) estimated that 2,400 premature deaths occurred statewide in 2005 with 1,200 of those located in the South Coast Air Basin. For Los Angeles County, air quality is heavily impacted by goods movement and this has led to sharp criticism by those that live and work in close proximity to the Ports, railyards and other incompatible land uses. As an example, Mr. Morrissey reported that 46 schools in Los Angeles County are located within 2 miles of the Ports of L.A. and Long Beach. As mentioned previously, goods movement activities add considerably to traffic congestion and lead many major roadways to become pollution "hot spots". Unfortunately, even if a full fleet turnover of trucks to 2010 truck standards and of rail to the Tier 4 locomotive standards put forth by the USEPA were to occur, the resulting reduction in air pollution would still be insufficient.

The third challenge is funding. The Action Plan identifies more than $50 billion in projects over the next 30 years. For Los Angeles County, approximately $29 billion will be
needed. Currently, the Action Plan identifies approximately $2.4 billion in allocations. With traditional funding sources running dry, the lack of a dedicated funding source and limited private sector involvement, funding will remain a dynamic issue for the region.

The fourth challenge is economic vitality. Currently, logistics activity directly accounts for 6.6% of the region’s economy and indirectly accounts for nearly 13% of the economy. One logistics job supports, on average, 2.2 new jobs. More specifically, Los Angeles County represents the nation’s largest manufacturing center with over 1,100 warehouses and storage facilities supporting a variety of goods movement activities.

Mr. Morrisey stated that the Action Plan separated freight transport according to modal market segments. He reported that of the goods being transported out of the port area, 20% are by rail only, 36% are by truck only and 44% use intermodal transport with at least one truck trip. With this understanding of modal segmentation, staff was able to evaluate innovative strategies that specifically addressed truck traffic.

Before considering innovative truck strategies, the project team first recognized the need to maximize the amount of on-dock/near-dock rail service (40%). Second, the project team realized that 23% of the truck-only traffic for local distribution/delivery could not be shifted to a different mode of transport. With this in mind, the project team focused on the 37% of truck and intermodal transport that would be most receptive to innovative strategies. Mr. Morrisey introduced the strategies listed below:

- Inland staging areas (inland port);
- Separated corridor (truck lanes, rail, maglev, other shuttle technologies);
- Clean fuels & efficient vehicles (LNG trucks, maglev, LNG locomotives);
- Warehouse clustering around inland port.

Modal market segmentation also enabled the project team to consider ways for addressing “Fair Share” funding. Project team identified the rail market segment (combined 52%) as the point of “maximum opportunity” for obtaining State and Federal funding, applying user fees, and or applying port assessed or container fees. This distinct and easily identifiable market segment has goods that are known to be leaving the region by rail. The local truck-only segment (23%), however, offers very little opportunity for fair share funding because specific routes and users are less identifiable. Lastly, the regional truck-only segment (25%) has a moderate level of opportunity due to the ability to identify users and their dedicated regional routes.

The Action Plan goes on to identify four sets of actions:

- Accelerate regional environmental mitigation through both region-wide and project-specific measures;
- Relieve congestion and increase mobility through increased intermodal and mainline rail capacity as well as improved highways/roadways;
- Improve operational efficiencies by improving marine terminal productivity, truck turn times, intermodal operations, and highway operations;
- Develop an equitable public/private funding strategy which maximizes the region’s fair share of federal/state funds and obtains private sector contributions.
The Action Plan describes the potential future system as one that:

- Maximizes regional intermodal rail traffic through on-dock rail facilities, regional mainline capacity and grade separations;
- Minimizes regional truck traffic with high priority freight corridors, dedicated freight guideways, inland ports and staging areas and land use policies;
- Mitigates environmental and community impacts through grade separations, technological solutions, simultaneous and continuous investment, and a proactive contribution by Federal government, regulatory agencies and private industries.

Mr. Morrisey stated that a number of stakeholder concerns were brought up during the public outreach process. Five key concerns included:

- More aggressive environmental mitigation strategies to reduce current impacts;
- Dedicate new private/public funding sources to reduce health and environmental impacts;
- More aggressive use of alternative fuels and technologies;
- Study all costs and benefits of meeting a seemingly unlimited goods movement demand;
- Consider limiting trade growth to invest in clean industries.

Mr. Morrisey stated that the community and stakeholders expressed concern that the Action Plan would assume port growth as inevitable. In order to address such concerns, four separate growth scenarios are documented in the Action Plan. The first scenario represents a baseline which forecasts port growth of 42.5 million TEUs by 2030 and includes the assumption that improvements in SCAG’s 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with committed funding will be implemented. The second and third scenarios forecast port growth of 24 million and 33 million TEUs respectively by 2030 while also assuming implementation of SCAG’s 2004 RTP. The fourth scenario also forecasts port growth of 42.5 million TEUs by 2030 but assumes that SCAG’s 2004 RTP will be supplemented by additional projects, private investment and fees.

Following stakeholder feedback and formulation of evaluation of strategies, the Action Plan addresses four categories of “next steps”. The four categories are Environmental and Community Impacts, Partnership and Advocacy, Mobility, and Funding. For Environmental and Community Impacts, the next steps include:

- Utilize the Southern California National Freight Gateway (SCNFG) Cooperation Agreement, that was developed by multi-agencies and jurisdictions to develop a specific set of actions to accelerate implementation of strategies contained in various air quality and emission reduction plans;
- Partner with CARB, air districts, the logistics industry, and local governments to generate public and/or private funds to accelerate implementation of air quality improvements;
- Initiate the Environmental Justice Analysis and Outreach for the MCGMAP.

Partnership and Advocacy next steps include:

- Implement the SCNFG Cooperation Agreement to maintain dialogue among federal, state, regional, and other implementing agencies;
- Request the incorporation of MCGMAP strategies and actions into other state, regional and local plans;
• Continue to convene multi-county meetings;
• Support and propose legislation that provides funding mechanisms for goods movement projects/strategies and that facilitates regional multi-county goods movement goals without undermining local priorities and quality of life;
• Support groups such as Mobility 21 in developing federal and state goods movement funding sources;
• Continue to work closely with all stakeholders;
• Seek goods movement and logistics industry involvement throughout planning and project development phases.

Mobility next steps include:
• Initiate a study to investigate the linkage between industry supply chain trends and port and trade-related transportation patterns and movements;
• Continue project development efforts including planning, design, funding and implementation;
• Initiate a Regionally Significant Transportation Investment Study (RSTIS) to evaluate feasibility of implementing a Dedicated Freight Guideway System/Regional Truck Lanes from the Ports to Victorville;
• Initiate localized studies as appropriate.

Funding next steps include:
• Pursue new avenues of goods movement funding for projects including securing the region’s fair share of Proposition 1B Trade Corridor Improvement Funds;
• Continue fair share and user fee discussions with private sector stakeholders to seek their support in addressing goods movement impacts and filling funding gaps;
• Establish structures to manage user fees and revenue that are acceptable to both public and private sector stakeholders.

Mr. Morrisey stated that project partners will be receiving conducting County workshops on the Draft Action Plan and Executive Summary throughout December, 2007/January 2008. The Final Action Plan and Executive Summary are expected to be released January 2008 with Board presentations running through March 2008. Additional information about the project, the tech memos and upcoming meetings and county workshops, can be found at www.metro.net/rgcmap.

Ms. Kim asked how the projects identified in this plan differ from those identified in the statewide plan. Ms. Smith answered that while several projects will appear in both plans, the projects identified in this plan represent those of highest priority to the project partners involved. Some projects were drawn from project partners’ long range plans while others were a result of findings from the Wilbur Smith Study. In regards to Los Angeles County, Ms. Kim asked which projects did not overlap between both plans. Mr. Morrisey responded that all projects identified in the statewide plan for Los Angeles County are included in this plan but that for purposes of this study, additional projects were included.

Sgt. Steve Shenian (California Highway Patrol) stated that the I-710 and I-110 freeways were already running at capacity for 16 of the 24 hours a day. He asked if this Action Plan considered incentives that would encourage goods movement by truck to take place during off-peak hours, 9pm-5am. Mr. Morrisey stated that the PierPASS Program has been very
successful at the Ports and that consideration for expanding similar off-peak programs to roadways beyond the ports is a part of this Action Plan.

Mr. Stevens asked if details concerning the size, location and recommended land use strategies for inland ports are available in the Draft Action Plan. Mr. Morrisey replied that the Action Plan does not present specific locations for inland ports but that more detailed information on potential locations can be found in a recent study performed by SCAG.

Mr. Stevens also asked the meaning behind “potential non-freeway implementation”. Mr. Morrisey answered that freeway right of way (ROW) is a valuable commodity throughout the region and that stakeholders and project partners have commented on the inability to expand capacity on existing roadways or connect certain systems. A connection between utility ROWs and transportation ROWs has been applied in other states but has yet to be considered as an option for Southern California. Mr. Stevens asked if “potential non-freeway implementation” would ever include the transfer of truck traffic to arterials and local streets. Mr. Morrisey replied that that was not the intention.

Mr. Drayton asked if Congestion Pricing was considered as an alternative funding source in the Action Plan. Mr. Morrisey replied that a regional cordon-pricing strategy was not considered for this study but that HOT lanes and truck toll lanes were evaluated in Technical Memorandum 6B. Longer combination vehicles were also considered in that memorandum. Ms. Kim asked if longer combination vehicles were recommended in this study. Mr. Morrisey replied that staff did not recommend such vehicles and understands that there is strong opposition to their use on local streets.

Ms. Kim asked if all the counties needed to approve the Action Plan before it becomes official. Ms. Smith replied that was the goal. Ms. Kim asked if the Action Plan would be ready in time to include in the county applications for the Proposition 1B Trade Corridor Improvement Fund (TCIF). Shahrzad Amiri (Metro) replied that project partners are recommending the State take into consideration the plans that are in place at the time of programming and therefore requires this Action Plan be adopted before July of 2008.

Haripal Vir (City of Los Angeles) asked if there were any plans to improve the corridor between Bakersfield and Los Angeles County. Mr. Morrisey replied that a dedicated freight guideway as well as an extra-regional freight link were considered for areas beyond our regional boundaries but specific recommendations on connections with Bakersfield were not presented as part of this study. Mr. Vir asked if specific studies such as this would eventually become part of the Final Report. Ms. Smith replied that addressing specific concerns such as this would be addressed in a localized study described in the “next steps” phase of this study.

9. Metrolink Cost/Benefit Study (Patricia Chen, Metro)

Ms. Chen reported that the study was a response to September 2006 motions when, at the time, the Board was approached with a new cost sharing formula for Metrolink. The Board accepted the new formula on the condition that staff review and revise the formula within three years as well as perform a Cost-Benefit study to determine how best to direct Metro's Metrolink subsidy. The subsequent study addressed potential cost savings in the operating
subsidy to SCRRRA as well as how best to allocate the subsidy among the six lines that operate within Los Angeles County.

Staffs’ current recommendation to the Board requests that negotiations for the cost-sharing formula be re-opened and that SCRRRA continue to collect on a regular basis ridership information by county of residence.

Ms. Chen stated that if the formula were changed to reflect 50% train miles and 50% county of residents rather than train miles alone, Metro would likely realize an 8% cost savings in 2007. The savings would decline over time due to additional services being added and Los Angeles County residents beginning to ride more.

With regards to cost allocation, Ms. Chen explained that the Base Allocation formula was the old formula used prior to negotiations in 2004. The problem with this formula was that it was pegged to frozen statistics; as other counties’ services grew disproportionately more than LA County’s, it became less and less fair to L.A. County.

Ms. Chen directed TAC members to a graph showing Los Angeles County’s subsidy per resident rider to be substantially higher than the system-wide average. This imbalance helped justify the inclusion of “county of residents” into the allocation formula. However, to provide a fair and balanced comparison, staff analyzed the average subsidy per work trip rider to Los Angeles and found that the system-wide subsidy was considerably higher than Metro’s.

Ms. Chen concluded by showing a chart that illustrated Metrolink’s benefit to congestion relief. As part of the cost-benefit study, the analysis revealed that Metrolink service is equivalent to taking approximately one lane of traffic off the freeways.

Mr. Stevens asked whether fares would be adjusted as a result of the cost-benefit study. Ms. Chen replied that Metrolink’s fare system is currently being changed from a zone-based to a distance-based fare and will be applied to all lines. The current study, however, does not address fare policy. Rather, it addresses the subsidy required to cover the costs that remain after fare revenue is taken into account. Mr. Stevens asked if an increase or decrease to the subsidy of a particular line would result in a change in fare price. Ms. Chen replied that the study was not anticipated to affect fares.

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

Ms. Hills informed the Committee that the Long Range Transportation Plan is currently re-evaluating the financial model assumptions due to budget funding deficit issues at the state level as well as the combination of rising costs of highway and transit projects. January or February are possible dates for the release of the draft plan and outreach. Because Metro cannot depend on the state or federal for funds, the Long Range Transportation Plan will describe pursuing self-help measures: gas tax increases, sale taxes, congestion pricing, public/private partnership, mitigation fee, etc.

Ms. Kim asked how this will affect SCAG’s RTP process. Ms. Hills responded that it will have no affect.
11. Countywide Congestion Mitigation Fee (Robert Calix, Metro)

Mr. Calix discussed how Metro has looked at the Congestion Mitigation Fee for the past three years as a way to raise revenue throughout the county due to limited local, state and federal funds. On October 30, 2007, a Draft Congestion Mitigation Fee Feasibility Study Report was distributed to the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) members. Based upon the feedback from the PAC, several sections of the Draft Study Report are being revised to better reflect the comments received. Within the next couple weeks, a revised version of the Draft Study Report titled: "Congestion Mitigation Fee Feasibility Study Report: The Self-Help Proposal for Congestion Relief for LA County" should be available. He cautioned that the proposed congestion mitigation fee will not be the panacea to help everything. It is just another revenue option for cities, developers, etc. Questions were raised by the PAC about certain sections of the Draft Study Report, which required Metro staff to address these questions in an updated version of the Draft Study Report. Once the Draft Study Report is distributed, another round of stakeholder outreach will be scheduled early 2008. Once that occurs, a Revised Study Report will be prepared in mid-2008 to reflect the comments received on the Draft Study Report. In February, a status report should be presented to the Board. In addition, since the population forecasts are based on SCAG data, a revised fee revenue calculator will be distributed sometime after the final RTP is released in 2008. The Final Study Report will be brought to the Metro Board in mid-2008, and this will be the decision point whether to proceed to the next step of working with local jurisdictions on identifying projects for analysis in the Nexus Study.

Mr. Stevens asked how the Draft Study Report distinguished between a fee and a tax when the various fee scenarios presented in the report did not show the proper nexus between type of development and associated fee structure. Heather Hills replied that a Nexus Study has yet to be initiated. Mr. Calix added that the majority of stakeholder feedback, including input from the Board, requested that the process for implementing a mitigation fee be evaluated prior to developing a Nexus Study for a specific project list.

Mr. Stevens recommended that the various fee scenarios be applied to existing developments and actual transportation projects in order to provide a more tangible example for stakeholders. He also suggested that a clear explanation be provided for how development credits would be applied under this 'regional' mitigation fee approach. Mr. Calix replied that the stakeholder feedback has been mixed and that a previous attempt to illustrate real-world applications came back with mixed results. Consequently, staff incorporated fee scenarios as illustrative examples to give stakeholders a better idea of the ranges of fee revenue that could be generated. Ms. Hills reminded the audience that the current Draft Study Report was strictly a feasibility study and that future studies, such as a Nexus Study, would need Metro Board approval to proceed.

12. Congestion Pricing Feasibility Study (Ashad Hamideh, Metro)

Mr. Hamideh reported that the study provides a Congestion Pricing Operating plan for Los Angeles County. Part of the operating plan would involve feasibility while another part would involve identifying at least three options that could be implemented by 2010.
Originally, the outreach component was designed to be a separate RFP. However, after further consideration, staff decided to combine outreach with the main study and utilize a single consultant. Consequently, revisions to the Scope of Work delayed the release of the RFP project until sometime next week.

Mr. Hamideh informed TAC members that the U.S. DOT announced another round of funding. The Urban Partnership Program, now referred to as the Congestion Reduction Demonstration Initiative Program (CRDIP), applications are due December 31, 2007. The Metro Board will be presented a list of projects that will be included in Metro’s CRDIP application on November 29, 2007.

With the passing of AB 1467, Metro received the authority in coordination with Caltrans to construct High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes. The Bill limits the number of projects to four, with two from Northern California and two from Southern California. Applications are approved by the CTC on a first-come, first-serve basis and are accepted through 2012. An area of contention, however, is that the CTC interprets the legislation to apply to new construction only. Metro disagrees with that position and instead believes that conversion of existing general purpose lanes or HOV lanes to HOT lanes is both appropriate and necessary.

Ms. Kim asked if the CTC’s revised guidelines favor conversion of existing lanes over new lanes in constructing HOT lanes. Mr. Hamideh stated that a preference for one over the other is not explicit in the guidelines, but merely a form of Congestion Pricing is required in order to receive funding. With regards to the CRDIP application, Ms. Kim asked if specific routes for HOT lanes had to be included. Mr. Hamideh replied that a prior Urban Partnership application failed to be selected in part because of the lack of project specific information and that Metro intends to be more forthcoming with the current application.

Mr. Stevens asked if staff will be releasing a list of potential projects to be included in the application. Mr. Hamideh stated that staff will present corridor specific information to the Metro Board, while stressing the fact that project specific information is needed in order for the application to be competitive.

Mr. Haripal asked who Metro is working with at LADOT and Caltrans. Mr. Hamideh replied John Fisher from LADOT and Frank Quon with Caltrans.

13. 2008 TIP Deadline (Avital Shavit, Metro) Handout

Ms. Shavit stated that the previous October 31st deadline for submitting to the 2008 TIP was extended to November 12, 2007. TAC members were provided a handout outlining which agencies have partially completed the submittal process and which agencies have yet to begin the submittal process. Ms. Shavit asked TAC members to please inform their respective agencies on the list that Metro will be accepting submittals until the end of the week. For questions or further information, please contact Avital Shavit at (213) 922-7518 or Nancy Marroquin at (213) 922-7237.
14. New Business

Mr. Stevens requested that items which may require committee action be listed on the agenda as such. He stated that consultation with the agencies he represents requires different degrees of preparation according to whether the item is an update, information only, or an action item. Mr. Patashnick acknowledged the requested, and noted that it was a staff oversight on the items mentioned by Mr. Stevens.

15. Adjournment

The next meeting will be held on December 12, 2007 in the Union Station Conference Room on the 3rd Floor at 9:30 a.m.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>Marianne Kim/ Stephen Finnegan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (BOS)</td>
<td>Dana Lee/Susan Lipman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Reyno/Dennis Kobata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL</td>
<td>It. Damian McDermott/Sg. Steve Shenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>Raja Mitwasi /Alberto Angelini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rose Casey/ Kirk Cerena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVE ON ADA</td>
<td>Ellen Blackman/John Whitbread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>Abdollah Ansari/Sumi Cant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>James Lefton/David Rzepinski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haripal Vir/Mike Uyeno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gina Mancha/Fredy Choy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Herwick/Gunnar Hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Maselkas/Maged El-Rabaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick V. DeChellis/Shari Afshari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greg Herrmann/Cathi Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities COG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desi Alvarez/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes Malibu COG</td>
<td>Robert Brager/Tom Gdala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Tom Horne/Nicole West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
<td>Larry Stevens/Craig Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td>Steven Huang/Victor Rollinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Cities COG</td>
<td>David Feinberg/Sharon Perlstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Name</td>
<td>Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE (LTSS)          | 1. Jand Baghdanian/Thomas Uwal  
                                                      | 2. Joyce Rooney/Bertha Tafoya |
| METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (Metro)      | 1. Alan Patashnick/Fanny Pan Countywide Planning & Development  
                                                      | 2. Jim Drayton/Christopher Gallanes 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. Eyvonne Sells/Kathryn Higgins |
| SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG -- Ex-Officio) | 1. David Rubinow/Annie Nam |
| GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)         | 1. LaDonna DiCamillo/Ron Guss |
| TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/ AIR QUALITY SUBCOMMITTEE | 1. Mark Yamamoto/Phil Aker  
<pre><code>                                                  | 2. Robert Newman/Brooke Geer Person |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTO CLUB</td>
<td>John Doe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANA LOPEZ</td>
<td>Bob Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>Alice Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>Charlie Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COYOTE VALLEY COG</td>
<td>David Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY ON LA</td>
<td>John Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF GATEWAY</td>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>Bob Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>John Doe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANA LOPEZ</td>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>Bob Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COYOTE VALLEY COG</td>
<td>John Doe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY ON LA</td>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF GATEWAY</td>
<td>Bob Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>Bob Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANA LOPEZ</td>
<td>John Doe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>Bob Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COYOTE VALLEY COG</td>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY ON LA</td>
<td>Bob Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF GATEWAY</td>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>Bob Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>John Doe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANA LOPEZ</td>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>Bob Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COYOTE VALLEY COG</td>
<td>John Doe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY ON LA</td>
<td>Bob Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF GATEWAY</td>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>Bob Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table appears to be a list of attendees, possibly for a committee meeting, with names listed under different categories or agencies.
Overview of Action Plan

"The Action Plan is the master plan for goods movement in Southern California and is intended to be used as a guide in preparation of state, regional, and local transportation plans."

- Regional in scope
What's New

> The Action Plan represents a partnership between county, regional, and state transportation agencies, resulting in ongoing collaboration with State and Federal agencies.
> The Action Plan included regional modeling of freight facilities.
> The Action Plan presents a market segmented approach to addressing goods movement and associated issues.

Agency Roles

> The MCGMAP partners are the transportation and planning agencies that co-manage the development of the Action Plan.
> The MCGMAP partners plan, fund, maintain, operate, construct and implement multi-modal transportation projects.
> The MCGMAP partners influence the goods movement system through the regional planning and programming of funds to transportation projects.
SIMULTANEOUS AND CONTINUOUS

Core Mandates

Environment
- Avoid, reduce and mitigate environmental, community, and health impacts.

Mobility
- Promote the safe and efficient movement of all transportation modes and reduce congestion.

Economy
- Ensure the economic well-being of the region and the state.

Funding
- Secure the region's fair share of public and private funds for investment in the freight transportation system.
Implementation Principles

1. Guideline – For state, regional, and local planning.
2. Investment – Simultaneous and continuous.
3. Cost Distribution – Users and beneficiaries will pay their fair share.
5. Public Benefit – In order to use public funding a clear public benefit must be demonstrated.

Challenges
Challenges (Continued)

> Mobility
  > More than doubling of regional VMT and freight rail traffic by 2030
  > 5.4 million hours of daily delay by 2030
  > Some freeways may carry more than 80,000 trucks per day
    > In Los Angeles County increasing freight volumes directly impact passenger service and grade crossings
    > At-grade crossings will add to motorist delays; promoting congestion, and reducing air quality
    > In the South Bay cities subregion, between 2002 and 2006 there were 15 collisions at highway-rail crossings
    > Many old existing highways such as I-710 have non-standard features which cause congestion and safety concerns.

Challenges (Continued)

> Environment and Community
  > In 2005, almost $19.5 billion is health costs due to freight transport in California
  > Premature deaths – 2,400 (CARB) statewide, 1,200 in South Coast Air Basin
    > In Los Angeles County, air quality is greatly impacted by goods movement
    > Proximity of schools to goods movement industry/infrastructure
    > Incompatible land uses between residential neighborhoods and goods movement activities
Challenges (Continued)

> Environment and Community (continued)*
  > California counties not meeting the basic public health standard for fine particles
  > Major roadways are pollution "hot spots"
  > Even full fleet turnover to 2010 truck standards and to the Tier 4 locomotive standards proposed by USEPA will not provide sufficient reductions
  > Additional emission reductions — over and above the control measures the agencies have been able to identify for inclusion in plans to date — will have to be implemented

* Source: "Southern California's Freight Movement Challenge" presentation to California Bar Association Environmental Law Conference, October 2007 (SANBAG)
Challenges (Continued)

> Economic
  > Logistics activity is directly responsible for 6.6% of the region’s economy
  > One logistics job supports 2.2 new jobs
  > Border crossing delays resulted in the loss of $3.9 billion from the binational economy
  > 1,101 warehouses and storage facilities in Los Angeles County
  > Los Angeles County as a whole is the nation’s largest manufacturing center
Strategic means to address ...

Truck Issues

Hwy Operations & Capacity
General purp. hwy network

Innovative Strategies
1) Inland staging areas (inland port);
2) Separated corridor (truck lanes, rail, maglev, other shuttle technologies);
3) Clean fuels & efficient vehicles (LNG trucks, maglev, LNG locomotives);
4) Warehouse clustering around inland port.

Maximize On-Dock Rail
Minimize local truck drayage

---

Strategic means to address ...

"Fair Share" Funding

Minimal Opportunity
Traditional funding sources – strained

Moderate Opportunity
Regional truck markets

Maximum Opportunity
1) State and Federal;
2) User fees;
3) Port assessed or container fees
Four Sets of Actions

**ACCELERATE Regional Environmental Mitigation**
1) Region-wide approaches  
2) Project specific mitigation measures

**RELIEVE Congestion and Increase Mobility**
1) Increased intermodal and mainline rail capacity  
2) Improved highways/roadways

**IMPROVE Operational Efficiencies**
1) Improve marine terminal productivity, truck turn times, and intermodal operations  
2) Improve highway operations

**DEVELOP EQUITABLE Public/Private Funding Strategy**
1) Maximize the region's fair share of Federal/state funds  
2) Obtain private sector contribution

Potential Future System
Potential Future System (Continued)

- Maximize Regional Intermodal Rail Traffic
  - On-dock rail facilities
  - Regional mainline capacity
  - Grade separations
- Minimize Regional Truck Traffic
  - High priority freight corridors
  - Dedicated freight guideways
  - Inland ports and staging areas
  - Land use policies
- Target the Mitigation of Environmental and Community Impacts
  - Grade Separation
  - Technology solutions
  - Simultaneous and continuous
  - Federal government, regulatory agencies, and private industries must play a proactive role

Key Stakeholder Concerns

1. More aggressive environmental mitigation strategies to reduce current impacts.
2. Dedicate new private/public funding sources to reduce health and environmental impacts.
3. More aggressive use of alternative fuels and technologies.
4. Study all costs and benefits of meeting a seemingly unlimited goods movement demand.
5. Consider limiting trade growth to invest in clean industries.
Freight Growth Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>2030 Employment Impact (number of jobs)</th>
<th>Change relative to Scenario 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>San Pedro Bay port growth of 15.3 million TEUs by 2030; SCAG 2004 Regional Transportation Plan baseline implementation</td>
<td>1,601,476</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>San Pedro Bay port growth of 24 million TEUs by 2030; SCAG 2004 Regional Transportation Plan baseline implementation</td>
<td>1,013,044</td>
<td>-38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>San Pedro Bay port growth of 33 million TEUs by 2030; SCAG 2004 Regional Transportation Plan baseline implementation</td>
<td>1,393,496</td>
<td>-18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>San Pedro Bay port growth of 42.5 million TEUs by 2030; SCAG 2004 Regional Transportation Plan baseline implementation supplemented by additional projects and reallocation of external sources and uses</td>
<td>1,601,476</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>zeq</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Distance (mi)</th>
<th>Reduction of Time of Delays 2039 Fantasy (min)</th>
<th>Relative (Time)</th>
<th>Relative (Distance)</th>
<th>Relative (Miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>San Pedro to Victorville</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>47.560</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-710 to I-5 in LA</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>47.560</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I-710 to I-5 in LA</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>47.560</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I-710 to I-5 in LA</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>47.560</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-710 to I-5 in LA</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>47.560</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I-710 to I-5 in LA</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>47.560</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-710 to I-5 in LA</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>47.560</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-710 to I-5 in LA</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>47.560</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-710 to I-5 in LA</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>47.560</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-710 to I-5 in LA</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>47.560</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-710 to I-5 in LA</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>47.560</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I-710 to I-5 in LA</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>47.560</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data may not include San Diego County information.
Action Plan Projects/Strategies

- Included in Draft Executive Summary
  - Two lists – Regional and County level
  - Over $50 billion in total cost, of which approximately $2.4 billion is currently committed

- Project/Strategy Categories
  - Project-specific environmental mitigation emissions reductions
  - Rail
  - Intermodal ground access
  - Alternative technology
  - Freeway/highway

Next Steps

- Environmental and Community Impacts
  - Through the Southern California National Freight Gateway (SCNFG) Cooperation Agreement and other related activities, develop a specific set of feasible actions to accelerate implementation of the strategies contained in the various air quality and emission reduction plans that are within the scope of responsibility of the project partners.
  - In partnership with CARB, air districts, the logistics industry, and local governments, initiate an activity to generate public and/or private funds to accelerate implementation of air quality improvement strategies being undertaken by these and other entities.
  - Initiate the Environmental Justice Analysis and Outreach for the MCGMAP in Fall 2007.
Next Steps (Continued)

> Partnership and Advocacy
  > Implement the SCNFG Cooperation Agreement among federal, state, regional, and other implementing agencies to maintain dialogue to address the challenges outlined in MCGMAP.
  > Request the incorporation of MCGMAP strategies and actions into other state, regional, and local plans.
  > Continue to convene multi-county meetings.
  > Support and propose legislation that: 1) Provides funding mechanisms; and 2) improves mobility and facilitates regional multi-county goods movement goals without undermining local community priorities and quality of life.
  > Support groups such as Mobility 21 and the Coalition for America’s Gateways and Trade Corridors in developing dedicated federal and state goods movement funding sources.
  > Continue to work closely with all stakeholders.
  > Seek goods movement and logistics industry involvement throughout planning and project development phases.

Next Steps (Continued)

> Mobility
  > Initiate a study to investigate the linkage between industry supply chain trends and port and trade related transportation patterns and movements.
  > Continue project development efforts of the regional and county-specific projects listed in the Action Plan, including the mitigation of the impacts of those projects.
  > Initiate a Regionally Significant Transportation Investment Study (RSTIS) to evaluate the feasibility of implementing a Dedicated Freight Guideway System/Regional Truck Lanes (I-710 from Port of Long Beach to SR-60; East-West Corridor between the I-710 and to I-15; and I-15 to Victorville) inclusive of potential non-freeway implementation
  > Initiate localized studies, as appropriate
Next Steps (Continued)

> Funding
  > Pursue new avenues of goods movement funding for projects, including the region's fair share of Proposition 1B trade Corridor Improvement Funds, other state appropriations, federal funds, and private sector contributions consistent with the impacts of the benefits they derive from the use of the transportation system.
  > Continue fair share and user fee discussions with private sector stakeholders to seek their support in addressing goods movement impacts and filling funding gaps.
  > Establish structures to manage user fees and revenue that are acceptable to both public and private sector stakeholders.

Completion Schedule

> County workshops – November/December, 2007
> Board presentations and approval – January through March, 2008
Questions & Answers

More Information:
www.metro.net/mcgmap
TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS WILL PRESENT A LONG-TERM STRATEGY FOR
GOODS MOVEMENT IMPROVEMENTS IN THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGION

Tell us what you think about recommendations to improve the movement of goods through
Southern California – projected to increase dramatically over the next 20 years!

WHAT IS "MCGMAP"?  The Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan is a consensus strategy and implementation plan for the Southen California goods movement system.

Specific objectives:
- Document existing freight movement systems and constraints
- Identify projected goods movement growth and trends, and possible private sector responses
- Identify strategies to lessen community and environmental impacts
- Identify optimal short-term and long-term infrastructure and operational strategies
- Identify private and public-sector roles in implementation, and funding sources
- Identify partnership opportunities and solutions for implementation and needed public-private institutional arrangements

Refreshments will be served. Spanish translation will be provided at all workshops.
Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan (MCGMAP)

Goods Movement Public Workshops will be held throughout the Southern California region. Upcoming workshops are scheduled in the following counties:

**LOS ANGELES**
Monday, December 3, 07
6:00 - 8:00 p.m.
South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD)
1365 Copley Drive
Lundon Bar, CA 91765

Tuesday, December 4, 07
6:00 - 7:00 p.m.
Boy & Girls Club - East Los Angeles
24 N. McDonnell Awe.
Los Angeles, CA 90022

Thursday, December 6, 07
6:00 - 8:00 p.m.
Wilmington Senior Center
175 Eubank Street
Wilmington, CA 90744

**RIVERSIDE**
Monday, December 10, 07
6:00 - 8:00 p.m.
City of Riverside
8800 Avenue
Riverside, CA 92503

**VENTURA**
Monday, December 12, 07
6:00 - 8:00 p.m.
Ventura Community Center
430 E. Knapp Street
Ventura, CA 93003

Additional Public Workshops will be held in early January 2008

**SAN BERNARDINO**
SANBAG Office--Santa Fe Depot
1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Floor, San Bernardino, CA 92410

**SAN DIEGO**
SANDAG Office
401 B Street, San Diego, CA 92101

**ORANGE**
North and South Orange County locations

For more information, contact Melissa Holguin at 909.627.2974 or visit www.metro.net/mcgmapp
November 5, 2007

MEMO TO: CITY MANAGERS AND PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTORS FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (FTIP) PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

FROM: FRANK FLORES EXECUTIVE OFFICER PROGRAMMING AND POLICY ANALYSIS

SUBJECT: TIME EXTENSION FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY AGENCIES TO CARRY OVER EXISTING PROJECTS AND SUBMIT NEW PROJECTS INTO 2008 TIP ADOPTION

Metro requires all Los Angeles County agencies that request Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) funds to carry over their existing projects from the 2006 TIP, as well as submit new projects into the 2008 TIP Adoption through the Program Metro TIP database at http://program.metro.net. The deadline for carrying over existing projects and submitting new projects into the 2008 TIP Adoption was Wednesday, October 31, 2007. However, as this is the first year of our implementing the new Program Metro TIP database and several agencies have yet to carry over their existing projects and submit their new projects into this database (see Group 1 and Group 2 listings on the following page), we are extending the deadline to Monday, November 12, 2007.

The TIP is a federal and state-mandated, six-year programming document that contains financial and other project planning information about local highway, state highway, and transit projects and services. This listing includes all capacity and non-capacity-enhancing transportation projects programmed with federal, state or local funds. The TIP also includes all capital and non-capital/operational elements for both highway and transit projects. Lastly, any regionally significant project, as defined by the Southern California Association of Governments, must be included in the TIP even if it is not federally funded. The current FY 2008/09 - 2013/14 TIP includes $13 billion in federal, state and local funds for Los Angeles County.

If an agency fails to update, edit, carry over and submit projects into the 2008 TIP Adoption, then access to federal project funds may be delayed or lost. If an agency allows project funding in the TIP to lapse, the agency may lose a portion of this federal project funding.

The following Group 1 agencies have not carried over any existing projects or added any new projects into the 2008 TIP Adoption:
GROUP 1

Calif. Department of Parks and Recreation
Irwindale, City of
La Puente, City of
Lynwood, City of
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments
San Marino, City of
Sierra Madre, City of

The following Group 2 agencies have made some progress in carrying over existing projects or adding new projects into the 2008 TIP, but still have additional projects that need to be carried over:

GROUP 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baldwin Park, City of</th>
<th>Maywood, City of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burbank, City of</td>
<td>Norwalk, City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson, City of</td>
<td>Palos Verdes Estates, City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covina, City of</td>
<td>Pasadena, City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bar, City of</td>
<td>Pico Rivera, City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey, City of</td>
<td>Pomona, City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duarte, City of</td>
<td>Port of Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Monte, City of</td>
<td>Rancho Palos Verdes, City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardena, City of</td>
<td>Redondo Beach, City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry, City of</td>
<td>San Fernando, City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglewood, City of</td>
<td>Santa Monica Mountain Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mirada, City of</td>
<td>Southern Calif. Regional Rail Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster, City of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To carry over a project into the 2008 TIP Adoption, one only needs to do the following:

Go to the ProgramMetro Main Menu @ http://program.metro.net.
Click on 2008 TIP ADOPTION.
Click on Carry-Over 06 TIP PROJECTS.
Click on CARRY-OVER to open a project form.
Once in the project form, edit, review and complete the project form.
Provide a description of the project progress or changes to the project in the NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION field.
If your project is in progress, but you have no changes to make to your project, note that in the NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION field.
If the project is complete, revise the CHANGE REASON to Project Complete.
To submit the project to Metro for review, click SUBMIT TO METRO.

If you have any questions about carrying over projects or placing new projects into the 2008 TIP Adoption, please contact Nancy Marroquin at (213) 922-7237, marroquinn@metro.net, or Avital Shavit at (212) 922-7518, shavita@metro.net. Thank you.
Attachment 4

Board Report: Los Angeles County Congestion-Reduction Demonstration Initiative Proposal
SUBJECT: LOS ANGELES COUNTY CONGESTION-REDUCTION DEMONSTRATION INITIATIVE PROPOSAL

ACTION: APPROVE CONGESTION-REDUCTION DEMONSTRATION INITIATIVE PROPOSAL

RECOMMENDATION

A. Approve the submittal of a one-year congestion-pricing demonstration project to the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) that includes conversion of existing High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes to High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes along Interstate 10 (El Monte Busway), Interstate 110 (Harbor Freeway Transitway), and Interstate 210 from the I-605 to the I-710 as part of a first phase, with the potential for a second phase that would include HOV lanes currently under construction along State Route 60 (Pomona Freeway), future carpool lanes on the I-10 east of the I-605, and carpool lanes on the I-210 east of the I-605 as HOT lanes during a second phase.

B. Approve the submittal of an application to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for legislative authority to develop and operate High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes for the freeway corridors included in action "A" of this recommendation, including the administration and operation of a congestion-pricing program and exclusive or preferential lane facilities for public transit per Assembly Bill 1467.

ISSUE

On November 13, 2007, the USDOT’s Office of the Secretary of Transportation published a Solicitation of Applications for Funding of Congestion-Reduction Demonstration Initiatives. To participate in the solicitation for possible federal funding, Metro must submit an application for Los Angeles County by a December 31, 2007 deadline.

On a related note, the CTC approved the Assembly Bill 1467 HOT Lane Guidelines and application procedures in October 24, 2007. Metro, as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Los Angeles County, and in cooperation with Caltrans, may apply to the
CTC to develop and operate HOT lanes. Per Assembly Bill 1467, the CTC may grant authority for only two projects in Southern California.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Our recommendation is consistent with the Board directive to develop congestion-pricing alternatives that could be implemented in Los Angeles County by the year 2010. Approval of our recommendation could provide funding and/or authority to implement congestion-pricing HOT lane projects. Approval of our recommendation also would place Los Angeles County strategically to compete for federal highway and transit funds to help finance congestion reduction strategies in the region.

OPTIONS

The Board of Directors could choose not to approve all or part of the recommendation. We are not recommending this option because without these actions, our region will not be competitive for the immediate opportunities provided by the USDOT and the CTC for implementing congestion relief strategies that include pricing. Metro staff considered toll lanes on other freeways. These freeways had attributes which made them less appropriate for a near term demonstration project. Depending on the freeway, some freeways had less congestion, less parallel transit, less capacity in the HOV lanes, less of a direct link to major destinations, created less of a network and/or had less space for the toll lanes technology than the recommended projects.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The recommended actions have no impact on Metro's FY 08 Budget. Selecting a congestion pricing project for the USDOT and CTC applications would increase the likelihood of Los Angeles County receiving federal and/or state funds.

DISCUSSION

Last month, the USDOT's Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy, Tyler Duvall, informed the Board of Directors of an upcoming request for solicitations for funding for an initiative similar to the Urban Partnership Agreement (UPA) program that the USDOT had established a year ago. Subsequently, the USDOT's Office of the Secretary of Transportation published a Solicitation of Applications for Funding of Congestion-Reduction Demonstration Initiatives on November 13, 2007. Applicants that are not a State Department of Transportation (DOT) are expected to partner with or submit an application through their corresponding DOT in applying for highway discretionary funding. Soon after the December 31st deadline, the USDOT will enter into agreements with the successful applicants who will be designated as "qualified jurisdictions" of federal assistance in accordance with this notice. These agreements would support congestion-pricing and complementary transportation projects and strategies. To be competitive, proposals must integrate innovative transit strategies, new transportation technologies, and direct highway pricing during congested travel periods. In addition, applications must address the USDOT's expectations for the implementation or pre-implementation efforts of any proposed congestion-reduction
activities to commence shortly after an agreement with the USDOT is signed. Proposed projects and programs could be implemented on a demonstration basis.

The new federal solicitation generally follows the same guidelines and evaluation process for the earlier UPA program. The USDOT will consider a variety of factors in reviewing applications seeking funding, including: (1) the extent to which the proposed congestion-reduction plan reduces traffic congestion, enables improvements in transit service, and demonstrates innovative technology applications; (2) the projects national demonstration value; and (3) the technical feasibility and political probability of the project(s) being implemented in the near-term.

Although the USDOT did not specify in its solicitation notice the potential funding that could be made available for designated qualified jurisdictions, it has identified the various discretionary funding programs that will be available in FY 08 for implementing congestion-reduction demonstration initiatives. These funding opportunities include Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) programs, such as Innovative Bridge, Interstate Maintenance, and Truck Parking Facilities. In addition, funding opportunities included Federal Transit Administration (FTA) programs, such as Bus and Bus-Related Facilities and Small Starts.

Also, the USDOT may allocate up to $9.5 billion in private activity bond authority not already allocated or applied for under the Private Activity Bond program. The UDOT may also provide qualified jurisdictions direct loans, loan guarantees, and lines of credit for qualified projects under the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA). TIFIA allows for the support of approximately $10 billion in credit assistance. These funding opportunities are in addition to any funds designated by law to support the USDOT’s Congestion Initiative. The President’s Fiscal Year 2008 Budget includes $175 million for USDOT’s Congestion Initiative.

The USDOT’s recent solicitation follows the same funding approach of the former UPA program, which solicited proposals without any funding commitment from the USDOT, but resulted in about $850 million in discretionary funds that were conditionally awarded to five designated Urban Partners (Miami, San Francisco, Minneapolis, Seattle, and New York). Additional funding could become available to the USDOT for qualified jurisdictions proposing innovative congestion-reduction demonstration projects if the Urban Partners designated under the UPA program are unsuccessful in obtaining needed legislative authority to move their projects forward or to provide the required local funding match.

For Los Angeles County’s proposal to be competitive and responsive to the USDOT’s notice, Metro would need to have proper State legislation in place or demonstrate efforts for obtaining legislative approval for implementing congestion-reduction related projects and activities, including congestion-pricing. In this regard, Assembly Bill 1467 allows Metro, as the RTPA for Los Angeles County and in cooperation with Caltrans, to develop and operate HOT lanes, including the administration and operation of a congestion-pricing program and exclusive or preferential lane facilities for public transit. The number of projects that may be approved under Assembly Bill 1467 is limited to four: two in Northern California and two in Southern California. Metro staff will request that our combined corridors constitute one network or one project. If limited to two single freeways, Metro staff will apply for the Harbor Freeway and the El Monte Busway. There is no deadline for submitting applications to the CTC application for developing HOT lanes, but we need to be ready to submit an application
as soon as possible to compete for the two spots that are available for Southern California. The State Legislature would approve projects submitted by RTPA's on a first come first serve basis per the recommendation of the CTC. Among the eligibility criteria is whether proposed projects for developing HOT lanes or exclusive or preferential lane facilities for public transit are included in the RTPA's Long Range Transportation Plan or necessary steps are being considered to include them. If we are not successful under this process for implementing Assembly Bill 1467, we will have to seek new State legislation for Los Angeles County. In any case, we expect to seek new State authority for developing HOT lane corridors or for a more general language that would allow implementing other congestion-pricing alternatives in Los Angeles County. We are currently working with our Government Relations staff to include this effort in Metro's Legislative Program.

To help identify a congestion pricing proposal, Metro organized a meeting with the region's major transportation agencies to discuss the potential of congestion pricing alternatives that could be implemented in Los Angeles County in the short-term. Metro staff also had initial contacts with the Council of Governments (COG's). The meeting included high-level staff from Caltrans, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, and the City of Los Angeles. SCAG was also invited to participate in the meeting. The discussions focused on developing HOT lanes, whether through converting existing HOV lanes or operating those HOV lanes that are currently under construction. The regional partners considered several criteria, including current operating conditions (traffic volumes, average speeds, travel time savings, minimum passenger occupancy requirements, etc.), the availability of transit alternatives, easiness for implementation in the short-term, and potential to operate as a system or bundle of HOT lanes that could developed into a network of managed priced lanes. Attachments A, B, and C summarize information on travel time savings and HOT lane peak hour volumes. Attachments D and E contain more detailed data on these same features. Attachment F is a map of the current carpool lane network which staff consulted to look at connectivity.

One strong project to emerge from this discussion and evaluation of the data was conversion of the Harbor Freeway Transitway (both lanes each direction) into a toll lane facility. Advantages of this facility are that it contains two lanes in each direction, it has some capacity left during peak hours in the carpool lanes so that toll paying cars could be added without significantly impacting adjacent mixed flow lanes, there is good opportunity to use any tolls collected to increase parallel transit service, the freeway is congested enough so that a toll facility could provide significant travel time savings for drivers, it has physical space for toll monitoring equipment, and it has limited egress and access which may help in toll monitoring.

The El Monte busway on the I-10 Freeway from the I-605 to downtown Los Angeles also emerged from the discussion as a strong project. The I-10 freeway is highly congested and a toll lane could provide excellent travel time savings opportunities to drivers. There is excellent parallel transit service such as on the El Monte Busway and Metrolink to provide additional mobility options. The facility has physical space to accommodate any toll monitoring equipment and there is limited egress and access to aid in toll monitoring. The I-210 freeway similarly had the advantages of a long continuous HOV lane, significant congestion and opportunities to provide drivers with significant travel time savings. Toll facilities on both the I-210 and the I-10 could provide drivers two parallel opportunities to travel through portions.
of the San Gabriel Valley and also access Downtown Los Angeles with travel time savings. Staff intends to propose the portion of the I-210 carpool lane from the I-605 to the I-710 as part of a first phase with extension east of that as a second phase. With respect to the SR-60, the current carpool lanes were not considered long enough to be part of an initial pilot project. As the lanes that are currently under construction are completed, this freeway could be added in the future providing yet a third parallel corridor with a high speed travel lane option during peak periods. Similarly, future carpool lanes on the I-10 east of the current El Monte busway would be proposed in the USDOT application as a second phase.

The basic elements of the pilot congestion pricing projects would be to open the HOV lanes to all drivers with a graduated toll designed to keep the lane moving at a minimum 50-mile per hour speed. The tolls would vary by time of day and congestion levels. Tolls would be highest for solo drivers and gradually lower for 3-plus and 2-plus occupancy vehicles. Buses and van pools would be free. Toll revenues would be used for improvements along that same corridor. These improvements could include, for example, additional transit facilities and service, subsidies for van pools, advanced signal timing, and arterial capacity improvements.

Prior to opening any pilot project, Metro in conjunction with affected transportation agencies would prepare a detailed implementation plan with extensive outreach to local jurisdictions and communities. This implementation plan would assess how the facility could be designed and implemented in such a way that it provided travel time and mobility benefits to users without adversely impacting adjacent freeway lanes and arterials.

**NEXT STEPS**

Upon approval of the recommendations above, we will continue working with our major stakeholders to formulate a set of strategies that could be integrated into a comprehensive proposal for Los Angeles County under both the USDOT and the CTC applications.

Prepared by: Ashad Hamideh, Ph.D., Transportation Planning Manager
Regional Program Management

Attachments:
A. Travel Speed Comparison Chart
B. Speed Comparison Table
C. HOV Lane Peak Hour Volume Chart
D. Current HOV Volumes Chart
E. Travel Time Data (HOV Lane Time Savings) Chart
F. LA County HOV System Status Map
Carol Inge
Chief Planning Officer

Roger Snoble
Chief Executive Officer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Speed General Lane (mi/hr)</th>
<th>Speed HOV (mi/hr)</th>
<th>Travel Time Savings (min)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>210 Rt. 134 to S.B. Co. Line AM</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 H. Hughes to O.Co. Line AM</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Alameda to Rt. 605 AM</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 Rt.5 to Waterford AM</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170 Rt.101/134 to Rt. 5 AM</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Alameda to Rt. 605 PM</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 Rt. 91 to Adams AM</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210 Rt. 134 to S.B. Co. Line PM</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 Rt. 405 to 605 AM</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 H. Hughes to O.Co. Line PM</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170 Rt.101/134 to Rt. 5 PM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605 Orange Co Line to 10 AM</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 Rt. 405 to 605 PM</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Brea Canyon to S.B Co. Line PM</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 Rt. 110 to Central PM</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data shown are from a typical observation and do not represent an average over time.
Source: Data extrapolated from Caltrans District 7 2007 HOV Annual Report
HOV LANE PEAK HOUR VOLUME
Single Car Pool HOV Lane Capacity is 1650 VPH
Two Car Pool HOV Lane Capacity is 1800 VPH

Note: Traffic volumes shown above do not necessarily indicate that the facility has excess capacity. Excess capacity could be achieved by managing vehicle throughput.

Source: Caltrans District 7 2007 HOV Annual Report
**CURRENT HOV VOLUMES**

HOV LANE CAPACITY IS 1650 VPH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Post Mile</th>
<th>Count Date</th>
<th>2+ Peak Hourly Volume **</th>
<th>2+ Peak Hourly Volume **</th>
<th>Hybrid Vehicles Peak Period Volume 1-Hour</th>
<th>2-Hour</th>
<th>Dir.</th>
<th>HOV Lane Peak Period</th>
<th>Peak 2-Hour HOV Volume **</th>
<th>Occupancy Requirement</th>
<th>Peak Period Violation Rate</th>
<th>HOV ADT (vehicles)</th>
<th>Corridor HOV ADT (vehicles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jackson Ave.</td>
<td>25.09</td>
<td>11-14-06</td>
<td>1515***</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>6:30-7:30 A.M.</td>
<td>2782</td>
<td>3+ (2+ offpeak)</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>13790</td>
<td>25500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Golden Valley</td>
<td>29.63</td>
<td>12-20-06</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>S/B</td>
<td>6:30-7:30 A.M.</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>2+ (1+ offpeak)</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>13063</td>
<td>25587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Pathfinder</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>5-2-07</td>
<td>1391</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>S/B</td>
<td>6:45-7:45 A.M.</td>
<td>2479</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>13813</td>
<td>25788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Phillips Ranch</td>
<td>28.04</td>
<td>12-13-06</td>
<td>1389</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>6:45-7:45 A.M.</td>
<td>2457</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13858</td>
<td>26180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Bloomfield</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>2-15-07</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>6:45-7:45 A.M.</td>
<td>2243</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11335</td>
<td>22473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Artesia</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>12-20-06</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>4:15-5:15 P.M.</td>
<td>2857</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>11138</td>
<td>22473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Long Beach Bl.</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>11-1-06</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>S/B</td>
<td>6:30-7:30 A.M.</td>
<td>2948</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>17564</td>
<td>33246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Long Beach Bl.</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>10-31-06</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>4:00-5:00 P.M.</td>
<td>2499</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>14862</td>
<td>33246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1107</td>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>17.98</td>
<td>11-2-06</td>
<td>3163</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>N/B</td>
<td>7:30-8:00 A.M.</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>26816</td>
<td>76715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1107</td>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>17.98</td>
<td>11-1-06</td>
<td>2639</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>S/B</td>
<td>4:30-5:30 P.M.</td>
<td>4939</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>28243</td>
<td>76715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Reseda Ave.</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>12-4-06</td>
<td>1269</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>6:45-7:45 A.M.</td>
<td>2299</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>5465</td>
<td>11144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Reseda Ave.</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>12-3-06</td>
<td>1389</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>4:15-5:15 P.M.</td>
<td>2533</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3078</td>
<td>15022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Jackson Ave.</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>10-24-06</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>S/B</td>
<td>7:15-8:15 A.M.</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>6940</td>
<td>15022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Sherman Way</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>12-5-06</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>S/B</td>
<td>7:30-8:00 A.M.</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6940</td>
<td>10824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Willson Ave.</td>
<td>34.57</td>
<td>11-21-06</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>E/B</td>
<td>4:30-5:30 P.M.</td>
<td>2524</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>10616</td>
<td>23468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Second St.</td>
<td>39.12</td>
<td>10-25-06</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>W/B</td>
<td>7:30-8:30 A.M.</td>
<td>2874</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>12192</td>
<td>23468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2-14-07</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>N/B</td>
<td>7:30-8:30 A.M.</td>
<td>2357</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15962</td>
<td>10737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2-13-06</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>S/B</td>
<td>4:30-5:30 P.M.</td>
<td>2824</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14778</td>
<td>10737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Normandie</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>11-19-06</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>N/B</td>
<td>6:30-7:30 A.M.</td>
<td>2412</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>14651</td>
<td>28098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Normandie</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>11-23-06</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>S/B</td>
<td>3:45-4:45 P.M.</td>
<td>2428</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>13447</td>
<td>28098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Burbank Blvd.</td>
<td>40.28</td>
<td>12-9-06</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>S/B</td>
<td>6:30-7:30 A.M.</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>9475</td>
<td>25400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Burbank Blvd.</td>
<td>40.28</td>
<td>12-17-06</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>N/B</td>
<td>3:45-4:45 P.M.</td>
<td>2677</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>25400</td>
<td>25400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Beverly Blvd.</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>12-7-06</td>
<td>1231</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>S/B</td>
<td>6:45-7:45 A.M.</td>
<td>2379</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14655</td>
<td>28822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Beverly Blvd.</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>12-6-06</td>
<td>1482</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N/B</td>
<td>3:15-4:15 P.M.</td>
<td>2834</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>14167</td>
<td>28822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Average occupancy during peak hourly volume: 2+ facility is 2.2; 1+ facility is 2.1 (excluding buses and motorcycles).

Note: ADT data is not necessarily taken at the same count locations.

** Volume for Carpool, Vanpool, Motorcycle, and Buses. Excluding Vans and Hybrid Vehicles.

*** Volume for Carpool, Vanpool, Motorcycle, Bus and Other. excluding Hybrid Vehicles.

---

**ATTACHMENT**

Total Vehicles / Day: 330459

Total People / Day: 759930
## Travel Time Data (HOV Lane Time Savings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROUTE</th>
<th>LIMITS</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PEAK DIRECTION</th>
<th>TRAVEL TIME</th>
<th>HOV LANE - TIME SAVINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed Flow</td>
<td>HOV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 / San Bernardino Freeway</td>
<td>Anaheim to Route 90F</td>
<td>13.8 mi</td>
<td>04/20/07</td>
<td>Westbound (AM)</td>
<td>45 min - 33 sec</td>
<td>21 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastbound (PM)</td>
<td>42 min - 56 sec</td>
<td>18 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 / Antelope Valley Freeway</td>
<td>Route 57 to S.B. Co. Line</td>
<td>5.4 mi</td>
<td>04/18/07</td>
<td>Westbound (AM)</td>
<td>06 min - 02 sec</td>
<td>02 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastbound (PM)</td>
<td>11 min - 23 sec</td>
<td>05 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 / Orange Freeway</td>
<td>Route 60 to Ora. Co. Line</td>
<td>5.4 mi</td>
<td>03/14/07</td>
<td>Southbound (AM)</td>
<td>32 min - 17 sec</td>
<td>02 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound (PM)</td>
<td>38 min - 45 sec</td>
<td>05 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 / Pomona Freeway</td>
<td>Brea Canyon to S.B. Co. Line</td>
<td>7.0 mi</td>
<td>03/15/07</td>
<td>Westbound (AM)</td>
<td>21 min - 11 sec</td>
<td>05 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastbound (PM)</td>
<td>10 min - 22 sec</td>
<td>05 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 / Artesia Freeway</td>
<td>* Wilmington to Route 110</td>
<td>1.4 mi</td>
<td>05/16/07</td>
<td>Westbound (AM)</td>
<td>02 min - 13 sec</td>
<td>01 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Route 110 to Central</td>
<td>1.7 mi</td>
<td>04/26/07</td>
<td>Eastbound (PM)</td>
<td>13 min - 16 sec</td>
<td>02 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed Flow</td>
<td>HOV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 / Glaze Anderson (Century) Freeway</td>
<td>Route 405 to Route 605</td>
<td>15.5 mi</td>
<td>04/17/07</td>
<td>Westbound (AM)</td>
<td>37 min - 36 sec</td>
<td>05 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 / Harbor Freeway</td>
<td>Route 91 to Adams Blvd</td>
<td>9.8 mi</td>
<td>04/22/07</td>
<td>Northbound (AM)</td>
<td>32 min - 46 sec</td>
<td>16 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 / Ronald Reagan Freeway</td>
<td>Route 5 to Ventura Co. Line</td>
<td>11.1 mi</td>
<td>04/18/07</td>
<td>Westbound (AM)</td>
<td>13 min - 58 sec</td>
<td>05 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastbound (PM)</td>
<td>11 min - 02 sec</td>
<td>05 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134 / Ventura Freeway</td>
<td>Route 5 to Route 210</td>
<td>7.7 mi</td>
<td>04/24/07</td>
<td>Westbound (AM)</td>
<td>07 min - 20 sec</td>
<td>01 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Route 5 to Hollywood Way</td>
<td>8.1 mi</td>
<td>04/24/07</td>
<td>Eastbound (PM)</td>
<td>09 min - 33 sec</td>
<td>02 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170 / Hollywood Freeway</td>
<td>Route 101/134 to Route 5</td>
<td>5.8 mi</td>
<td>05/02/07</td>
<td>Southbound (AM)</td>
<td>26 min - 14 sec</td>
<td>01 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound (PM)</td>
<td>22 min - 29 sec</td>
<td>01 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210 / Foothill Freeway</td>
<td>Route 134 to S.B. Co. Line</td>
<td>27.5 mi</td>
<td>04/25/07</td>
<td>Westbound (AM)</td>
<td>66 min - 26 sec</td>
<td>24 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastbound (PM)</td>
<td>62 min - 01 sec</td>
<td>17 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 / San Diego Freeway</td>
<td>Route 5 to Waterford</td>
<td>15.6 mi</td>
<td>05/03/07</td>
<td>Southbound (AM)</td>
<td>52 min - 48 sec</td>
<td>20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound (PM)</td>
<td>32 min - 11 sec</td>
<td>10 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605 / San Gabriel River Freeway</td>
<td>Orange Co. Line to Route 10</td>
<td>20.7 mi</td>
<td>05/01/07</td>
<td>Southbound (AM)</td>
<td>38 min - 26 sec</td>
<td>14 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound (PM)</td>
<td>28 min - 21 sec</td>
<td>08 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travel time runs conducted at 7:30 am and 2:00 pm in the peak direction.

* Temporary HOV lane closure.
L.A. County
HOV System Status

- Existing [234 Centerline Miles]
- Under Construction [22 Centerline Miles]
- Design Stage [21 Centerline Miles]
- Planning Stage [69 Centerline Miles]
- HOV Direct Connector

- Toll Roads (not included in totals)
- Freeway Construction
Attachment 5

List of Call for Projects with June 30, 2008 Lapse Date
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ ID#</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>FUND AMT (1000)</th>
<th>LAST DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7012</td>
<td>BALDWIN PARK</td>
<td>LOCAL NTD REPORTERS' BUS FLEET EXPANSION</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6328</td>
<td>BEVERLY HILLS</td>
<td>CCTV CAMERA INSTALLATION</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6323</td>
<td>CALABASAS</td>
<td>CALABASAS REGIONAL TRAFFIC CENTER</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8219</td>
<td>CARSON</td>
<td>SOUTH BAY PAVILION REGIONAL TRANSIT CENTER</td>
<td>4,075</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8216</td>
<td>COVINA</td>
<td>MITIGATE PARKING DEFICIENCY FOR COVINA METROLINK STATION</td>
<td>2,960</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8128</td>
<td>CULVER CITY</td>
<td>FOX HILLS TRAFFIC SIG SYNCH &amp; CITY-WIDE AUTO TRAFFIC SIG CONTROL</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8323</td>
<td>EL MONTE</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL VALLEY METRO HUB (VALLEY BLVD RESURFACING AND RESTRIPPING)</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6330</td>
<td>EL SEGUNDO</td>
<td>DOUGLAS ST. GAP CLOSURE/RAILROAD GRADE SEPARATION</td>
<td>15,114</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8079</td>
<td>EL SEGUNDO</td>
<td>NASH ST/DOUGLAS ST ONE-WAY TO TWO-WAY CONVERSION</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6374</td>
<td>GATEWAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT &amp; IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7221</td>
<td>GLENDALE</td>
<td>RTE 5/WESTERN AVE. ACCESS PROGRAM</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8221</td>
<td>GLENDALE</td>
<td>COMPRESSED NATURAL GAS FUELING AND MAINTENANCE FACILITY</td>
<td>4,691</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4318</td>
<td>INGLEWOOD</td>
<td>ARBOR VITAE STREET IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>2,277</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4319</td>
<td>INGLEWOOD</td>
<td>INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8135</td>
<td>INGLEWOOD</td>
<td>INGLEWOOD ITS DEPLOYMENT AND INTEGRATION PROJECT</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>HARBOR TRANSITWAY ARTERIAL HOV CONNECTION W/DOWNTOWN LA</td>
<td>4,124</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2120</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>GLENDALE BLVD. CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROJECT</td>
<td>3,197</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4293</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>ALAMEDA ST./N. SPRING ST. ARTERIAL REDESIGN</td>
<td>6,546</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4304</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>HIGHLAND AVE. WIDENING AT FRANKLIN AVE.</td>
<td>2,804</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6019</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>CULTURAL CRESCENT BLUE LINE FACILITY</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJ ID#</td>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>PROJECT TITLE</td>
<td>FUND AMT (000)</td>
<td>LAPSE DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6299</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>WESTCHESTER TRANSPORTATION MGMT. ENHANCEMENTS (ATCS)</td>
<td>2,004</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6301</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>GOLDEN STATE FWY CORRIDOR ATSAC</td>
<td>6,731</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6305</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>HYDE PARK WEST ATSAC</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6385</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>101 FWY CROSSING AT N. MAIN ST. PHASE II</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6390</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>SEPULVEDA BLVD. FROM CENTINELA AVE. TO LINCOLN BLVD.</td>
<td>5,906</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6413</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>CENTINELA AVE. - WASHINGTON BLVD. TO SHORT AVE.</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6415</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>UPPER 2ND ST. COMPLETION</td>
<td>3,096</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6427</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>VALLEY BLVD. GRADE SEPARATION PHASE II</td>
<td>32,485</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7061</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>EAGLE ROCK ATSAC PROJECT</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7207</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>L.A. STREET REALIGNMENT NEAR EL PUEBLO</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7234</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>OVERLAND AVE. BRIDGE WIDENING OVER RTE 1 FWY</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7330</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>SAN FERNANDO ROAD RIGHT OF WAY BIKE PATH - PHASE 2</td>
<td>3,524</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8031</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>TAMPA AVE BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND WIDENING (HBRR)</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8032</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>SEPULVEDA BLVD TUNNEL UNDER MULHOLLAND DRIVE (HBRR)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8036</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>HYPERION AVE. UNDER Waverly Drive BRIDGE REPLACEMENT (HBRR)</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8042</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>VANOWEN STREET BRIDGE WIDENING AND REHABILITATION (HBRR)</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8047</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>BALBOA BLVD AND VICTORY BLVD INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>2,420</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8048</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>CAHUENGA BLVD WIDENING - MAGNOLIA BLVD TO LANKERSHIM BLVD</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8049</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>ANAHEIM STREET WIDENING - FARRAGUT AVE TO DOMINGUEZ CHN</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8053</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>SAWTELLE BLVD WIDENING AT VENICE BLVD</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJ ID</td>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>PROJECT TITLE</td>
<td>FUND AMT ('000)</td>
<td>Lapse Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8054</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>SKIRBALL CENTER DRIVE WIDENING - I-405 Fwy to Mulholland Dr</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8055</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>MOORPARK AVENUE WIDENING - WOODMAN AVE to MURRIETTA AVE</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8058</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>LA TIJERA BRIDGE WIDENING OVER I-42005 FREEWAY</td>
<td>5,920</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8058</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>LA TIJERA BRIDGE WIDENING OVER I-42005 FREEWAY</td>
<td>8,784</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8063</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>RIVERSIDE DRIVE VIADUCT WIDENING AND REPLACEMENT (HBRR)</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8064</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>SAN FERNANDO MISSION BLVD. BETWEEN SEPULEDA BLVD. AND I-5</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8075</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>CESAR CHAVEZ AVE./LORENA ST/INDIANA ST INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8084</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>WINNETKA AVENUE BRIDGE WIDENING AND REHABILITATION (HBRR)</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8087</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>MAGNOLIA BLVD. WIDENING - CAHUENGA BLVD. TO VINEYLAND AVE.</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8090</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>VERMONT AVENUE BRIDGE WIDENING</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8197</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>BROADWAY/FIGUEROA TRANSIT CORRIDOR ENHANCEMENTS</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8230</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>SOUTH BAY GATEWAY TRANSIT HUB</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8241</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>PICO UNION/ECHO PARK DASH VEHICLE PROCUREMENT</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8318</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>LA CITY AND SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES BICYCLE MAP</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8330</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>BICYCLE COMMUTER TECHNOLOGY ACCESS</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8377</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>HOLLYWOOD MEDIA DISTRICT BUS IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8385</td>
<td>LA CITY</td>
<td>EL SERENO DASH PROCUREMENT</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2214</td>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>PACIFIC COAST HIGHWAY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SYSTEM</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2314</td>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>EAST SAN GABRIEL VALLEY SOM PILOT PROJECT</td>
<td>6,278</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6295</td>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>GATEWAY CITIES TRAFFIC SIGNAL CORRIDORS PHASE III</td>
<td>13,723</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJ ID#</td>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>PROJECT TITLE</td>
<td>FUND AMT (000)</td>
<td>LAPSE DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8120</td>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>SOUTH BAY FORUM TRAFFIC SIGNAL CORRIDORS PROJECT</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8121</td>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL VALLEY TRAFFIC SIGNAL CORRIDORS PROJECT</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8127</td>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>GTWY CITIES FORUM TRAFFIC SIGNAL CORRIDORS PROJECT - (PH IV)</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8102</td>
<td>LANCASTER</td>
<td>SR-14 FREEWAY/AVENUE 1 INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>5,351</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8129</td>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>PORTS OF LONG BEACH AND LOS ANGELES ATMIS PROJECT</td>
<td>4,236</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8157</td>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>LONG BEACH EAST/WEST BIKEWAY CONNECT &amp; BIKE SIGNAGE PROG</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8163</td>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>P.E. RIGHT-OF-WAY BIKEWAY AND PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8331</td>
<td>LONG BEACH CRA</td>
<td>LONG BEACH WAYFINDING/TRANSIT CONNECTION PROGRAM</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8056</td>
<td>MANHATTAN BEACH</td>
<td>NASH /DOUGLAS &amp; ROSECRANS AVE INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7237</td>
<td>MONTEREY PARK</td>
<td>NORTH ATLANTIC BLVD. WIDENING AND CHANNELIZATION</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6086</td>
<td>PASADENA</td>
<td>OPERATION OF 3 ALTERNATIVE FUEL SHUTTLES</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6324</td>
<td>PASADENA</td>
<td>ITS IMPROVEMENTS: LAKE AVE. &amp; DEL MAR BLVD.</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7270</td>
<td>PASADENA</td>
<td>PASADENA BLUE LINE PEDESTRIAN ENHANCEMENT</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8008</td>
<td>PASADENA</td>
<td>PASADENA SR 710 MITIGATION PROJECT (ROGAN BILL PROJECT)</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8191</td>
<td>PASADENA</td>
<td>PLAYHOUSE DISTRICT STREETCAPES, WALKWAYS AND ALLEYS PROJECT</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8315</td>
<td>PASADENA</td>
<td>ELECTRIC BIKE AND SCOOTER DEMONSTRATION PROJECT</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8072</td>
<td>REDONDO BEACH</td>
<td>PCH/CATALINA AVENUE INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7335</td>
<td>SANTA CLARITA</td>
<td>SANTA CLARA RIVER REGIONAL TRAIL I-5 TO DISCOVERY PARK</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8130</td>
<td>SANTA CLARITA</td>
<td>INCIDENT MANAGEMENT - TRAVELER INFORMATION SUBSYSTEM</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJ ID#</td>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>PROJECT TITLE</td>
<td>FUND AMT (000)</td>
<td>LAPSE DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6327</td>
<td>SANTA MONICA</td>
<td>OCEAN AVE. SIGNAL SYSTEM</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8002</td>
<td>SGV COG</td>
<td>ALAMEDA CORRIDOR - EAST PHASE 1</td>
<td>12,450</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8095</td>
<td>SIGNAL HILL</td>
<td>CHERRY AVENUE WIDENING PROJECT</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6347</td>
<td>SOUTH GATE</td>
<td>I-710/FIRESTONE BLVD. INTERCHANGE RECONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>1,783</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6348</td>
<td>SOUTH GATE</td>
<td>FIRESTONE BLVD/RIO HONDO BRIDGE WIDENING</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6268</td>
<td>SOUTH PASADENA</td>
<td>BUSINESS DISTRICT PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4314</td>
<td>TORRANCE</td>
<td>DEL AMO BOULEVARD EXTENSION (GRADE SEPARATION)</td>
<td>20,121</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8009</td>
<td>TORRANCE</td>
<td>TORRANCE BLVD. AT MAPLE AVE. INTERSECTION CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8082</td>
<td>TORRANCE</td>
<td>HAWTHORNE AT SEPULVEDA INTERSECTION CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4300</td>
<td>VERNON</td>
<td>I-710 ATLANTIC/BANDINI INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS PHASE I</td>
<td>3,378</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>