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
   10 min
   Information
   (Dana Lee)
   (Alex Gonzalez)
   (Sharon Perlstein)
   (Mark Yamarone)

3. Consent Calendar
   - Approval of Minutes
   Attachment 3: Draft March 12, 2008 Minutes
   Action/Concurrence

4. Chairperson’s Report
   Attachment 4: Rolling 90-Day Agenda Items for April – June 2008
   5 min
   Information
   (Alan Patashnick)

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

6. Draft 2008 Long Range Transportation Plan
   Attachment 5: Presentation slides
   30 min
   Update/Possible Action
   (Heather Hills/Rena Lum)

7. Countywide Congestion Mitigation Fee
   Feasibility Study
   10 min
   Update/Possible Action
   (Robert Calix)
8. Orange County/Los Angeles Intercounty Transportation Study
   10 min

9. Parking Forum
   5 min

10. Congestion Pricing Operating Plan for Los Angeles County
    5 min

11. New Business

12. Adjournment

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

Please call Fanny Pan at (213) 922-3070 or e-mail to “panf@metro.net”, if you have questions regarding the agenda or the meeting. The next meeting will be on May 14, 2008 at 9:30 a.m. in the Union Station Room.
Attachment 1

Subcommittee March 2008 Agendas

• Bus Operations

• Local Transit Systems

• Streets and Freeways

• TDM/Air Quality
Agenda

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Windsor Conference Room — 15th Floor

1. Call to Order 1 minute

2. Approval of January 15 & February 19, 2008 Minutes 1 minute

3. Chair's Report 5 minutes

4. Legislative Report 10 minutes

5. Metro OIG Audit of Access Services 10 minutes

6. FY 08 Prop 1B Transit Security Funds 10 minutes

7. Long Range Transportation Plan Update 10 minutes

8. FY 08 MOSIP MOU 10 minutes

9. FY 08 STA Mid-Year Allocation Report 10 minutes

10. STA Efficiency Test 5 minutes

Action Dana Lee

Action BOS

Information Dana Lee

Information Raffi Hamparian/Marisa Yeager/Michael Turner

Information Arun Prem, ASI

Information Frank Flores

Information Rena Lum

Information Rufus Cayetano

Information Rufus Cayetano/Susan Richan

Information Susan Richan

Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Metro
11. Metro Rapid Express Update
   10 minutes
   Information
   Steve Fox

12. New Business

13. Adjournment

Information Items:

90-day Rolling Agenda
Pre-SAFETEA-LU 5307 15% Discretionary Fund Balances
Pre-SAFETEA-LU 5307 85% Fund Balances
Pre-SAFETEA-LU TE1% Fund Balances
RTAA-CMAQ Fund Balances
SAFETEA-LU 5307 15% Discretionary Fund Balances
SAFETEA-LU 5307 85% Fund Balances
SAFETEA-LU TE1% Fund Balances
Summary of Invoices — FY08
Summary of EZ Pass Invoices — FY08
Subsidy Matrix
TDA/STA Claim Summary
Document Requirement Status

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

Please call MARTHA BUTLER at 213-922-7651 if you have questions regarding the agenda or meeting. The next BOS meeting will be held Tuesday, April 15, 2008 at 9:30 am in the Windsor Conference Room, 15th Floor of the Gateway Building.
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE

Union Station Room – 3rd Floor

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes – February 28, 2008
   (Attachment 1)

3. Election of New LTSS Officers
   (Attachment 2)

4. Appoint New LTSS Alternate to Metro TAC

5. DRAFT Long Range Transportation Plan
   (to be handed out at meeting)

6. Congestion Mitigation Fee
   (to be handed out at meeting)

7. Rider Relief Transportation Program

8. Voluntary NTD Payments for FY ’05 and ’06

9. NTD Reporting of Rest/Meal/Fuel Breaks

10. AB 2321

11. DRAFT Sub-regional Paratransit Fundmarks for FY ’09

12. New Business/Adjournment

Action
Martin Gomberg, Acting Chair

Action
Martin Gomberg, Acting Chair

Action
Martin Gomberg, Acting Chair

Action
Martin Gomberg, Acting Chair

Information
Rena Lum, Metro

Information
Robert Calix, Metro

Information
Armineh Saint, Metro

Information
Jay Fuhrman, Metro

Information
Jay Fuhrman, Metro

Information
Mike Turner, Metro

Information
Susan Richan, Metro

Martin Gomberg, Acting Chair

Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Agenda
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

Union Station Conference Room, 3rd Floor

1. Call to Order 1 min
   Action (Sharon Perlstein)

2. Approval of Minutes
   Attachment 1: Draft February 21, 2007 Minutes
   Attachment 2: Sign in Sheet/Attendance Sheet 1 min
   Action (Subcommittee)

3. Countywide Congestion Mitigation Fee Feasibility Study
   10 min
   Information (Robert Calix)

4. Chairperson Report
   10 min
   Information (Sharon Perlstein)

5. Metro Report
   Attachment 3: 90 Day Rolling Agenda 10 min
   Information (Randy Lamm)

6. Caltrans Report
   • Local Agency Access to E-76 Status
   • OA Balances 15 min
   Information (Kirk Cessna)

7. CTC Recap 10 min
   Update (Tim Papandreou)

8. Trade Corridor Improvement Fund Recommendations
   Attachment 4: Board Report 10 min
   Information (Tim Papandreou)
9. Legislative Update
   - National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission
   - Lack of an appropriations budget impacts on Highway Trust Fund negative balances in 2009 or 2010
   - Appropriations Bill
   - Prop42 and the FY09 Budget
   20 min

10. Revised 2008 Los Angeles County TIP
    10 min

11. Long Range Transportation Plan
    10 min

12. Metro Orange Line Canoga DEIR
    10 min

13. Public-Private Partnership Standards
    Attachment 5: Board Report
    10 min

14. New Business
    5 min

15. Adjournment
    1 min

The next meeting of the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee is scheduled for April 17, 2008 at 9:30 AM in the Windsor Conference Room, 15th Floor. Please contact Randy Lamun 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
Agenda

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

**TDM/ AIR QUALITY SUB COMMITTEE**

**Pasadena Conference ROOM**

1. Call to Order/Roll Call
   
   Action (Mark Yamaron)

2. Chairperson’s Report
   5 min

   Information
   (Mark Yamaron)

3. Legislative Update
   Federal
   State
   10 min

   Information
   (Raffi Hamparian)
   (Michael Turner)

4. Long Range
   Transportation Plan
   5 min

   Update
   (Rena Lum, Robert Calix)

5. Countywide Congestion
   Mitigation Fee
   Feasibility Study
   5 min

   Update
   (Robert Calix)

6. New Business

7. Adjournment

Please call Rufina Juarez at (213) 922-7405 or e-mail to “juarezr@metro.net”, if you have questions regarding the agenda or the meeting. The next meeting will be on TBD 2008 at 10:30 a.m. in Room to TBD
Attachment 2

Subcommittee Actions
Disposition of March 2008 Subcommittee Actions

Bus Operation Subcommittee:

March 18, 2008 meeting
No Action

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:

March 27, 2008 meeting

Elected New LTSS Officers:
  Chair – Alex Gonzalez (City of Covina)
  Vice Chair – Martin Gombery (Palos Verdes Peninsula Transportation Authority)
  Secretary – Joyce Rooney (City of West Hollywood)

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:

March 20, 2008 meeting
No Action

TDM/Air Quality Subcommittee:

March 19, 2008 meeting

Motion: Unanimously Passed

The TDM/AQ Subcommittee recommends the following to the TAC for its consideration when commenting on the Draft Metro Long Range Transportation Plan:

- That the LRTP acknowledge the importance of ridesharing and highlight the significance and cost effectiveness of ridesharing on the future countywide transportation network.
- The LRTP should recognize the efforts and commitments of the business community/private sector in reducing employee commute trips.
- The LRTP should identify that funding included the Constrained Plan for TDM programs should flow to non-auto modes in the event it can not all be spent on TDM projects and programs.
- The LRTP should identify Metro’s leadership role in coordinating bicycle facility planning in the region.
Attachment 3

Draft March 12, 2008 TAC Minutes

Sign-In Sheet

Handouts
Meeting Minutes

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Fanny Pan (Alternate Chair) called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m., took roll and declared a quorum was present.

2. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees

BOS (Dana Lee)
- Not present.

LTSS (Joyce Rooney)
- Last meeting held on February 28th;
- Received reports on:
  o Recently completed Metro Audit of Access Services;
  o Metro Bike-to-Work day;
  o 2009 Paratransit funding marks;
  o Voluntary National Transit Database (NTD) payments for FY05 and FY06
  o Rest and fuel breaks. A subcommittee will be formed to address some of the issues that were raised during the last audit.
- Distributed State Legislation for the local transit operators to review;
- Correction to Action’s report, which reflects no action had been taken:
  o Membership status change: Removed the Cities of Glendora and West Covina and added the Cities of Downey and Whittier. The representative from the City of Downey is Ms. Amelia Jennings; the new representative for the City of Whittier is Mr. Martin Brown.
  o Moved two of the regular members’ positions to alternates, those being the Cities of Manhattan Beach and Baldwin Park.
- Noted funding allocations matrix for Universal Fare System (UFS) funds to LADOT and the Cities of Glendale and Pasadena in the Tier 1 group. The Tier 2 group includes the Cities of Burbank, Los Angeles and Monterey Park. If there is
additional money left over from the Tier 2 group, there may be an opportunity to add more cities to the UFS funds in future years.

- Next meeting scheduled for March 27th.

Streets and Freeways (Sharon Perlstein)
- Last meeting held on February 21st;
- Received updates on:
  - Proposition 1B Bond Fund for Signal Synchronization with applications due by the end of March;
  - State and Federal legislation and CTC actions;
  - Transportation Enhancement Funds and the steps to receive allocations and time extensions;
  - 2008 Federal Obligation Plan where agencies anticipating obligating certain federal funds must submit a plan to Metro by the beginning of March or risk losing the funds;
  - The Congestion Mitigation Fee and the Long Range Transportation Plan.
- Surface Transportation Program-Local: there were a number of cities that had balances with potentially lapping funds, but were recommended for time extensions. A motion was made and approved to concur with Metro staff recommendations on extending all of the agencies with lapping balances.
- Next meeting scheduled for March 20th.

TDM/AQ (Mark Yamarone)
- There was no meeting in February;
- Next meeting scheduled for April 16th at 10:30 am.

3. Consent Calendar (Alan Patashnick, Metro)

February 13th Meeting Minutes
Ms. Rooney asked to change the second bullet from “Active Services” to “Access Services” on page 9. The Consent Calendar was approved as amended on a motion by Joyce Rooney and seconded by Greg Hermann (League of California Cities – Arroyo Verdugo Cities). There were no abstentions or objections.

4. Chairperson’s Report (Alan Patashnick, Metro)

Mr. Patashnick mentioned that he had about 7 items to report:
- The League of California Cities made two new appointments:
  - Mr. Mike Behen, the City of Palmdale, as the new TAC representative for the North County Transportation Coalition; and
  - Mr. Ramiro Aveda as the new TAC representative for the Las Virgenes Malibu COG;
- On Tuesday, March 18th at 1:00 pm in the Board Room, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) will hold the Southern Counties 2008 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) hearing;
- Governor Schwarzenegger announced $394 million for transit projects across the State. In Los Angeles County, the funded projects included $237,640 for Antelope
Valley Transit vehicle, facility and security system upgrades and $727,000 for commuter bus replacement; $161 million for Metro including bus procurement and rehabilitation, the 12 mile Wilshire Boulevard Bus-Only lane project and the Mid City/Exposition light rail project; Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) received three projects totaling approximately $10.4 million and $1.5 million to the City of Montebello for a Clean Fuel Bus Replacement Project;

- The Planning and Programming Committee is scheduled to approve: the Trade Corridor Improvement Fund (TCIF) Project recommendations which would utilize a part of the $19.9 billion Proposition 1B bond funds. Metro as well as many other representatives in Southern California submitted their list of projects both in Tier 1 and Tier 2. The CTC is meeting today and tomorrow to discuss these projects with a vote scheduled for April. There are ten projects in Los Angeles County including two for Alameda Corridor-East Construction Authority (ACE), a Ports rail system, replacement of the Gerald Desmond Bridge, the City of Commerce Washington Boulevard widening and reconstruction, a new siding for freight trains on the Antelope Valley Metrolink line and other grade separation, interchange and intersection improvements. The Tier 2 program is for any additional projects over and above the Tier 1 projects. For Southern California, the Tier 1 project requests totaled $1.7 billion; while Tier 2 amounted to $497 million;

- The FY 2008 State Transit Assistance (STA) estimate was revised by the State Controller from $31.6 million to $53.2 million, a $21.6 million increase for the included Municipal Transit operators. The eligible operators will receive nearly $3 million in formula equivalent amounts of local Proposition A Growth Over CPI/Proposition C 40% Discretionary funds through the Formula Allocation Procedure (FAP);

- The Gateway Cities Service Sectors Governance Council approved Anne Marie Bayer as the new appointment to serve until January 2009;

- The 90 day rolling agenda for March includes:
  - Receive and file updates for three transit corridor projects, the Eastside Extension Phase 2 Project, the Regional Connector and the Crenshaw-Prairie project;
  - Approval of the revised 2008 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP);
  - April reports include supplemental funds for the I-5/ Carmenita Road Interchange and Grade Crossing project as well as a consultant contract for the Congestion Pricing Plan.
  - May will have a Receive and File report on the evaluation of the SR-134 Design/Build Soundwall Project as well as approval of the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Canoga Extension of the Metro Orange Line.
5. Legislative Update (Raffi Hamparian/Michael Turner, Metro)

Federal

Mr. Hamparian stated that he would address two issues: the Federal budget and the status of earmarks. Mr. Hamparian reported that the U.S. Senate began consideration of their 2009 budget proposal on March 11th while the House of Representatives will begin consideration of their version on March 12th. Combined, these budgets provide an extra $7 billion towards the upcoming Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) reauthorization. The Senate's version has an economic stimulus package budgeted at $3.5 billion for what is considered "Ready to Go Projects". Metro has contacted Senators Boxer and Feinstein to discuss what is meant by "Ready to Go Projects". Both versions are expected to be approved in April.

In regards to earmarks, Los Angeles County did receive a decent amount of money. However, there is a storm brewing in Washington between Republicans and Democrats concerning earmarks. In the House of Representatives, the Republicans intend to offer a substitute budget for FY 09 which does not include any earmarks. On the Democratic side, led by Speaker Pelosi and Majority Leader Hoyer, the intent is to create a one year (FY 09) moratorium on earmarks in order to eliminate the debate entirely. In the Senate, conservative GOP members Jim DeMint and Tom Colbert are also pushing for the moratorium on earmarks. In fact, Senators McCain, Obama and Clinton recently supported the moratorium idea creating additional energy in the Senate. Even so, Senate Majority Leader Reid has stated he supports earmarks and believes that Congress has a constitutional responsibility to maintain certain spending levels.

Mr. Hamparian stated that an additional item had to do with the Section 1909 Commission. In a recent trip to Sacramento, Mr. Hamparian learned that a number of State Legislative hearings on the matter have been initiated to discuss what is at stake for California and how the State should respond. Mr. Hamparian believes that the State's current position is to wait and see what the federal government decides to do.

Finally, Mr. Hamparian stated that it appears there will be a second economic stimulus package and that Speaker Pelosi's office has arranged a meeting today to specifically discuss any major public works projects which might play a role in that package. Similar to a previous proposal by Ron Wyden (D-OR) and John Thune (D-SD), there is the belief that approximately $10-$15 billion in public works projects may be included in the economic stimulus package. Should this be the case, Mr. Hamparian believes that it is incumbent upon Metro to draft a letter to Congress which outlines a vision for how a portion of that money should be spent on transportation projects in Los Angeles County.

State

Mr. Turner stated there were three items to discuss: an update on the budget, an update on legislation, and the Trade Corridor Improvement Funds (TCIF).

With respect to the State budget, the situation is not good. The Legislature seems focused on addressing the current year's budget deficit, while avoiding the real problem in FY 09.
There has been some discussion of an oil tax for which the Assembly may put to a vote today. Oil tax aside, there are a number of other revenue proposals that are beginning to surface during the budget process for which Metro will track closely to determine any impacts on transportation.

Mr. Steve Lantz (SCRRRA) asked if the revenue from an oil tax would be for transportation or the General fund. Mr. Turner responded that it would go to the General fund. Mr. Turner added that it may be a producer's tax as opposed to a levy at the pump, but that it is still too early in the process to be determined.

The issue for Metro is watching the overall health of transportation funds in two areas: Proposition 42 and the Public Transportation Account (PTA). Currently, the Governor's proposal fully funds Proposition 42, but only funds the PTA to the level required by existing law. Fortunately, the State is beginning to acknowledge that it may not make fiscal sense to suspend (or borrow) Proposition 42 because if they do, State law requires that it be repaid within three years with interest. The PTA, however, has historically been one of the first sources of revenue for when the State needs to balance its budget and unfortunately, that looks to be the case for this year as well. Although the impacts from a reduction in the PTA are not felt immediately, many of Metro's current service cuts are directly related to last year's cuts to the PTA.

As the State continues to use PTA funds to address its budget deficit, Metro must consider sources outside the State and Federal level to help fund transportation in Los Angeles County. While the federal government will contribute some, it cannot to the extent needed to compensate the reduction in State funding. For this reason, Metro has worked closely with State Assemblymember Mike Feuer in putting together a package of bills that are intended to provide local solutions to our current funding crises. A key measure in this package is AB 2321 which proposes modifications to the Murray bill. Currently, the Murray bill provides Metro the authority to implement an increase in the sales tax in Los Angeles County for six and a half years. Should the Metro Board approve requesting that the initiative be placed on the ballot, there could be a significant amount of revenue generated for transportation.

Mr. Lantz asked if Metro intends on adding these bills to the November ballot. Mr. Turner responded that that would be the Board's decision. Marianne Kim (Auto Club of Southern California) asked that if it doesn't go in November, would the authority to implement a tax under the current Murray bill expire? Mr. Turner replied that there was not a time limit tied to implementing the sales tax. Rather, the six-and-a-half year time limit had to do with how long the sales tax itself could be in existence. Part of the modifications proposed in AB 2321 has to do with extending the life of the sales tax to 30 years.

Michelle Caldwell (Metro) stated that at the recent UCLA Economic Conference she asked a financial analyst from KNX 1070, who also was the moderator for the event, whether he believed the residents of Los Angeles County would support an increase in the sales tax to relieve traffic congestion. The answer was no. Mr. Turner responded that, fortunately, he has seen survey data revealing more and more residents consider traffic congestion to be one the biggest issues facing Los Angeles County suggesting that there may be significant support should a measure be placed on the ballot.
Lastly, Mr. Turner reported that there has been much discussion over the $2 billion in Trade Corridor Improvement Funds (TCIF), which is to be allocated toward trade corridors which support high volumes of goods movement. The debate has largely centered on how the TCIF should be allocated between the Bay Area, San Diego, and the Los Angeles region. Largely based on the freight volumes evident at both the Los Angeles and Long Beach Ports, Metro feels that Los Angeles County should receive 80% of whatever money is made available. The CTC, however, has recommended Los Angeles County receive $1.7 billion or 55% of current and anticipated TCIF. Obviously, Metro does not feel this is an appropriate allocation of funds. Although they are not supposed to vote until April, the CTC may vote on staff recommendations today. Given that the Legislature will not appropriate the funds until after the CTC vote, Metro hopes that the vote does not occur today in order to give CTC members and members of the legislature time to consider more appropriate levels of allocation.

Mr. Yamarone asked the relationship between AB 2321 and the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)? Mr. Turner responded that the original Murray bill was a six-and-a-half year sales tax whose revenue would be dedicated to specific projects identified by Metro's LRTP. The amounts dedicated to each project were based on the revenue assumed to be generated by sales tax. Under AB 2321, the life of the sales tax would be extended from six-and-a-half years to 30 years. The Bill's intent is to maintain the minimum funding commitments for projects identified in the original Murray bill, while also allowing Metro to further fund projects in the LRTP with additional revenue that is generated above and beyond the original timeframe.

Mr. Yamarone asked if Metro will look to cities to support this bill? Mr. Turner responded that Metro intends to work closely with Mr. Feuer's office in developing formal fact sheets for the Bill to be distributed to cities, COGs, etc. Mr. Yamarone stated that the Mayor for his city has already expressed support for this bill, but that some still question whether the funding amounts in the original bill are still tied to the original projects. Mr. Turner responded that the original project list and the corresponding funding amounts will remain in the Bill. Mr. Yamarone stated though that it was not clear where those amounts came from and whether or not the original projects would be eligible for additional funding or limited to the minimum funding amounts originally set. Mr. Turner stated that the first step needs to be securing the initial amount identified and then work with Metro through the LRTP process to secure any additional funding that may be needed.

Paul Maselbas (County of Los Angeles) asked if the Bill maintained the Local Return program for local streets and roads that was a part of the original Murray bill. Mr. Turner responded that AB 2321 will keep the local return provision because it was a category given a specific dollar amount. Mr. Turner added that the Bill also requires Metro to complete an expenditure plan for the anticipated revenue and that within that plan the Metro Board could designate additional funding commitments for projects carried over from the Murray bill such as the Local Return program. Mr. Maselbas asked if Mr. Turner knew the percentage or dollar amount for the Local Return program. Mr. Turner replied that he did not, but reemphasized that if a project or program was in the original Murray Bill, then that project would receive the original funding commitment at a minimum.

Mr. Lantz asked if the intent behind AB 2321 was to keep the original six-and-a-half year plan in place plus create an undesignated revenue stream beyond the six-and-a-half years
because no formula will be provided for allocating revenue by program? Mr. Turner responded that a formula is not necessary for the Bill, but would most likely be included in the sales tax measure itself.

Mr. Lantz asked if there was a cap for the sales tax increase? Mr. Turner responded that there is a 2% cap which was actually raised by the original Murray Bill.

6. Amend the FY 09 Business Planning Parameter (Michelle Caldwell, Metro)

Ms. Caldwell reported that in February the Metro Board approved amending the Business Planning Parameters for FY 09. The Business Planning Parameters are taken to the Board each January to determine the assumptions necessary for developing the upcoming fiscal year budget. The assumptions that needed revising were both the sales tax growth assumption and the assumption for the Consumer Price Index (CPI). The original assumptions were developed last summer in conjunction with the LRTP update and were primarily based on the UCLA forecast and Metro’s 20-year historical growth rate for sales tax. Both the UCLA forecast and Metro’s 20-year historical growth rate were at approximately 4%. In January, however, the Board revised the sales tax assumption of 3% growth over the FY 08 budget. Then in February, UCLA revised their forecasts for both FY 08 and FY 09. As a result, Metro revised its assumptions in February and presented the Board with a sales tax revenue assumption of 1.1% growth over the estimated FY 08 actuals and a CPI forecast down from 2.45% to 1.84%.

Ms. Caldwell referred TAC members to a handout illustrating the affects of the revised assumptions. With regards to the Proposition A, Proposition C, and TDA tax revenues, the FY 08 Estimate came in at $7 million less than the FY 08 Adopted budget. Also, the change from 3% to 1.1% resulted in an approximately $40 million reduction in proposed FY 09 sales tax down to $1.75 billion.

The good news, however, is that the State Controller’s estimate for Proposition 42 and STA funds is currently $227 million. Metro’s estimate was a much more conservative $89 million. This is a significant increase over what Metro was expecting to receive from the State. Should, however, the May revise of the State budget result in a lower STA fund estimate, staff will return to the Board with a possible contingency plan.

Ms. Caldwell added that it’s important for TAC members to realize that the Budget Planning Parameters adopted by the Board in February are a conservative approach to estimating sales tax revenue.

7. Transit Corridor Studies (David Mieger, Metro)

Mr. Mieger stated that his presentation would highlight five Transit Corridors currently being studied: the Crenshaw Corridor, the Westside Extension, the Regional Connector, the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2, and the Harbor Subdivision. Of these five projects, however, the Crenshaw Corridor Project is the only project in the funded portion of the LRTP.
The Crenshaw Corridor Study, led by project manager Roderick Diaz, presented a number of alternatives during the scoping process last fall that resulted in a number of issues being examined, such as how to connect with Wilshire Boulevard to the north, LAX to the west, and the Metro Green Line to the south. In addition, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and Light Rail Transit (LRT) continue to be examined for use in this corridor.

In the southern portion of the corridor, the alignments considered were along Crenshaw Blvd, Prairie Ave, Hawthorne and Aviation Boulevards. Of those alignments, Aviation Blvd uses the Harbor Subdivision rail right-of-way (ROW) from the Metro Green Line station near Imperial Highway north along the eastern boundary of LAX and continues northeast to reach Crenshaw Boulevard near Florence Ave. As such, it is recommended that the Aviation Boulevard alignment be carried forward in the environmental review process.

In the northern portion of the corridor, it is recommended that for the LRT alternative, the line terminate at the future Exposition-Crenshaw station due to right-of-way constraints north of Exposition Boulevard. Should there be a future study of possible connections north of Expo; La Brea Ave may prove to be more viable than Crenshaw insofar as it provides a better alternative for connecting to Wilshire Blvd and eventually Hollywood.

Mr. Lantz stated that the handout shows Hawthorne Blvd as an alignment still under consideration, but that the presentation shows it as eliminated. Mr. Mieger responded that Hawthorne is proposed for elimination. Mr. Mieger added that Metro is working with the City of Inglewood to address concerns over eliminating the alternative that serves the Prairie Ave Corridor.

As for the Westside Corridor project, the community meetings held in January and February resulted in 17 build alternatives. To summarize comments from the meetings, there appears to be an overwhelming consensus that some form of this project is necessary and needs to move forward. West Hollywood and Hollywood are particularly supportive of an extension from the Hollywood-Highland or Hollywood-Vine stations. Since Wilshire Blvd has historically been considered an ideal option, the Hollywood supporters are promoting a combined Santa Monica and Wilshire Boulevards alignment as well.

The 17 alternatives have since been grouped under five main headings: 3 options for the Wilshire Subway, 5 for the Santa Monica Subway, 5 for a combined Wilshire/Santa Monica Subway, 3 aerial rail alternatives, and 1 BRT alternative. Currently, staff is conducting ridership forecasts for all 17 alternatives in the hopes of reducing the number of alternatives to 5 distinct recommendations.

Mr. Lantz asked if monorail was considered as an alternative? Mr. Mieger responded that monorail is one of the three aerial alternatives.

The Regional Connector is a project intending to connect the future Little Tokyo Station along the future Metro Gold Line Eastside with the 7th & Metro Station. There are a number of options for this connection, but they all begin by traveling north along Flower Street. From Flower, the alignments range from at-grade options along 2nd or Temple Streets, an at-grade option that parallels the 101 Freeway, and an underground LRT option. Given that the overall goal is to connect LRT with LRT, the choice of mode is fairly obvious. This project turned out to be one of the most cost-efficient in the draft LRTP analysis due to
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the increases in ridership that can be attributed to connecting several lines together and reducing the number of transfers.

Most of the comments from the public meetings seem to support a subway alternative versus an at-grade option. In addition, there are a number of supporters for an alignment along First Street and Grand Avenue, but unfortunately, there are a number of topographical constraints limiting these alternatives. Staff is currently refining the number of alternatives as part of the Alternatives Analysis process.

For the Eastside Extension Phase 2, the question is what happens after connecting LRT to Atlantic Boulevard. Will the terminus of this project result in a bus hub or is it feasible to extend rail further east? To extend east, there are 3 main corridors under consideration: a northern corridor which runs east between the I-10 and SR-60 Freeways, a central corridor which runs along or parallel to SR-60; and a southern corridor which follows an I-5 alignment toward Whittier and other points south. The Southern corridor, however, is prohibited from further extensions by a mountain range that sits just east of Whittier. The various alternatives considered include: at-grade LRT, aerial rail options, subway or underground LRT, and three BRT options. Cost-effectiveness will play a key role in this study as densities decrease as you move further east along these potential corridors.

Mr. Mieger reported that comments from the recent scoping meetings are still being gathered and analyzed. Staff’s goal is to screen this initial list of alternatives over the next three to five months to determine a more manageable set of alternatives for more detailed analysis.

A Request for Proposal (RFP) was released in December 2007 for the Harbor Subdivision Alternatives Analysis Study. The Harbor Subdivision is a 27-mile freight rail right-of-way running from just south of downtown Los Angeles toward LAX along Slauson Ave and then south again to its southern terminus at Watson Yard near Wilmington. Metro purchased this right-of-way back in 1993 and the current study is designed to examine the feasibility of running transit along this corridor. Currently, Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) operates limited freight service primarily in the southern portion south of LAX. North of LAX, however, there is less freight rail activity which has led many to suggest that an express air-rail service between Union Station and LAX may be a viable alternative worth exploring as part of this Study.

The contract is scheduled to be awarded in April. Given the length of the corridor, a number of cities and agencies will become important stakeholders in the study.

Mr. Lantz asked if Metro is assuming mixed-flow traffic with freight along the corridor? Mr. Mieger responded that it could be a mixed-flow arrangement or possibly a temporal separation agreement but either way, Metro hopes to procure a consultant well versed in the various opportunities out there. Mr. Lantz stated that Metrolink is well versed in Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) laws as well as the complexities of mixed-flow traffic arrangements and would be happy to assist Metro’s consultant, if needed.
8. Revised 2008 Los Angeles County TIP (Toye Oyewole, Metro)

Mr. Oyewole reported that the Board Report transmitted as information/possible action on the TAC agenda is a revision to our 2008 LA County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) submittal. The CTC and Caltrans want us to approve the revised support costs to reflect increases to the overall project costs. If we choose not to revise our TIP submittal, the CTC could reject its adoption of the 2008 LA County TIP which could prevent us from meeting our planned funding commitments for the six highway projects that are in the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) as well as possibly jeopardizing CTC approval of allocation requests for existing projects. The CTC wants every region to be responsible for working with Caltrans to ensure that the support costs are accounted for in the STIP when they are submitted to the State. By the time we got the new support cost numbers from Caltrans, as mentioned in the board report, we had already submitted the TIP to the CTC. Since it is a new regulation requiring the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies to be involved, we need to revise the Caltrans support costs to reflect newly revised estimated costs. Caltrans has agreed to contribute $98.7 million of the $153.1 million in Los Angeles County support cost increases from two sources, $74 million from the State TIP Grandfathered projects and $24.7 million in discretionary Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) funds. Attachment A of the Board Report lists the projects for which Caltrans needs additional support costs. Metro’s senior management and Caltrans had a discussion in which we felt Caltrans should honor the projects that they have agreed to grandfather before. But Caltrans has always held the position that if there are changes in scope, they will not pay for the increase, but if the increase does not involve a change in project scope, they will. We were able to get part of the Grandfathered projects that Caltrans had said they would pay before SB45 was passed which was $74 million.

Mr. Patashnick entertained a motion on the recommendations shown in the Board Report to approve the programming of $54.4 million of RIP money to fund Caltrans support costs and also to authorize the CEO to negotiate and execute the appropriate agreements. The motion was approved with no abstentions or objections by Mr. Greg Herrmann and seconded by Ms. Kim.

9. Public-Private Partnership Evaluation (Kathleen Sanchez, Metro)

Ms. Sanchez reported on the Receive and File report being presented this month to the Planning & Programming Committee on the status of staff’s efforts in responding to two Board motions. She explained that in November 2007, the Board directed staff to research opportunities to attract and incorporate Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) into the LRTP. In January 2008, the Board directed staff to determine standards for acceptable PPs. The last page of the agenda provides details on four projects identified as likely candidates for PPP in the High Priority Strategic element of the Draft Long Range Transportation Plan. These four projects contain elements such as toll or truck toll lanes which make them attractive for PPP. A set of interview questions was developed to ascertain information and advice from transit agencies, financial investment groups and legal firms on how such partnerships might work in a transportation environment such as Los Angeles County. The interviews covered how to get started, how to identify a candidate for PPP, and how might projects evolve while developing PPPs. This process is very similar to Metro's Joint Development program which identifies and defines a marketable project, assesses a revenue
stream to attract private investment, solicits proposals and then negotiates a mutually beneficial contract. The Board would like to know the criteria for a firm commitment from the private firms to participate in a PPP. Staff will continue to contact public agencies with PPP experience to determine if there are any commonalities in how they secured a firm financial commitment from the private sector. Additional work will focus on whether any legislative remedies are needed to establish PPPs in Los Angeles County. Staff’s goal is to return to the Board in June with standards for acceptable PPP funding commitments and recommendations for moving forward.

10. Long Range Transportation Plan (Rena Lum/Robert Calix, Metro)

Ms. Lum announced the release of the Draft 2008 LRTP for a 45 day public review ending April 25th. As hardcopies of the Draft Plan were distributed to TAC members and members of the audience, Ms. Lum stated that the Draft Plan is also available for download at www.metro.net/projects_studies/lrtp.htm. Ms. Lum stated that the outreach efforts will be coordinated by Robert Calix and that a series of public meetings will begin later this month. Since a formal presentation on the Draft 2008 LRTP is scheduled for the April TAC meeting, Ms. Lum stated that her presentation would be a brief introduction and overview of the Draft Plan.

Ms. Lum began by stating that resources are not available to fund new projects. Those projects recommended for funding represent the same projects in the 2001 LRTP. Ms. Lum stated that the key area of concern for most stakeholders involves the placement of projects in either the Recommended portion or the Strategic Unfunded portion of the LRTP.

Ms. Lum stated that if all improvements recommended for funding were built, mobility in Los Angeles County could be maintained and possibly improved slightly. To increase the likelihood for improved mobility, additional projects need to be funded. The Strategic Unfunded portion of the Plan is broken down into Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects to represent packages of projects eligible to receive newfound additional funding. Tier 1 projects represent high-priority projects which have undergone significant study and therefore given initial consideration for funding. Tier 2 projects are less defined and are included as candidates for additional study or funding in the longer-term.

In conclusion, Ms. Lum stated that the outreach process associated with the Draft 2008 LRTP will ask the public to help envision new self-help revenue sources. Potential revenue sources include: Congestion Pricing, a Congestion Mitigation Fee, Tolls, Public-Private Partnerships and or a Countywide Sales Tax. Ms. Lum added that the document distributed to the public only captures the highlights of the LRTP and that a more-detailed technical document will be available upon request as well as in electronic form on the Metro website.

Ms. Kim asked if there is any cost associated with Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects? Ms. Lum responded that they are not highlighted in the LRTP, but that staff is in the process of developing cost estimates for Tier 1 projects which will be presented at next month's meeting. Mr. Ferdy Chan (City of Los Angeles) asked if there are any additional incentives to lure drivers into taking public transit? Ms. Lum responded that it is not something that they are actively pursuing at this time.
Ms. Ellen Blackman asked if there will be a discussion concerning the public outreach process? Ms. Lum stated that Mr. Calix will address that during his presentation.

Larry Stevens (League of California Cities – San Gabriel Valley COG) asked about the source underlying the growth assumptions. Ms. Lum responded that it was the SCAG 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Mr. Stevens commented that that document was used as the basis for the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process and that during that process, there were number of changes made. Mr. Stevens asked how those changes are reflected in the LRTP. He added as an example that if the City of San Dimas uses those growth projections through 2014, there would be about 3,500 new housing units. The City’s growth projection through 2014 estimates about 600 new housing units. He asked if those types of anomalies in SCAG’s growth forecast have been adjusted when considering the needs and demands of the transportation system or have those assumptions been accepted as fact? Ms. Lum stated that they have not made any adjustments for any individual jurisdictions and these were the forecasts supposed to be adopted by the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). Mr. Stevens commented that he looked at the 2014 forecast primarily because that was the RENA forecasting period. Those numbers have growth going all the way out to the 2030 are similarly fantastic. The forecasts have the cities that are essentially completely built out, doubling their population, which is not a reasonable expectation. At some point in time, there should be a way to more rationally revisit the growth projections in those areas, not necessarily on a city by city basis. Mr. Stevens remarked that some of these growth projections are not rational expectations that have any chance of being reasonably achieved. Ms. Lum commented that we use SCAG’s assumptions in our analyses. She stated that it might be more appropriate to pursue this with SCAG directly. Mr. Stevens mentioned that he has already done so and by the way, the same thing goes for the Congestion Mitigation Plan which is also based on what he considers to be faulty growth projections. Mr. Stevens mentioned that most of us probably do not really look at growth projections until it really affects us directly. Mr. Stevens continued that the more the numbers hit us, the more rational they are expected to be and in some point in time, we need to get to some rationality in growth projections. Cities will not accept it. San Dimas, for instance, is having difficulties in getting General Plan amendments passed by trying to accommodate these growth projections. Ms. Lum responded that she could look into that, but does not have a comment at this time. Mr. David Rubinow (SCAG) asked Mr. Stevens if he has ever been involved in the RENA process, which is a local-input process. Mr. Sevens responded that he has been involved, but that he does not consider it a local-input process.

Ms. Eyvonne Sells (SCRRA) asked how close the Strategic Plan is to the RTP Strategic Plan and are they identical? Ms. Lum responded that she was not sure if they are identical, but are pretty close and that she will get back to her.

Mr. Calix distributed Metro’s new brochure which invites the public to attend community meetings concerning the Draft 2008 LRTP. The brochure, printed in both English and Spanish, will also be placed on all buses and trains. Mr. Calix informed TAC that DVDs will also be available.

Mr. Calix reported that a series of community meetings have been scheduled for March and April. All of the COGs are being contacted to arrange a series of briefings for both the COGs and their appropriate subcommittees concerning the LRTP and the Congestion
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Mitigation Fee. The date, location, address and time for the meetings and workshops are listed in the brochure. Mr. Calix invited TAC members to provide any names and or addresses of groups or individuals who should receive these invitations. To provide that information, TAC members were referred to Mr. Calix's contact information on the back of the brochure as well as to an email address (metroplan@metro.net) set up to receive comments. Mr. Calix stressed that receiving comments is important and that comments will be responded to in the final Technical Appendix, as they were for the Short Range Transportation Plan.

Mr. Yamarone asked if there will be a technical appendix that provides more in-depth information on the sub-regions and their priority projects? Mr. Calix responded that this document is high-level summary, but that a technical appendix will be available in 2 to 3 weeks to provide the modeling assumptions and financial assumptions. The Sub-Regional chapter is the largest chapter of the document. Mr. Calix asked that the audience send him their comments if they see any changes, misrepresented items, or insufficient information so that additional material may be added to the Technical Appendix in the final document.

Ms. Ellen Blackman asked if there is any planned outreach efforts to other types of specific groups, for example, people with disabilities, in addition to community meetings. In addition to transit issues, people with disabilities and older adults will be very interested in pedestrian access. A suggestion would be to make a presentation to Metro's Accessibility Advisory Committee. Mr. Calix commented that all the Metro subcommittees that have any interest whatsoever such as Local Transportation Services Subcommittee (LTSS), Bus Operations Subcommittee (BOS), TAC and all of its subcommittees and the Business Advisory Groups should be on the list and if they are not, they will be added. He reiterated that if TAC members have suggested groups, please provide him with their contact information.

Mr. Lantz mentioned that one of the big missing pieces is any reference to Access Services, Inc. (ASI), the program the whole disability community uses to the tune of $70 million a year. Mr. Calix responded that he will make sure ASI is noted in the final copy which would be posted on April 25th.

Ms. Sumi Gant (City of Long Beach) asked if there is any funding for "Complete Streets" which would also affect pedestrians, bikes, transit and people with disabilities? Brooke Geer Person (TDM/AQ) also asked if funding from the federal government was considered? Ms. Lum remarked that "Complete Streets" is mentioned in the LRTP (page 21) of the Sustainability Chapter. Ms. Geer commented that she just wants to know where the funding is and that it is a great idea for a LRTP to include, but there is a need for funding to make it happen.

Mr. Calix then asked the audience to let people know that Metro is available to communicate the contents of the LRTP.

Mr. Yamarone asked Mr. Patashnick about the process for each of the TAC subcommittees in reviewing the LRTP and if their comments will come through TAC to be presented and reviewed in the next meeting for a global TAC recommendation or is each subcommittee expected to submit their own? Mr. Patashnick responded that they could bring their comments through TAC since staff will be presenting the item to all of the TAC.
subcommittees. Mr. Yamarone stated that it seems that the LRTP will be reviewed at the next TAC meeting, perhaps on the earlier part of the agenda. Mr. Patashnick announced that the next TAC meeting is on April 9th. Mr. Maselbas asked if all the questions should go through TAC? Mr. Yamarone responded that they should go through TAC Subcommittees as was done with the Call for Projects. Each subcommittee will make their comments, but they come through TAC.

Mr. Stevens asked about the distribution of the technical report. Ms. Lum commented that the technical report will be on the website and if anyone is interested in a hardcopy to contact her because the document is more than 270 pages. Mr. Stevens asked how people will know when the technical document will be available and how to request it. Ms. Lum responded that that information is provided on the website.

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

Mr. Calix distributed copies of the Congestion Mitigation Fee Feasibility Study Report and reported that during the same outreach for the LRTP, they met with all the COGs and the stakeholders who contacted Metro regarding issues, questions, or concerns. The process is to receive public input and revise the document if anything is missing. Before obtaining Board approval in June, staff must reconcile growth forecasts such as population, employment, etc., and cost estimates for the projects that are identified. The projects are called local projects with regional benefit, because by saying regional projects, people may think that they are just freeways. Yet, it is much more than that: it could be signal synchronization or performing roadway system preservation. Mr. Calix stated that staff will summarize comments in a matrix format and include it as an appendix in the Board Report. Mr. Calix announced again that the deadline for comments is April 25th.

Mr. Stevens commented that people in Real Estate development will look at this document very carefully because its implications are significant. Mr. Stevens added that, under this fee program, a 150,000 square foot project at the minimum fee would be charged an additional $1 million and under the maximum fee, $7.4 million. Those are substantial numbers added to development. In theory, they could have offset system improvements and receive half a million dollars credit versus fees. These are significant numbers for development and shouldn’t be looked at as just a way to raise money, but should be looked at as an impact on the overall system of land use development.

11. New Business

No new business.

12. Adjournment

The next meeting will be held on April 9, 2008 in the Union Station Conference Room on the 3rd Floor at 9:30 a.m.
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Pelosi Wants House to Consider Infrastructure Bank Bill

By Colby Itkowitz, CQ Staff

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi said Wednesday she wants the House to take up a Senate bill to create a national infrastructure bank to develop public-private investments into large transportation projects.

At a news conference, the California Democrat said she is committed to overhauling the nation’s infrastructure to mirror such historical achievements as President Eisenhower’s interstate highway system 50 years ago.

She said she foresees some infrastructure spending in a future stimulus bill, but that her vision is, “much bigger than a stimulus.”

Pelosi met with House Democrats and economic and infrastructure experts before the news conference to discuss the role the federal government should play in meeting transportation goals.

The experts warned that the nation is lagging behind foreign competitors and the structures in place will not be able to withstand projected growth in trade and population. Currently the federal government is barely investing enough to maintain current standards let alone build new capacity.

“It’s a high national priority and the speaker understands this point,” said Robert D. Hormats, vice chairman of Goldman Sachs. “Public-private cooperation is a really critical part. The needs are urgent. It can be something good the government does for the American people.”

The Senate bill (S 1926) that Pelosi hopes to take up is sponsored by Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee Chairman Christopher J. Dodd, D-Conn., and Chuck Hagel, R-Neb., and aims to leverage private capital to supplement public spending.

House Financial Services Committee Chairman Barney Frank, D-Mass., told Pelosi he’s interested in sponsoring the legislation in the House.

The Speaker said not to anticipate a large comprehensive infrastructure bill comparable to the energy bill (PL 110-140) signed into law in December because Congress will be addressing surface transportation needs when it rewrites a comprehensive highway bill next year.

Peter A. DeFazio, D-Ore., chairman of the House Transportation Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, said the speaker’s support will help the committee’s efforts next year as “we fashion the first bill of the next century.”

Source: CQ Today Online News
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Moratorium on Earmarks Unlikely as Budget Proposals Head to Floor

By David Clarke and Liriel Higa, CQ Staff

As the House and Senate consider their fiscal 2009 budget blueprints, earmarks remain a central issue, though both chambers are likely to reject proposals that would institute a one-year moratorium on the special member projects.

In the House, a temporary ban on earmarks will be part of a Republican substitute proposal. In the Senate, a bipartisan amendment has drawn backing from the chamber's three remaining presidential candidates.

On Tuesday, Senate Democratic leaders made clear they do not support such a ban. In the House, meanwhile, Democratic leaders are considering not including earmarks in spending bills this year.

The House takes up its budget proposal (H Con Res 312) Wednesday. The Senate began debating its plan (S Con Res 70) March 10. Both will finish by the end of this week, setting up conference negotiations.

The annual budget resolution is non-binding but sets the parameters for considering spending and tax bills each year.

In the House, the GOP alternative that includes the earmark moratorium, among other provisions, is expected to be rejected.

In the Senate, the proposal from Jim DeMint, R-S.C., calling for a one-year break in the member-sponsored projects, is also likely to be rejected, though it got a boost this week when the Democratic presidential contenders — Sens. Barack Obama of Illinois and Hillary Rodham Clinton of New York — said they support it. The presumed GOP nominee — Sen. John McCain of Arizona — also backs the amendment.

"I have a feeling that, as pressure mounts over the next few days, we might get more votes than you think," DeMint said.

Funding set-asides for projects such as bridges, academic institutions and other facilities in a member's district or state have come under increasing fire in recent years after being linked to some corruption cases.

Senate Democratic leaders argued Tuesday that lawmakers know their states' needs best and that banning earmarks would cede too much power to the president.

"Remember, the Founding Fathers wanted us to have control of the spending," Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., said.

Several Senate Republicans, particularly appropriators, also oppose the amendment. Minority
Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., said he was not sure how he would vote.

The amendment also could face procedural roadblocks if it is ruled non-germane to the budget resolution. That would mean that a point of order, requiring 60 votes to waive, could be raised against it.

The DeMint proposal, meanwhile, would create a point of order against bills with earmarks, as defined by last year’s ethics law (PL 110-81), for fiscal 2009. Waiving the point of order would require a two-thirds vote.

Many Democrats feel they have not gotten enough credit for changes they made to the process last year in response to the rising cost and use of earmarks when Congress was under GOP control.

For example, the nine-bill fiscal 2007 funding measure (PL 110-5) that cleared in February 2007 did not include earmarks. Both chambers also implemented rules requiring more information to be made available about the sponsor and purpose of earmarks.

The Senate likely will hold its final vote on adoption late Thursday or on Friday.

**House Debate**

In the House, debate on the budget is expected to be completed Wednesday, with votes on amendments and the budget’s adoption Thursday. The rule for debate allows for three substitute amendments to be considered. In addition to the Republicans’ substitute, others will be offered by the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

The Republican substitute, by the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Paul D. Ryan of Wisconsin, would use the $14.8 billion the GOP estimates would be saved by the earmark moratorium to reduce discretionary spending.

Ryan’s proposal calls for retaining the “patch” for the alternative minimum tax (AMT) for the next three years and fully repealing it in fiscal 2013. The Democratic proposal includes a one-year patch to the AMT that would be offset using the “reconciliation” process. The GOP proposal also calls for extending President Bush’s 2001 and 2003 tax cuts (PL 107-16, PL 108-27).

The Senate has yet to vote on any amendments, as leaders await the return of the three presidential candidates so they can attend key votes. Votes on possibly dozens of amendments are expected shortly before the final vote Thursday or Friday. It is unclear how many may occur before then.

Besides the DeMint amendment, the chamber will vote on a proposal from Finance Chairman Max Baucus, D-Mont., that calls for extending middle-class tax cuts due to lapse in 2010 and providing tax benefits for veterans and military servicemembers. The proposal calls for dedicating the $336 billion in projected surpluses under the Senate plan in fiscal 2012 and 2013 to the tax-break extensions, though the measure would not affect tax law.

Senate Republicans have also introduced amendments that call for boosting the amount of fiscal 2009 war funding assumed in the resolution from $70 billion to $170 billion. The GOP is also lining up amendments that propose extending all of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts.
Transit Corridor Studies Update

- Crenshaw Corridor
- Westside Extension
- Regional Connector
- Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2
- Harbor Subdivision RFP

Technical Advisory Committee
March 12, 2008
Crenshaw-Prairie Transit Corridor

- Receive & File Update going to Metro Planning & Programming Committee on March 19th
- Report on 2nd Round of Community Meetings in February
  - Added northern alignment to Wilshire/La Brea
  - Added consideration of grade separations in constrained locations
Alignments Eliminated for Environmental Analysis

Southern Section

Northern Section

Will be examined in Technical Feasibility Study
Alternatives for Further Environmental Study

Metro LRT Alternative

BRT Alternative
Summary of Comments from Latest Public Meetings

- Affirmation of core direction:
  - Metro Green Line, LAX, and Expo Line as primary connections
  - Future northern connection toward Wilshire/La Brea is preferable to Wilshire/Crenshaw
- LRT has more proponents than BRT
- Some comments for stronger/more direct connection into LAX terminals
- Service and/or connections through Inglewood commercial corridors, esp. the Prairie corridor
- Focus on grade separations/subway sections
- Impacts of concern: traffic, safety, aesthetics, noise from horns

Metro
• Receive & File Update went to Metro Planning & Programming Committee on February 20th
• Report on 2nd Round of Community Meetings in January/February
  • Identified 17 Build Alternatives
  • Preparing Initial Alternatives Screening Report
Westside Extension Transit Corridor
Fixed-Route Alignments and Potential Stations

5 Groups of Alternatives

Wilshire Subway (3)
Santa Monica Subway (5)
Combined Wilshire/ Santa Monica (5)
Aerial Rail Alternatives (3)
BRT Alternative (1)
Summary of Comments from Latest Public Meetings

- Overwhelming consensus that project is necessary and needs to move forward soon
- Strong support for Wilshire Subway Alignment that primarily follows Wilshire as well as Wilshire subway alignments that detour to north to serve Farmer’s Market/the Grove and Beverly Center/Cedars Sinai Medical Center
- Support for Santa Monica subway alignments that primarily follow Santa Monica Blvd as well as Santa Monica subway alignments that detour to south to serve Beverly Center/Cedars Sinai
- Crenshaw station – consider deleting
- La Brea/Santa Monica station – Add station here (West Hollywood Gateway)
- Some support for aerial, but similar levels of opposition
- Ongoing concerns about tunneling under homes
Regional Connector Transit Corridor

- Receive & File Update going to Metro Plg. & Programming Comm. on March 19th
- Report on Early Scoping comments and initial 8 Build Alternatives
- Four typical alignments:
  - 2nd Street at-grade
  - Couplet at-grade
  - Temple St. at-grade
  - Underground LRT
- 11 to 12 potential station locations
Summary of Comments from Latest Public Meetings

- **Mode**: Overwhelming support for Light Rail Transit (LRT)

- **Grade**: Most indicated preference for below grade or subway

- **Alignment**: Even split between 2 routes: Grand Avenue (served by several alternatives) or 1st Street (engineering constraints, served by other alternatives); 2nd Street route identified as the next most preferred

- **Potential Station Locations**: Little Tokyo, 7th Street/Metro, Bunker Hill, Union Station, Main/1st and Civic Center, Grand Avenue

- An overwhelming majority supported the need for a Regional Connector to enhance the efficiency of the current and future rail system by providing service through Downtown Los Angeles

- Some encouraged developing a transit system that connects multiple lines

- Some recommended expanding the 7th Street/Metro station to accommodate enhanced service and upgrading various operational systems
Eastside Phase 2 Transit Corridor

- Receive & File Update going to Metro Plg. & Prog. Committee on March 19th
- 17 Build Alternatives in 3 Distinct Corridors
  - Northern
  - Central
  - Southern
- Various Configurations
  - At-grade
  - Aerial
  - Underground
  - 3 BRT Alts.

Metro
Summary of Comments from Latest Public Meetings

- Conducted 4 Early Scoping Meetings and 1 Interagency Scoping Meeting

- Comments received support the project goals and provide strong direction, including:
  - Whittier Boulevard as a preferred alignment with grade separations
  - SR-60 Freeway and Washington Boulevard as strong secondary alignment options
  - Beverly Boulevard is the most noted street to avoid due to narrow right-of-way and established trees in Whittier
  - Light Rail Technology (LRT) is preferred transit mode
  - Parking, safety, property values and congestion are biggest community issues

Metro
Harbor Subdivision Transit Corridor

- RFP for AA, DEIS/R, FEIS/R released in December 2007
- Proposals received February 2008
- To Metro Board of Directors in April 2008 for contract award
- Contract Award is for Phase 1 of project – AA, Financial Feasibility and Conceptual Engineering
Harbor Subdivision Transit Corridor

- Scope of Work to Include DMU, LRT, BRT and other technologies, Conc. Eng., and Financial Feasibility Analysis

- Corridor defined as existing Metro-owned railroad ROW in addition to connections to traffic/transit generators beyond north and south termini, i.e. downtown Los to LAX and LAX to Port of Los Angeles
Attachment 4

Rolling 90-Day Agenda Items for April 2008 – June 2008
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: ROGER SNOW

SUBJECT: ROLLING 90-DAY AGENDA ITEMS FOR APRIL 2008 – JUNE 2008

Attached is the 90-Day Rolling Agenda look ahead of items that I will be focusing on in the coming months. The listing will be updated and distributed to you on a monthly basis. Since this is a forecasting tool, some items may be deferred to a later month for my further review and analysis.

The following items scheduled for the April 2008 Committee/Board cycle that may be of interest to you are:

- Amend the FY08 budget to include funds for project development work associated with the I-405 Sepulveda Pass Carpool Lane Project.
- Authorize the Chief Executive Officer to execute a contract modification for continuation of Construction Management Support Services for the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension Project.
- Award service contract for financial and compliance audit services.
- Authorize the Chief Executive Officer to purchase Property, Boiler and Machinery insurance.
- Award contract for 260, 45' Low Floor Composite Transit Buses.
- Approve proposed changes to Tier 1 Service.
- Award design build contract for Bauchet Street Storage and Facilities Maintenance Structure.
- Award consultant contract for Congestion Pricing Operating Plan for Los Angeles County.
- Receive and file status report on Orange -Los Angeles Inter-county Transportation Study.
- Award contract for the Harbor Subdivision Transit Corridor.

Attachments:
A. 90-Day Listing by Month
B. 90-Day Listing by Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>BRD</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer's Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>Access report of the Chief Capital Management Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Amend the FY09 Budget to include funds for project development work associated with the I-405 Sepulveda Pass Carpool Lane Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Authorize CEO to execute Mod. 4 to Contract MC067 w/ Jacobs Carter Burgess, Contract Work Order(CWO), for continuation of Construction Management Support Services (CMSS) for the McGEE Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Authorize CEO to execute Mod. 4 to Contract PS-2020-1051 w/ Dr. Eisenstein, and to execute Mod. 4 to Contract PS-2020-1055 w/ Dr. Martin, for continuation of geotechnical and tunneling consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Authorize CEO to execute Mod. 35 to Contract PS-4310-0964, w/ Eastside LRT Partners, a joint venture, consisting of Parsons Brinckerhoff, Jenkins/ Gales &amp; Martinez, &amp; Barrio Planners, Inc. for cont. of Phase III Design Svcs During Construction &amp; provide Phase IV System Activation Svcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>Receive report of the Chief Communications Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>Receive report of the Chief Communications Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>Federal / State Affairs update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>Receive TAP and Gating update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Adopt the FY09 Audit Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Approve Investment in LACMTA Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Award Service Contract for Financial and Compliance Audit Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Purchase Property, Boiler and Machinery Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Adopt resolution authorizing issuance of Prop A Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Adopt resolution authorizing issuance of Prop C Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>Receive Transit Operations report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>Receive TAP and Gating update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>Receive and file report on Quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Approve Contract Modification Authority to Contract No. C0693 for Four Quadrant Gate Expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Award Contract for 260, 45' Low Floor Composite Transit Buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Award Contract for Incident Based Recording Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Execute 22 Amendments to Extend FSP and Big Rig Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Approve Proposed Changes to Tier 1 Service Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Award Contract for Engine Coolant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Approve Continuance of the Wilshire Metro Rapid Express and Discontinue the Hawthorne Metro Rapid Express.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Approve Award of Design/Build Contract for Bauchet Street Storage and Facilities Maintenance Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Award Contract for Toilet Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>AHCP</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Award Consultant Contract to Congestion Pricing Operating Plan for Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>Receive Oral Report from Chief Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>Receive and file OC/LA Intercounty Transportation Study - Draft Purpose and Need Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Approve Fiscal Year 2008 Federal Transit Administration Section 5310 Delegation Authority Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>Award Contract for Harbor Subdivision Alternatives Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

attachment A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May-08</th>
<th>BRD</th>
<th>Chief Executive Officer's Report</th>
<th>ORAL</th>
<th>SNOBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Receive report of the Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>SNOBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Approve Revision and Update of Metro Records Management Policy</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>MITCHELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Award Contract for North Region Contracted Transportation Services</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>FLOWERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Award Contract for Mid-Size Sport Utility Vehicles for Transit Operation Supervisors</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>FLOWERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Approve Two Year Extension to LTK Engineering Contract PS8310-1267 for rail vehicle (P2550) consultant services.</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>CANNELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Approve the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Canoga Extension of the MOL</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>INGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Approve Supplemental Funds 1-5/Carmenita Road Interchange and Grade Crossing</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>INGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Approve Programming of Prop 1B Transit Security Funds</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>INGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>BRD</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer's Report</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>SNOBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>Receive and file report on Excess Liability Insurance</td>
<td>R&amp;P</td>
<td>MATSUMOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Receive report of the Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>SNOBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Transit Adjudication Bureau</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>FLOWERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>Receive and file Excess Liability Insurance</td>
<td>R&amp;P</td>
<td>MATSUMOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>SR-134 Design/Build Soundwall Evaluation</td>
<td>R&amp;P</td>
<td>INGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>BRD</td>
<td>Report Title</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>BRD</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer's Report</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>SNOBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>BRD</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer's Report</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>SNOBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>BRD</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer's Report</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>SNOBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Approver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>Receive report of the Chief Capital Management Officer</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>THORPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>Amend the FY09 Budget to include funds for project development work associated with the I-405 Sepulveda Pass Carpool Lane Project</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>THORPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>Authorize CEO to execute Mod. 4 to Contract MC067 w/ Jacobs Carter Burgess, Contract Work Order (CWO), for continuation of Construction Management Support Services (CMS) for the MGLEE Project</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>THORPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>Authorize CEO to execute Mod. 4 to Contract PS-2020-1051 w/ Dr. Eisenstein, and to execute Mod. 4 to Contract PS-2020-1055 w/ Dr. Martin, for continuation of geotechnical and tunneling consulting</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>THORPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>Authorize CEO to execute Mod. 15 to Contract PS-4310-0964, w/ Eastside LRT Partners, a joint venture, consisting of Parsons Brinckerhoff, Jenkins, Gales &amp; Martinez, &amp; Barrio Planners, Inc, for cont. of Phase III Design Svcs During Construction &amp; provide Phase IV System Activation Svcs</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>THORPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>SNOBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>RAYMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>RAYMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>MOLIERE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>HOLDEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>SNOBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>MITCHELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>SNOBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>FLOWERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 90 - Day Rolling Agenda Forecast

**April 2008 - June 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>Approve Investment in LACMTA Bonds</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>MATSUMOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>Award Service Contract for Financial and Compliance Audit Services</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>MATSUMOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>Purchase Property, Boiler and Machinery Insurance</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>MATSUMOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>Adopt resolution authorizing issuance of Prop A Bonds</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>MATSUMOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>Adopt resolution authorizing issuance of Prop C Bonds</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>MATSUMOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>Receive and file report on Excess Liability Insurance</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>MATSUMOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>Receive and file Excess Liability Insurance</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>MATSUMOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Approval Type</td>
<td>Approver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OFS</td>
<td>Receive Transit Operations report</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>FLOWERS / CANNELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OFS</td>
<td>Receive TAP and Gating update</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>MOLIERE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OFS</td>
<td>Receive and file report on Quality of life</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>FLOWERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OFS</td>
<td>Approve Contract Modification Authority to Contract No. C0693 for Four Quadrant Gate Expansion</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>CANNELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OFS</td>
<td>Award Contract for 260, 45' Low Floor Composite Transit Buses</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>FLOWERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OFS</td>
<td>Award Contract for Incident Based Recording Technology</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>FLOWERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OFS</td>
<td>Execute 22 Amendments to Extend, FSP and Big Rig Contracts</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>FLOWERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OFS</td>
<td>Approve Proposed Changes to Tier 1 Service Changes</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>FLOWERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OFS</td>
<td>Award Contract for Engine Coolant</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>FLOWERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OFS</td>
<td>Approve continuance of the Wilshire Metro Rapid Express and discontinue the Hawthorne Metro Rapid Express.</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>FLOWERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OFS</td>
<td>Approve Award of Design/Build Contract for Bauchet Street Storage and Facilities Maintenance Structure</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>FLOWERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>OFS</td>
<td>Award contract toilet paper</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>MITCHELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>OFS</td>
<td>Award Contract for North Region Contracted Transportation Services</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>FLOWERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>OFS</td>
<td>Award Contract for Mid-Size Sport Utility Vehicles for Transit Operation Supervisors</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>FLOWERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>OFS</td>
<td>Approve Two Year Extension to LTK Engineering Contract FS8310-1267 for rail vehicle (P2550) consultant services.</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>CANNELL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 90-Day Rolling Agenda Forecast
April 2008 - June 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr 08</td>
<td>AHCP</td>
<td>Award Consultant Contract to Congestion Pricing Operating Plan for Los Angeles County</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>INGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>INGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Receive and file OC/LA Intercounty Transportation Study - Draft Purpose and Need Report</td>
<td>R&amp;P</td>
<td>INGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Receive Oral Report from Chief Planning Officer</td>
<td>ORAL</td>
<td>INGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Approve Fiscal Year 2008 Federal Transit Administration Section 5310 Delegation Authority Recommendations</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>INGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Award Contract Harbor Subdivision Alternatives Analysis</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>INGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Approve the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Canoga Extension of the MOL</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>INGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Approve Supplemental Funds 1-5/Carmenita Road Interchange and Grade Crossing</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>INGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Approve Programming of Prop 1B Transit Security Funds</td>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>INGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>SR-134 Design/Build Soundwall Evaluation</td>
<td>R&amp;P</td>
<td>INGE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Purpose of Long Range Transportation Plan

- Metro is charged with Plan development
- Looks ahead through 2030
- Takes time to plan, to design, and to build major projects
- Identifies projects we think we can fund
- Proposes additional projects if more funding becomes available
- Performance-based
Major Themes

- Mobility
- Effect on Environment
  - Reducing Global Warming
  - Improving Air Quality
- Goods Movement
  - Heavy truck traffic
  - Community impact
  - Safety
- Funding – can we fund what we need to do?
The Challenge

• 10 million people today
• 2 million more people in 20 years
• People go everywhere in every direction throughout the county
• If we do nothing
  – Average system speed will get worse...from 30 mph today to 20 mph in 20 years
  – “Rush hour” continues to get longer
• In short, we want to maintain the quality of life
The Plan Process

To do it right, we move step-by-step:

- Establish Performance Criteria
- Honor Past Commitments
- How Much Money is Available
- Evaluate Potential New Projects
- Develop Draft Plan Recommendations
- Final Plan
What can be done in 20 years

- 1980—1 carpool lane
- Today—over 450 miles
- 1980—1 transitway
- Today—Countywide transit system:
  - Innovative bus services, Metro Rapid and Orange line
  - 24 miles of dedicated bus lanes
  - 73-mile Metro Rail network
  - 500-mile commuter rail system connecting LA to other counties
Fixed Guideways/Transitways

Existing Guideways and Transitways

Improvements Since 2001 Plan

Transit Under Construction
Financial Resources

- Main challenges are lack of money and cost of construction
- Expected revenues will not keep pace with growth
- Lucky to have a local source of revenue
- More money is needed
- Evaluate what we can do with existing resources
- Look for new funding
Recommendations: Public Transit

- Local Bus
  - Maintains extensive system
  - Efficiently expand service through larger buses that carry more riders
- Eastside Gold Line Extension: Downtown to ELA due in 2009
- Expo Phase I: Downtown to Culver City due in 2010
- Expo Phase II: Culver City to Santa Monica
- Crenshaw Corridor: Expo to Green Line
- San Fernando Valley: Northern extension of Orange Line to Chatsworth and bus speed improvements on other North/South Corridors
- Metrolink: Continue funding commuter rail service
Draft 2008 Plan - Transit Projects

Legend

- Existing Fixed Guideways/Transitways
- Adopted Metro Rapid Network
- Funded Transit Projects
- * Alignments to be determined through alternatives analysis

San Fernando Valley North/South, Canoga Extension, and/or Arterial Bus Speed Improvements*

WARNER CENTER

SANTA MONICA

Exposition LRT Phase II*

EXPO LRT Phase I Under Construction

Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension Under Construction

North County

LANCASTER

PALMDALE

NORWALK

LONG BEACH
Recommendations: Highways

- Fill in gaps in carpool lane system. Examples include:
  - SR-60 and I-10: connecting San Gabriel Valley with Inland Empire
  - I-405: connecting the Westside with San Fernando Valley
  - I-5: connecting San Fernando Valley with North L.A. County
  - And Others

- Improve traffic choke points, including:
  - I-5 bottleneck from Orange County Border to I-605

- Freeway Service Patrol
Projects and Programs

- City Streets
  - Lane Widenings and Turn Lanes
  - Traffic Signal Coordination

- Goods Movement
  - Grade separations
  - Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan
Projects and Programs (cont.)

- System Management
  - Traffic Control Centers
- Demand Management
  - Rideshare and Vanpool programs
  - Transit-Oriented Design
  - Smart Growth
- Bike Lanes and Pedestrian Improvements
  - Completing gaps in bike lane system
  - Encourage urban design which promotes walking
Measuring the Benefits

- Mobility/Speed
  - Will improve by 15%

- Air Quality
  - Will improve by 5%

- Transit dependent and minority populations
  - Will see improved access
Strategic Plan

- Projects we need but do not have the money to build
- First Tier
  - Projects with significant study
  - Candidates for new funding
- Second Tier
  - Projects that are less defined than First Tier Projects
  - New ideas requiring additional study
Strategic Plan (cont.)

- Transit Projects, including:
  - Regional Connector through downtown LA
  - Westside Extension of Subway to West LA
  - Foothill Extension beyond Pasadena
  - Eastside Extension beyond Atlantic/Pomona
  - Green Line Extensions (LAX, South Bay Galleria, Norwalk)
  - And Others

- Highway Projects, including:
  - Improvements to the 710, 101, 5 and 14
  - New Roadways for the High Desert Corridor
  - And Others
Draft 2008 Plan - Transit Strategic Unfunded Tier 1 Projects
Need for New Money

- Strategic projects require new funding sources
- Feasibility of new ways to fund projects
  - sales tax
  - congestion pricing
  - congestion mitigation fee
  - public-private partnerships
- Discussion is just beginning to find new approaches to funding
Conclusion

- Please review the Long Range Transportation Plan
- Let us know what you think
- Your input makes our planning better
Comments

- Comments are due April 25
- E-mail: metroplan@metro.net
- Mail to:
  Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
  Attention: Robert Calix, Transportation Program Manager
  One Gateway Plaza
  Mail Stop: 99-23-2
  Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952
## Draft 2008 Plan - Transit Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Est. Cost as of Jan 2008</th>
<th>Est. FY Open (Jan 2008)</th>
<th>Status (Jan 2008)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastside LRT</td>
<td>$ 899 M</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposition LRT Phase I to Culver City</td>
<td>$ 862 M</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposition LRT Phase II to Santa Monica (alternative is TBD, cost will depend on alternative selected)</td>
<td>$ 1,100 M to $ 1,632 M</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>In Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wilshire Boulevard Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 200 M</strong></td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>In Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crenshaw Corridor (mode is TBD) BRT or LRT</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 685 M to $ 1,057 M</strong></td>
<td><strong>2025 to 2027</strong></td>
<td>In Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley North/South BRT Phase I</td>
<td>$ 298 M</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>In Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 187 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 111 M</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Draft 2008 Plan - Highway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Est. FY Open (Jan 2008)</th>
<th>Status (Jan 2008)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 405 Carpool Lanes from I-105 to SR-90</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 57/State Route 60 Carpool Lane Direct</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-101 Freeway &amp; Ramp Realignment to Center St.</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 405 Carpool Lane Northbound from Greenleaf St.</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Burbank Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 14 Carpool Lanes from Pearblossom Hwy. to</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave P-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-405/US-101 Connector Gap Closure near Greenleaf St.</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-710 Freeway Improvements from PCH to Downtown Long</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 405 Carpool Lanes from SR-90 to I-10</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Est. FY Open (Jan 2008)</td>
<td>Status (Jan 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 Carpool Lanes from State Route 14 to State Route 118</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 405 Southbound Carpool/Auxiliary Lane from Waterford St. to Interstate 10</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5/State Route 126 Interchange Reconstruction Phases I and II</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend State Route 90 Freeway- 2 segments</td>
<td>Open to traffic</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-60 Carpool Lanes from I-605 to Brea Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5/SR-14 Carpool Lane Direct Connector</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 Carpool Lanes from SR-118 to SR-170</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 Carpool Lanes from SR-170 to State Route 134 (CMIA Project)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Draft 2008 Plan - Highway Projects (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Est. FY Open (Jan 2008)</th>
<th>Status (Jan 2008)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 10 Carpool Lanes from I-605 to Puente Avenue.</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 Carmenita Road Interchange Improvement</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>95% Designed (in right-of-way acquisition phase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 10 Carpool Lanes from Puente Avenue to Citrus Avenue</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 10 Carpool Lanes from Citrus Avenue to State Route 57</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 405 Carpool Lanes (northbound) from I-10 to US-101 (CMIA Project)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>In Planning- Environ. Clearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 Carpool &amp; Mixed Flow Lanes from I-605 to Orange County Line (CMIA Project)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Est. FY Open (Jan 2008)</td>
<td>Status (Jan 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 138 Widening – Remaining 7 segments</td>
<td>2007-2023</td>
<td>1 is complete, 2 in design, 2 start construction soon, 2 in pre-planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 14 Carpool Lanes from Ave P-8 to Avenue L</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>In Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 71 Freeway from Interstate 10 to Mission Blvd.</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 57/State Route 60 Mixed Flow Interchange</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5/Interstate 405 Carpool Lane Partial Connector</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>In Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 71 Freeway from Mission Blvd. to Rio Rancho Rd</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Draft 2008 Plan - Major Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Total 1/08</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro Transit Operations</td>
<td>$41,483</td>
<td>Thru 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service (Props A &amp; C)</td>
<td>$14,606</td>
<td>Thru 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal &amp; non-Metro bus operations (including MOSIP thru 2030 and Local Return to cities)</td>
<td>$13,402</td>
<td>Thru 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Bus Capital</td>
<td>$6,010</td>
<td>Thru 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation of Metro rail system</td>
<td>$3,953</td>
<td>Thru 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Total 8/07</td>
<td>Total 1/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 500</td>
<td>$ 453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 587</td>
<td>$ 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 737</td>
<td>$ 469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,140</td>
<td>$ 1,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,251</td>
<td>$ 1,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI (paratransit)</td>
<td>$ 3,340</td>
<td>$ 3,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal bus capital</td>
<td>$ 2,930</td>
<td>$ 3,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrolink (ops and capital)</td>
<td>$ 2,288</td>
<td>$ 2,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrofit soundwalls</td>
<td>$ 941</td>
<td>$ 979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>$ 679</td>
<td>$ 716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>FY 2009-10</td>
<td>FY 2010-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit contingency: rail/bus yards/rail cars/rail system improvements</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$1,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail project escalation contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway project escalation contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New bus speed improvements (bus-only lanes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Years:**
- Total 1/08

---

**Note:** The table continues on the next page.
## Draft 2008 Plan - Major Programs (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Total 1/08</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety Net (Immediate Needs) Program increase</td>
<td>$117</td>
<td>Thru 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alameda Corridor East</strong></td>
<td>$280</td>
<td><strong>FY 2005-15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metrolink - new capital</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td><strong>FY 2027-29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New airport bus division</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td><strong>FY 2016-18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union bus division</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td><strong>FY 2005-10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for new projects</td>
<td>$64</td>
<td><strong>FY 2007-10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit studies for new projects</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td><strong>FY 2025-28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>