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
   5 min

3. Consent Calendar
   • Approval of Minutes
   Attachment 3: Draft March 4, 2009 Minutes
   Action

4. Chairperson’s Report
   • TAC Representative Protocol
   • Corridor Studies Schedule Updates
   10 min

5. Legislative Update
   Federal
   State
   15 min

   Information
   (Raffi Hamparian)
   (Michael Turner)

6. TAC Special Committee report on ARRA – TEA Funds
   Attachment 4: Email to TAC on March 17th
   20 min

   Action
   (Jano Baghdanian)
   • LA Conservation Corps (Bruce Saito)
   Attachment 5: March Board Report Item #43
   30 min
   Update
   (David Yale)

8. 2009 Call for Projects
   5 min
   Update
   (Rena Lum)

9. Congestion Management Program
   10 min
   Update
   (Stacy Alameida)

10. Congestion Mitigation Fee
    10 min
    Update
    (Robert Calix)

11. Goods Movement Environmental Justice Analysis and Community Outreach Study
    10 min
    Information
    (Philbert Wong)

12. New Business

13. 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 6, 2009 at 9:30 a.m. in the Union Station Conference Room on the 3rd floor.
Attachment 1

Subcommittee March 2009 Agendas

• Bus Operations

• Local Transit Systems

• Streets and Freeways

• TDM/Air Quality
  ➢ No Meeting
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Windsor Conference Room — 15th Floor

1. Call to Order
   1 minute

2. Approval of February 17, 2009 Minutes
   1 minute

3. Chair’s Report
   5 minutes

4. Legislative Report
   10 minutes

5. American Recovery & Re-Investment Act (ARRA)
   15 minutes

6. $3 million TEA 1% Allocation from ARRA
   10 minutes

7. Bike To Work Day
   10 minutes

8. Call For Projects - Transit Capital Update
   10 minutes

9. Access Services Member Meeting
   10 minutes

Action
Dennis Korbata

Action
BOS

Information
Dennis Korbata

Information
Raffi Hamparian/Marisa Yeager/
   Michael Turner

Information
Ray Tellis/Frank Flores

Information
Frank Flores

Information
Paula Carvajal

Information
Larry Torres

Information
Andre Colaiace

Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Metro
10. New Business

11. Adjournment

Information Items:

90-day Rolling Agenda
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 — FY07
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 or QUENISHA WILLIAMS at 213-922-7474 if you have questions regarding the agenda or meeting. The next BOS meeting will be held April 21, 2009 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

Wilshire Conference Room– 4th Floor

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes – January 29, 2009
   (to be handed out at meeting)

3. 2009 Call for Projects and 5310 Update

4. Mini Call Update

5. ASI Update

6. DRAFT Sub-Regional Paratransit Fundmarks
   For FY 2009—10

7. NTD Workshop Recap (Feb. ′09)

8. FY ′06 and FY ′07 NTD MOU′s/Payments

9. LA County Bike to Work Day– May 14, 2009

10. New Business/Adjournment

Action
Alex Gonzalez, Chair

Information
Larry Torres, Metro

Information
Jay Fuhrman, Metro

Information
Arun Prem, ASI

Information
Susan Richan, Metro

Information
Jay Fuhrman, Metro

Information
Jay Fuhrman, ASI

Information
Paula Carvajal, Metro

Alex Gonzalez, Chair
Thursday, March 19, 2009 9:30 a.m.

Agenda

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

Windsor Conference Room, 15th Floor

1. Call to Order
   1 min

2. Approval of Minutes
   Attachment 1: Draft February 4, 2009 Minutes
   Attachment 2: Sign in Sheet/Attendance Sheet
   1 min

3. Chairperson Report
   10 min

4. Metro Report
   • TAC Actions
   10 min

5. Caltrans Report
   10 min

6. Legislative Update
   • Federal
   • State Budget
   15 min

   20 min

8. Call for Projects Update
   10 min

Action (Bahman Janka)

Action (Subcommittee)

Information (Bahman Janka)

Information (Randy Lamm)

Information (Kirk Cessna)

Information (Michael Turner, Raffi Hamparian, Marisa Yeager)

Discussion (David Yale)

Information (Rena Lum)
9. Congestion Mitigation Fee
   10 min
   Information (Robert Calix)

10. 710 Tunnel Feasibility Study
     10 min
     Update (Rebecca Barrantes,
          Deborah Harris)

11. New Business
    5 min
    Discussion (Subcommittee)

12. Adjournment
    1 min
    Action (Subcommittee)

The next meeting of the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee is scheduled for April 16, 2009 (date, time and room subject to change) at 9:30 AM in the Windsor Conference Room, 15th Floor. Please contact Randy Lamm at (213) 922-2470 should you have any questions or comments regarding this or future agendas.

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

Subcommittee Actions
Disposition of March 2009 Subcommittee Actions

Bus Operation Subcommittee:

March 17, 2009 meeting

Approved holding a Special Meeting on March 31, 2009 to allocate the ARRA TEA 1% funds

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:

March 26, 2009

No Action

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:

March 19, 2009 Special meeting

No Action

TDM/Air Quality Subcommittee:

No Meeting in March
Attachment 3

Draft March 4, 2009 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 (Dennis Kobata)
- Discussed the recent base fares increase:
  - Torrance Transit in January 2009;
  - Long Beach Transit in February 2009;
  - Others transit agencies are looking to increase their fares;
- The Subcommittee formed a Committee to review projects and expenses eligible for Measure R;
- Next meeting scheduled for March 17, 2009.

Local Transit Systems (Alex Gonzalez)
- The Subcommittee did not meet in February, instead a National Transit Database (NTD) training workshop was held;
- Next meeting scheduled for March 26, 2009.

Streets and Freeways (Al Patashnick)
- Mr. Patashnick reported that Streets and Freeways met early in February and meeting update was reported during the last TAC meeting;
- Next meeting scheduled for March 19, 2009.

TDM/ Air Quality (Mark Yamarone)
- The Subcommittee did not meet in February;
• Next meeting scheduled for March 18, 2009.

3. Consent Calendar

Ellen Blackman (Citizen Representative on ADA) had a correction to the Call for Projects section of the minutes. Ms. Blackman would like the minutes to reflect her original comment, “as all projects meet the ADA requirements, she would like the staff to encourage those jurisdictions applying for Pedestrian Improvements, Transit Centers or others to consider going beyond the ADA requirements to include additional disability friendly features.” Mr. Patashnick responded that the correction will be made.

A motion to approve the amended Draft February 11, 2009 minutes was made by Patrick DeChellis (County of Los Angeles) and seconded by Mark Hunter (TDM Subcommittee). There were no abstentions or objections.

4. Chairperson's Report (Alan Patashnick, Metro)
• At the February 26th Board meeting:
  o Approved as Amended the priorities and policies for American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 funds made available for Transportation Capital Projects:
    ▪ Directors Najarian & Dubois Amendment that Metro and the Municipal Operators that are eligible for ARRA funds under Federal Section 5307 shall have 135 days from February 17, 2009 (or by July 1, 2009) in which to obligate these funds. This allows a 45-day processing period for Metro staff. And in accordance with the provisions made in the ARRA law, the deadline applies to not more than 50% of the Federal Section 5307 funds allocated under the ARRA. The remaining 50% shall be obligated within 320 days from February 17, 2009 (or by January 3, 2010), allowing a 45-day processing period for Metro.
    ▪ Director Katz Amendment that Measure R Local Return funds can be exchanged on a one-for-one basis with Stimulus funds; and nothing in this item shall be construed as setting a priority for this funding. Based on new Federal Regulations, if other projects are eligible, the Board will revisit this issue at that time.
  o Approved the following:
    ▪ 2009 Call for Projects Application Package;
    ▪ Cancel the existing Funding Agreement with Caltrans for the construction of Soundwall Package 4 along the I-210 and transfer the package to Metro for construction;
    ▪ Program additional $4.6 million in Prop C 25% to complete the Final Design of Soundwall Package 11 (SR-170 and I-405 in the San Fernando Valley);
    ▪ Adopt as Board Policy that Measure R 3% Commuter Rail funds be prioritized for Metrolink System Safety Improvements, with a first priority for implementation of Positive Train Control in the Los Angeles County portion of the Metrolink service area;
March 27th is the deadline for sponsors to submit FY 09 allocation or extension requests to Metro for STIP-TE funded projects. Metro must concur prior to submittal to Caltrans. Sponsors must have funds allocated or extended by June 30, 2009 to avoid lapsing by the CTC;

- March 27th is the deadline for sponsors with projects programmed in FY 10 with STIP-TE funds to submit requests to have funds reprogrammed to FY 11 or later;

- May 4-6, 2009, the Transportation Research Board (TRB) will co-sponsor the 4th Bus Rapid Transit Conference in Seattle, Washington.

5. Legislative Update

State (Michael Turner, Metro)

Mr. Turner reported that the State has adopted a budget. The new budget includes a series of cuts and tax increases. The State is eliminating State Transit Assistance (STA) Account funds for five years.

When legislators cut the Transit funding, members recognized that there will be big impacts for transit. Metro has been talking to the Chairs of both Committees and leadership in both Houses in addressing the cuts. Legislators are willing to work with the Transit community to address the issues in this session. Senator Fran Pavley and friends from the San Francisco Bay Area have expressed interest in a Measure to address the budget cuts.

There are several State bills in which Metro has an interest:

1. Assemblymember Steve Knight proposes to restructure the Metro Board of Directors. The proposal would eliminate one of the City of Los Angeles' seat, and reassign the seat to the North County. Metro Board had a standing policy to oppose any Restructuring bills based on the principle that the governing structure of our Board is the result of a locally derived consensus that should not be changed through mandate from Sacramento. Any changes to the Metro Board should derive from a local consensus. There is a provision in the code that would allow one of the City of Los Angeles' seats to be transferred to another city should any city outside of Los Angeles get beyond a certain point. Mr. Turner added that the Metro Board had historically opposed all Board Reconstruction Bills, however, it will be taken to the Board in March 2009 for a position;

2. Assemblymember Anthony Portantino introduced a Measure requiring houses along the I-710 Gap Closure Right-of-Way (ROW) to be sold and the revenue beyond the original purchase price transferred to the University of California. In maintaining a Route Neutral Study on the Corridor, it would be premature to force the sale of these properties because Caltrans has not determined the location of the properties that will be needed when the route is determined. Therefore, Metro will oppose this Bill. Also, the funding from the sale of the houses is anticipated to offset the cost of the project;

3. Metro staff is reviewing approximately 3,000 Bills, which have a variety of interests beyond Transportation. They are looking at issues such as labor, procurement, employee benefits;
4. Metro is trying to introduce a Bill in the Legislation to implement the Federal Stimulus funds. There is an urgency and Caltrans is working with interest groups to help cities in the Los Angeles County receive additional funds.

Mary Lou Echternach (Metro) asked on the Statewide level, which agency will be taking the lead to get the Bill introduced. Mr. Turner responded that Caltrans is taking the lead, while working with a broad working group of agencies throughout the State such as League of California Cities, California State Association of Counties (CSAC), and Metro. Letters have been sent to all legislators. Metro will be calling all lobbyists, which represent the different agencies around Los Angeles County, to coordinate to get the Bill introduced.

Larry Stevens (League of California Cities – San Gabriel COG) asked if Metro can send information to the League of Cities on the proposed Bill. The San Gabriel COG has expressed interest to support the Bill and offered to make contact with the San Gabriel Caucus legislators to facilitate. Mr. Turner replied that the League should contact the San Gabriel Caucus legislators by a letter stating the urgency for a Bill. Metro had mailed a letter through Mobility 21 Coalition and the letter will be forwarded to all TAC members.

Federal (Raffi Hamparian, Metro)

Mr. Hamparian reported on the Blue Ribbon Panels that was commissioned from SAFETEA-LU. There were two panels, one that issued a report a year ago and a hearing was also held in the Metro building. The second panel was focusing on Finance. On February 26, 2009, the National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission issued its Final Report. In summary, the Financing Commission recommended to enact a 10¢ increase in the federal gasoline tax and a 15¢ increase in the federal diesel tax.

Mr. Hamparian also reported on the Appropriation Bill. The FY 09 Omnibus Appropriation Bill was adopted by the House in February 2009 and it is on the Senate floor today for adoption. Senator John McCain offered an amendment to demolish all of the earmarks from the Bill, which would include transportation related federal funds. The amendment was defeated.

In regards to the Federal Economic Stimulus Bill, Mr. Hamparian reported that California is expected to receive $2.56 billion of highway funds and the Los Angeles, Long Beach, and Santa Ana regions are expected to receive $268 million. He stated that the transit estimated is expected shortly.

Lastly, Mr. Hamparian reported that the President’s budget includes a 2.5% overall increase for Federal Transportation Funding, and $5 billion per year from the National Infrastructure Bank to fund Goods Movement projects.
6. TAC Special Committee report on Caltrans Local Assistance Meeting (Jano Baghdadanian) Handout

Mr. Baghdadanian reported that the Special TAC Subcommittee for ARRA and Metro staff met with Caltrans District 7 representatives on February 25th to discuss the ARRA project approval process.

Mr. Baghdadanian reported that Metro distributed the list of projects submitted by each city and the County of Los Angeles into the ProgramMetro TIP database by the February 6th deadline. The list submitted was based on an amount up to $315 million.

Mr. Baghdadanian reported that the Subcommittee recommended the eligibility criteria to receive the ARRA funds as follow:
- All project sponsors (cities and the County of Los Angeles) that submitted projects by February 6th are eligible to receive ARRA funding;
- Cities wishing to exchange their ARRA funds on a dollar-for-dollar basis for Measure R dollars with other cities can do so by March 13th by submitting the necessary changes into the ProgramMetro database. However, a signed letter by both parties is required prior to the submittal of changes in the ProgramMetro database;
- No project additions to the ProgramMetro database are allowed, except those cities that did not submit sufficient projects by the deadline due to lack of knowledge about the ultimate funding level;
- Project priorities established by the cities and the County of Los Angeles can be changed through March 6th. Please contact Metro staff to change any previously submitted project priorities;
- Metro, Caltrans, and SCAG staff will make every possible effort to amend the RTIP and the FTIP in time to enable the cities and the County of Los Angeles to meet their project approval deadlines.

Mr. Baghdadanian reported that the Metro Board at its February 26, 2009 meeting approved the allocation and programming of the federal Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds to the Cities and the County of Los Angeles for eligible transportation capital projects using “first-come-first-serve” approach up to 100% of each local jurisdiction’s population share and to allow the Cities, County of Los Angeles, other transportation agencies and Metro to request remaining unobligated funding after the 75-day deadline. The TAC Subcommittee is recommending a two tier deadline for processing the “Request to Proceed with Construction Package” (RPC) by Caltrans District 7 Local Assistance staff.
- First Tier Deadline - April 17, 2009:
  - Project sponsors that are on the Metro list submitted to Caltrans District 7 will have until Friday, April 17th to submit their RPC to Caltrans for review and approval. Project sponsors should only submit RPCs for the projects on the list for first tier processing. If a submitted project is not on the list, Caltrans will hold it for possible future processing;
  - Each RPC approved by the Caltrans District 7 Local Assistance staff will be transmitted to Caltrans Headquarters and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The project sponsor has met the first tier deadline to receive their allocation of ARRA funds, if and when Caltrans Headquarter approves the RPC by issuing an E-76 approval number by Monday, May 18, 2009;
- Project sponsors that missed the April 17th first tier deadline will be unable to receive ARRA funds. A second tier of funding to be made available to agencies that received approvals by the April 17th deadline will be created based upon the amount of unobligated funds.

  o Second Tier Deadline - May 18, 2009:
    - Project sponsors who do not meet the April 17, 2009 first tier RPC deadline are not eligible for any second tier funds that might be made available;
    - Caltrans and Metro will do an assessment of the total dollar amount of unobligated funds shortly after the April 17th deadline. Unused ARRA funds will be aggregated to determine the minimum size of a second tier program;
    - Project sponsors that submitted complete RPCs in the first tier will be eligible to compete for funds in the second tier;
    - Any available second tier funds will be distributed based on population of second tier eligible cities and the County of Los Angeles;
    - Eligible Tier two project sponsors will have between April 18, 2009 to May 18, 2009 to submit their second tier RPCs to Caltrans for review;
    - Project sponsors has met the second tier deadline to receive their allocation of ARRA funds, upon the approval of Caltrans Headquarters approving the RPC by issuing an E-76 approval number by Monday, June 1, 2009;

Mr. Baghdanian also added that all Preliminary Environmental Study (PES) forms submitted to Caltrans by the cities and the County will be reviewed and processed upon receipt. This will enable the rapid processing of RPCs by Caltrans upon second tier reallocation of unused funds.

Kirk Cessna (Caltrans) stated that nothing can go to FHWA without an approved FTIP number and he asked the target date for the TIP approval. Herman Cheng (Metro) replied approximately April 15th.

Mr. Cessna commented that Caltrans’ first priority is to review the PES forms on those projects that are on Metro’s list. As to agencies competing for funds available on tier two, their PES will be reviewed after the first list of approved PES forms. Mr. Baghdanian responded that agencies should first submit the projects that are on Metro’s list. Cities should begin preparing their projects now, but only submit the tier one projects to Caltrans for review. After April 17th, Metro and Caltrans will know the remaining amount that is available for tier two.

Mr. Cessna added that there might be some challenges for the County of Los Angeles. The County of Los Angeles may have to work within another agency because of city limits to obtain a permit or some sort on ROW Certificate, and that will affect the County’s ability to compete for tier two funding.

Mr. DeChellis responded that there are two issues:
1. If there will be other tiers 3, 4, 5, 6, etc. after tier 2 to allocate all the funding available. Projects need to be ready to go immediately for the tier two process. The PES is the first step in this process and without an approved PES projects are not complete. What
steps will be taken for this process, if there are funds still available after tier two? TAC could agree to:

a. Let Metro to obligate the remaining funds; or
b. Let the Cities and the County of Los Angeles obligate the remaining funds. Then, these agencies will need to have their PES approved NOW. In addition, agencies should apply for more than their share because it is unknown which agency will not deliver.

2. What will happen when there is intrastate redistribution? The $315 million gross and the interstate redistribution mean that the remaining ARRA funds will continue to grow. The deadline does not allow enough time to resubmit projects for PES approval and receive and E-76.

a. Caltrans should have all PES right now for approval;
b. Plans signed prior to PES approval are not allowed. In addition, pre-signed PES will be caught during the federal audit process and subject to return of the funds;
c. The Local Assistance Manual allows agencies to certify beyond tier two for a ROW Certificate at the time of submitting an E-76;

Sharon Perlstein (League of California Cities - Westside) asked if the Subcommittee can clarify the tier two process. For example, “an agency submitted a $10 million project in tier one that met all eligibility and deadlines, but is allocated $1 million. Can the agency receive tier two funds for the same project or start a new construction project to build elsewhere? There are projects shown in the ProgramMetro database that can easily consume all the funds in tier one without leaving any money for tier two.” What are the options for agencies waiting in tier two, which have good projects, shovel ready, and have the capacity to receive additional federal money?

Mr. DeChellis responded there is an existing process that has not changed with the Stimulus package. Agencies that submit a $10 million job, but receive $1 million federal funds, may not qualify due to a minimum qualification requirement. The federal STP guidelines require a minimum of 50% federal participation. Mr. Cessna replied that FHWA allows under funded projects, but he’s not sure about the percentage. He is sure that once the funds are locked into the reimbursement ratio, changes cannot be made to the project’s dollar amount. Mr. DeChellis responded that under the existing federal rule and process, projects that are approved and receives an E-76 number cannot add federal money. Changes can be made if the project is deobligated. It will then miss the April 17th deadline. Mr. DeChellis stated to answer Mr. Perlstein’s question, it would be no under the existing Federal Guidelines.

David Yale (Metro) replied that the sponsor should submit the RPC to Caltrans and allocate the $1 million before the tier one deadline. We will need Caltrans to hold the paperwork until the April 17th deadline. If there are available funds after April 17th, allow the sponsor to make the adjustments to the project funding before sending to Caltrans’ Headquarter.

Mr. Baghdanian replied that if there is not enough funding in tier two for the project, then the agency will have to keep their original allocation amount.
Mr. Baghdanian added that another option is to exchange ARRA funds with other cities on a dollar-for-dollar basis. The Cities and the County that cannot use their ARRA funds can exchange it with another local agency. A letter of agreement must be signed by both parties and submitted to Metro for approval prior to the exchange. Mr. Yale added that the Board permitted a dollar-for-dollar exchange of Measure R funds for the ARRA funds.

Joyce Rooney (Local Transit Systems Subcommittee) replied that City Council approval takes 30 days to fund trades. The March 13th deadline to complete the fund exchange is not realistic. Mr. Yale stated that Metro agreed to accept conditional letters upon City Council’s approval. Metro must also receive the TIP amendment in addition to the conditional letter by March 13, 2009. If the cities or the County of Los Angeles choose to exchange funds, please inform Metro in advance on/or before Friday, March 6, 2009. In addition, if the exchange is contingent on a subsequent City Council approval, Metro needs to know the date the City Council approval is anticipated, in case the City Council denies the swap, Metro can make the necessary changes to the TIP.

Mr. Stevens asked if the cities and the County can change priorities in the ProgramMetro database. Will there be a project minimum in the tier two funding redistribution? And will there be a second round of trade also? Mr. Yale responded that there will be no trade and no project minimum for the tier two and if a funding trade takes place, it has to be done now.

Mr. DeChellis suggested that in order to let the Cities and the County of Los Angeles allocate all the available ARRA-RSTP funds, Metro needs to agree not to obligate any remaining funds between the May 18th tier two deadline and the May Metro Board meeting. He’s requesting that there should be another TAC meeting shortly after the April 17th tier one deadline to discuss if further tiers should be developed. Mr. Yale responded that Metro will not obligate the remaining funds between the May 18th and the May Metro Board meeting. Renee Berlin (Metro) added that Metro should not be precluded from submitting projects to Caltrans prior to the Board meeting, but just not obligate.

An agreement was reached that Metro will not obligate any funds for the period between the May 18th deadline and the May Board meeting, and a Special TAC meeting is scheduled for April 22, 2009 to determine whether further tiers should be made available and if an item is needed for the May Metro Board meeting.

Mr. Baghdanian replied that the TAC Subcommittee memo on the two tiers will be sent to all the cities and the County of Los Angeles. Mr. Yale added that a letter has been sent to the cities and the County of Los Angeles and the TAC Subcommittee memo was included as an attachment. Metro can post the final TAC action on ProgramMetro database and any edits to the memo should be corrected now. Frank Flores (Metro) pointed out a wrong date of May 19, 2009 on the memo. Mr. Yale stipulated that the change from May 19, 2009 be corrected to read May 18, 2009 on the tier two deadline header.

Mr. Cessna announced that Caltrans will hold several workshops in late March. The purpose of the workshops is to assist agencies with questions about the ARRA funding application process. Caltrans District 7 and Headquarters’ staff will be present to answer any questions on the request forms. It would be nice to have the forms completed prior to attending the workshop since Caltrans’ staff will be available to review the forms.
Mr. Yale requested that Mr. Cessna inform Caltrans staff of Metro’s policies regarding deadlines. There has been correspondence sent out, in the past, which contradicted the Metro’s deadlines.

Mr. Cessna also announced that FHWA approved the California Department of Transportation’s 2009 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Annual Overall Goal. FHWA’s approval requires agencies to implement the new DBE Program, which includes a Race Conscious component (RC DBE Program). Local agencies have until June 2, 2009, to transition to the RC DBE Program. All federal-aid consultant and construction contracts must incorporate the new RC DBE Program Race Conscious contract specifications effective immediately. Caltrans will send information about the RC DBE program to all local agencies and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO).

Mr. Cessna added that the enactment of the ARRA heightened the urgency for Caltrans to implement a conditional contract goal. The 2009 Goal and Methodology provide a 6.75% race-conscious goal and a 6.75% race-neutral goal for an overall 13.5% program goal. The conditional approval requires Caltrans to submit monthly status reports beginning March 31, 2009.

Mr. Baghdadian asked if a sample package and the RPC checklist can be sent to local agencies. Mr. Cessna replied that Caltrans staff is reviewing the final version of the package, which will include a letter and a checklist. Errors were found in the previous checklist that was sent to local agencies and the MPO. Ms. Berlin added that the memo that was attached to the checklist contradicts Metro’s deadlines dates. Caltrans should just resend a revised checklist without the memo.


Mr. Yale referred to a PowerPoint and reported on that under ARRA, the Highway Infrastructure Investment split for Los Angeles County is as follows:
- Surface Transportation Program (STP) - $511 million total;
- Regional Surface Transportation Program Cities/County - $211 million;
- Rural Area-Federal Aid Secondary (or Rural Pop area <200k) $6 million for the County unincorporated areas;
- The Regional Surface Transportation Program subtotal of $217 ($211 + 6) million, however the Metro Board action proposes $215 million.

Mr. Yale stated that under California’s 30 percent STP share, at least $6 million has to be spent by the rural areas. Therefore, all $6 million will be given to the County of Los Angeles and the Cities will receive $211 million when SCAG distributes the funds. Metro will wait to distribute funds to the cities and the County of Los Angeles until they receive final numbers from SCAG. SCAG divides the numbers by Urbanized Area’s (UZA) between Orange County, Los Angeles County, Ventura, and the San Bernardino. We are anticipating that the $215 million will actually be $211 million.

Under the Proposed Legislation Column, it poses a concern if the funds were distributed as such:
• The Rural Area-Federal Aid Secondary (or Rural Pop area <200k) could receive $21 million for the County unincorporated areas. Currently, it shows $12 million with half going to the cities and half to the County Unincorporated Area. If the County unincorporated areas receive the $21 million, then Cities/County’s $306 million will decrease provided the RSTP amount remains the same. Therefore, the originally propose RSTP funds of $315 million is now the $306 million. Local Programming has not worked out a resolution, nor received a specific recommendation.

Mr. Stevens replied that in the Proposed Legislation Colum shows that $120 million be given to two projects ($100 million to the I-405 and $20 million to the I-5 North freeway). The $120 million will back-fill the Proposition 1B funds. Mr. Yale responded that the $20 million does not back-fill the Proposition 1B funds for the I-5 North, instead it back-fills a State and Local Partnership Program Grant. Therefore, the $20 million would free-up State and Local Program funds and the $100 million would free-up a quarter of the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) grant.

Mr. Yale added that Metro Board could direct the allocation to CMIA. The $20 million has to be spent on Mainline Freeway Corridor job, essentially a carpool lane somewhere in our system, if the I-405 should not need cost increases. In addition, the $20 million would have to be reprogrammed and according to Metro’s Board action, the freed-up funds to the same the Corridor Mobility Improvement jobs. FHWA required a $37 million reserve for the I-5 corridor project between SR-134 and SR-170. Therefore, Recommendation F of the February 26th Board report approved programming of $20 million in local funds released be put towards reserve.

Mr. DeChellis asked if Metro could come back with a status report of the legislation decision; and TAC would like to see a recommendation or proposal from Metro staff as to where the $100 million should go.

A motion to support the County of Los Angeles receiving up to $12 million, if the State legislation passes was made by Larry Stevens (League of California Cities – San Gabriel Valley COG) and seconded by Sumi Gant (City of Long Beach). The motion passed with no abstentions or objections.

8. Los Angeles County Congestion Reduction Demonstration Project (LA CRD)(Lynda Bybee, Metro) Handout

• Ms. Bybee reported that Metro was awarded a $291 million grant from the USDOT for the High Occupancy Tolling (HOT) and Congestion Reduction program. The grant requires that the HOT lanes be in operation by December 31, 2010. Metro’s goal is to “move more people, not more vehicles” through:
  o Increasing throughput of the HOT lanes;
  o Effectiveness (Mode Shift);
  o Efficiency (cost of project relative to benefits);
  o Environmentally Justice (impact on low income commuters) and;
  o Educate community (extensive community outreach);
• The grant funds will be used on I-110 and I-10 freeways. Initially, Metro studied the San Gabriel Valley’s I-210 and found it to be less beneficial in reducing congestion than a demonstration project on the I-10.

• The $291 million is divided into Transit Facility (50%), Transit Operations (20%), Toll Technology and Infrastructure (25%); and Parking Management (5%).

• Metro will partner with Caltrans, SCAG, and other Municipal Operators (Torrance, Gardena, and Foothill) to emphasize a Multi-modal Integrated Corridor approach focusing on:
  o Modal and spatial shift;
  o Transit and Rail options;
  o Vanpools; and
  o Transit stations.

• The project’s operation is to allow the Single Occupancy Vehicles (SOV) to buy into the High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes. Legislators, Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas and former Assembly Speaker Fabian Nunez supported the project adding that “those conducting positive behavior such as carpooling, should not be impacted by the transition.”

• The I-110 Concept for Demo includes:
  o Retain current free use among eligible HOV 2+ (along with all others currently allowed free use of the HOV lanes, such as the hybrids);
  o Toll SOV’s during the peak and off-peak periods, as space permit.

• The I-10 Concept for Demo Project includes:
  o Retain current free use among eligible HOV 3+ during the peak and eligible HOV 2+ during the off-peak periods (along with all others currently allowed free use of the HOV lanes, such as the hybrids);
  o Toll HOV 2 and SOVs at the same rate during the peak periods only, as space permits;
  o Revert to HOV 2+ operations only during off-peak periods with toll access to the lanes for SOV users during these periods.

• The Concept of the Operations will be all electronic “open road” tolling
  o Electronic Readers will be placed along points of access, readers use radio waves to capture Identification Codes;
  o Law Enforcement, California Highway Patrol (CHP) will be used to ensure efficient tolling operation;
  o Metro is developing the use of a transponder such as who will have a transponder; will only the SOV have a transponder, or will everyone have a transponder;

• Community concerns of security and the frequency of using the I-110 Harbor Transitway. Metro will address these issues through:
  o Community Outreach and Public Engagement
    ▪ Metro has met with a number of stakeholders in the region, such as hospitals and cultural facilities, who has expressed interest in finding ways to address congestion reduction;
    ▪ Metro has formed Corridor Advisor groups on the I-10 and the I-110, with the I-110 divided into two groups, north and south;
• Each Corridor Advisory group have had at least two meetings, shown interest in the tolling and pricing and the opportunity to have guaranteed trip time using the HOV/HOT lanes or improved transit facilities;
  • The next Corridor Advisory group meeting is June 2009.
    o Frequency of service;
    o Connection through the Central City towards the I-10 freeway;
    o Improve the Harbor Transitway stations by adding additional lighting and security, and making them more inviting and convenient for transit users.
• The USDOT grant will also fund improvements to: the Union Division; the El Monte Busway/Transit Plaza Connector to accommodate more vehicles; the Pomona Metrolink Station will undergo improvements to its parking structure, amenities, platform extension for additional cars; and Metro will increase bus service on the I-10 and I-110 Corridors to achieve:
    o Improve service reliability, increase travel time savings, improve transit connections, and enhance security and station amenities;
    o Metro will reduce headway on the I-110: peak time average is from 12 minutes to 3 minutes and base average from 60 min to 10 minutes; on the I-10 peak average from 6 minutes to 3 minutes, and base average remains at 10 minutes;
    o Improve travel time on Metro’s Bus Rapid Transit’s (BRT) time through the Central Area;
    o Add an additional 100 vanpools to the existing 800 vanpools;
    o Metro is working to address the issues of the bottlenecks at the I-110 and El Monte Busway;
    o Metro’s Board is expected to make a decision in June 2009 on the Dynamic Pricing on the Corridors.

9. 2009 Call For Project (Susan Chapman, Metro) Handout

At the February 26th meeting, the Board approved the 2009 Application package. An Errata sheet will be distributed since several errors were found. The fillable online applications will be available in a week and an email notification will be sent to the agencies once it is available. Applications are due April 17, 2009 at 3:00 P.M.

10. Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) Technical Feasibility Analysis (Kathleen Sanchez)

Deferred to the April 1, 2009 TAC meeting

11. SCAG's Comprehensive Regional Goods Movement Plan and Implementation Strategy (Mike Jones) Handout

Mr. Jones reported that the Major Goods Movement Initiative is a multi-year and multi-phase study to develop a comprehensive plan to refine SCAG's 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Goods Movement System. The study will build-upon Metro’s Multi-County Good Movement Action Plan (MCGMAP). MCGMAP represented a partnership between Counties and Regional and State agencies to address Goods Movement
challenges faced by the Counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, Ventura, and neighboring Imperial.

The Goods Movements System is critical to Southern California's economy along with other challenges: air quality, community impact, and congestion, and a myriad of issues that affect regional mobility and Goods Movements for the people in Southern California.

As the Regional Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), SCAG will:
- Develop a Comprehensive Plan refining the 2008 RTP Regional Goods Movement System;
- Build upon foundations of the MCGMAP;
- Developing an implementation strategy
- Attempt to resolve compatibility and connectivity issues

Major Project Tasks include:
- Public Outreach Strategy
- Truck Trip Data Collection and Analysis
- Heavy Duty Truck Model Validation/Enhancement
- Industrial Warehouses and Facilities
- Alternative Technology Assessment
- Environmental Mitigation Plan
- Finance and Implementation Plan

12. FY 2009 Obligation Plans (Maria Lopez/Nancy Marroquin)

Ms. Lopez announced that a memo was sent to the cities and the County requesting their FY 09 Obligation Plans.
- Obligation Plans are due on March 20, 2009;
- All projects need to be obligated by September 30, 2009;
- Only federally funded projects needs to be submitted: CMAQ, RSTP, STPL Local, Bridge projects, STIP and Safe Routes to School;
- All projects' funding needs to be in actual dollars.

Ms. Marroquin added that the Economic Stimulus projects should not be included in the Obligation Plan. The Obligation Plan is for federal funded projects only, exception to the Obligation Plan are the Section 5307 and TEA funding, Federal Appropriation, and Earmarks. The Obligation Plan should be submitted to Maria Lopez by March 20th, and call Maria Lopez at 213-922-3803 or Nancy Marroquin at 213-922-7237 if there are any questions or concerns.

13. New Business
No new business.

14. Adjournment
The next meeting will be on April 1, 2009 at 9:30 a.m. in the Union Station Room on the 3rd floor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>1. Marianne Kim/ Stephen Finnegan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (BOS)</td>
<td>1. David Reyno/Grace Eng/Nadel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Dennis Kobata/Susan Lipman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL</td>
<td>1. Sgt. Mike Stefanoff/Lt. Dave Bowen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>1. Raja Mitwasi /Alberto Angelini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rose Casey/Kirk Cessna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVE ON ADA</td>
<td>1. Ellen Blackman/John Whitbread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1. Sumi Gant/Mark Christoffels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>1. James Lefton/John Fong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Haripal Vir/Mike Uyeno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Gina Mancha/Ferdy Chan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>1. Mark Herwick/Guinar Hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Shari Afshari/Maged El-Rabaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Patrick V. DeChellis/ Paul Maselhas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES</td>
<td>1. Greg Herrmann/Cami Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Desi Alvarez/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Robert Brager/Ramiro Adeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td>4. Nicole Rizzo/Mike Behen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities COG</td>
<td>5. Larry Stevens/Craig Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes Malibu COG</td>
<td>6. Steven Huang/Victor Rollinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td>7. David Feinberg/Sharon Perlstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Cities COG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Name</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE (LTSS)</strong></td>
<td>Jano Naghdehban/Alex Gonzalez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (Metro)</strong></td>
<td>Alan Patashnick/Fanny Pan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Countywide Planning &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY (SCRRA - Ex-Officio)</strong></td>
<td>Steve Lantz/Joanna Capelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SCAQMD -- Ex-Officio)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG -- Ex-Officio)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/AIR QUALITY SUBCOMMITTEE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Jones</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Gable</td>
<td>C envis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Mccarty</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsen Managarian</td>
<td>LAPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debi Heimig</td>
<td>Santaclara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar, NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Metz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) Attendance Record
3/5/2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maranna Kim/Stephen Finnegern (A)</td>
<td>AUTO CLUB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Reyno/Grace Eng Nadel (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Kobata/Susan Limman (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgt Mike Stefanoff, Dave Bowen (A)</td>
<td>CHP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raja Miles/Wilbur Angelini</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant/Kirk Cessna (A)</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Bluhman/John Whitbread (A)</td>
<td>CITIZEN REP ON ADA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumi Ganti/Mark Christofle (A)</td>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Leffon/John Fong (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haripal Vir/Mike Uyeno (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Marsh/Feidy Chen (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Horwick/Gunner Hand (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shari Afshani/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick DeChelle/Paul Meiselbas (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg Hermann/Calhi Cole (A)</td>
<td>ARROYO VERDUGO CITIES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deq Alves/Lisa Rapp (A)</td>
<td>GATEWAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Braga/Ramiro Adeva</td>
<td>LAS VIRENES MALIBU COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Rizzo/Mike Bellen (A)</td>
<td>NORTH L.A. COUNTY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Steven/Craig Redshaw (A)</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL VALLEY COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Huang/Victor Rollinger (A)</td>
<td>SOUTH BAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Feinberg/Sharon Perstein (A)</td>
<td>WEST SIDE CITIES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Bagdarian/Alex Gonzalez (A)</td>
<td>LTSS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Rooney/Martin Browne (A)</td>
<td>LTSS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Patrick/Fanny Pan (A)</td>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Drayton/Christopher Galian (A)</td>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Lantz/Joanna Capelle (A)</td>
<td>SCERRA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewonne Selfs/Kathryn Higgins (A)</td>
<td>SCAQMD</td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Robinow/Annie Nam (A)</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupe Valdez/LaDonna DiCamillo (A)</td>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Yamane/Fil Aker (A)</td>
<td>TDM/AQ SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hunter/Brooke Gear Person (A)</td>
<td>TDM/AQ SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LA County Congestion Reduction Demonstration Project

FastLanes

Metro

caltrans
Move More People, Not More Vehicles

- Increase Throughput of HOT lanes
- Effectiveness (Mode Shift)
- Efficiency (Cost of Project Relative to Benefits)
- Environmentally Just (Address Impact on Low Income Commuters)
- Educate Community (Extensive Community Outreach)
- Execute by Grant Deadline (Toll Operational by December 31, 2010)
Partnerships w/Municipal Operators, Metro Sectors and SCAG

- Network of HOT Lanes
- Emphasis on Corridor Perspective
- Facility w/Limited Capacity
- Modal Shift/Spatial Shift
- Transit/Rail Options
- Vanpools
- Transit Stations
I-110 Concept for Demo Project includes:

> Retain current free use among eligible HOV 2+ (along with all others currently allowed free use of the HOV lanes, such as hybrids)

> Toll SOV’s during the peak and off-peak periods, as space permits

I-10 Concept for Demo Project includes:

> Retain current free use among eligible HOV 3+ during the peak and eligible HOV 2+ during off-peak periods (along with all others currently allowed free use of the HOV lanes, such as hybrids)

> Toll HOV 2 and SOVs at the same rate during the peak periods only, as space permits

> Revert to HOV 2+ operations only during off-peak periods with toll access to the lanes for SOV users during these periods.
Average Weekday Diurnal Speed Patterns (May 2008)
I-110 South of Slauson Ave (at Gage Avenue)
All electronic "open road" tolling

> Dynamic, segmented pricing assembled by trip
> Potential differential payment classes with self-declaration using switchable transponder
> Dedicated Enforcement CHP Officers
Platform Extension for Addtl Cars
Current Parking – 221 spaces
Parking at Completion – 369 spaces
New Parking Spaces – 148 spaces
Average Trip Length – 31 miles

Project Benefits
> ↑ Daily Boardings/Alightings by 74%
> ↑ New Trips by 847
> Daily Diversion from Freeway – 745 trips
> Daily Diversion in Passenger Miles – 23,100
Goal: Increase Ridership/Mode Shift

> For 110: ↑ Peak Avg from min to min
  ↑ Base Avg from min to min
> For 10: ↑ Peak Avg from min to min
  Base Avg remains at 10 minutes

Project Benefits

> Improved Service Reliability
> ↑ Travel Time Savings
> Improve Transit Connections
> Enhanced Security & Station Amenities
Goal: Improve performance of buses entering Downtown through surface streets

- State of the Art Signal priority system
- Extend peak-period bus lanes

Project Benefits

> Reduce Delays for Transit Buses
> Improve Transit Efficiency
Goal: Form 100 New Vanpools

Today

> I-110: 10% or 72 Metro vanpools
> I-10: 7% or 51 Metro vanpools
> Nearly 65% of Metro vanpools are former "drive alone" commuters; approx 28% are former carpools

Formation Strategy

> Work Directly with Cities to Coordinate Meetings/Locate Park n Rides
> Facilitate Grassroots Outreach/Train Community Groups
> Develop Localized Vanpool Marketing Material
DRAFT — PRELIMINARY CONCEPT PLAN

TO WIDEN ADAMS BLVD AT HARBOR FWY N/B OFF RAMPS
> Majority of Westbound AM Peak Traffic exits El Monte Busway at I-710
> Opportunity exists to add one additional HOT lane in each direction along a segment of I-10
> Design exceptions would be required
Goal: Improve linkage of FastLanes projects and encourage mode shift
   - New parking technology
   - Demand-Based Pricing

Project Benefits
> Relieve Traffic Congestion
> Reduce Air Pollution
> Improve Transit Efficiency Downtown
> Community Workshops

> Corridor Advisory Group (CAG)/
   Technical Advisory Group (TAG)

> Public Outreach & Communication Plan

**Input**
March 2, 2009

To: Technical Advisory Committee

From: Jano Baghdanian, TAC member

Subject: Report from Subcommittee for American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Process

At the last TAC meeting, a subcommittee of TAC was formed to meet with Caltrans District 7 Local Assistance staff to discuss and recommend a “first-come, first-served” process for the submittal of projects that are eligible to receive funding under the ARRA.

On February 25, 2009 the TAC subcommittee (consisting of TAC members and staff from a number of cities, and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)) met with Caltrans Local Assistance staff at Caltrans District 7 and developed the following Los Angeles County ARRA process and deadlines for TAC’s consideration:

Eligibility to receive ARRA funds:

Metro has submitted a list of projects for each city and the County of Los Angeles that met the February 6, 2009 Program.Metro.Net deadline. The list submitted to the Caltrans Local Assistance staff for their use is based on an up to $315 million level of funding that is pending State proposed legislation. Without the state legislation, the list will have to instead be reduced to an amount up to $215 million countywide.

1) All project sponsors (cities and County of Los Angeles) that submitted projects by February 6, 2009 into the Program.Metro.Net database for inclusion in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) remain eligible to receive ARRA funding. Actual receipt of the funds is contingent upon delivering a federally eligible project (as interpreted by Caltrans) by the Metro deadlines discussed below.

2) Cities wishing to exchange their ARRA funds on a dollar-for-dollar basis with other cities can do so through March 13, 2009 by submitting the necessary changes into the Program.Metro.Net database. A simple letter signed by both parties to the exchange will be required prior to changing the Program.Metro.Net data.

3) No project additions to the Program.Metro.Net database are allowed, except for a limited number of cities that did not submit sufficient projects on February 6, 2009 due to a lack of knowledge about the ultimate funding level for the ARRA program or for cities seeking to execute the exchange described above.

4) Project priorities established by cities and the County of Los Angeles in the database by February 6, 2009 can be changed through March 6, 2009 to reflect
policy body actions. Contact Program.Metro.Net staff to change any previously submitted project priorities.

Metro, Caltrans, and SCAG will make every possible effort to amend the Program.Metro.Net database, the Regional TIP, and the Federal State TIP, in time to enable cities and the County of Los Angeles to meet their project approval deadlines. Failure to submit the required data necessary for Regional and Federal State TIP approval by March 13, 2009 will make it impossible for Metro, SCAG, and Caltrans to accomplish the necessary amendments.

Caltrans Process

Based on a “first-come-first-served” approach adopted by the Metro Board on February 26, 2009, there will be a two tier deadline for processing of “Request to Proceed with Construction Package” (RPC) by Caltrans District 7 Local Assistance staff:

First Tier Deadline (March 6-April 17, 2009)

Project sponsors that are on the Metro list submitted to Caltrans District 7 will have between today and Friday, April 17, 2009 to submit their RPCs to Caltrans for review and approval. Project sponsors should only submit RPCs for the project that are on the February 6, 2009 Program.Metro.Net list for first tier processing by Caltrans. If a submitted project is not on the list, Caltrans will hold it for possible future processing.

1) Each RPC approved by the Caltrans District 7 Local Assistance Program staff will be transmitted to Caltrans Headquarters and, as required, to the FHWA. The project sponsor has met the first tier deadline to receive their allocation of ARRA funds if and when Caltrans HQ approves the RPC by issuing an E-76 approval number by Monday, May 18, 2009.

2) Project sponsors that miss the April 17, 2009 first tier RPC deadline will be presumed to be unable to receive ARRA funds for those projects that were not submitted on time. A second tier of funding to be made available to other agencies will be created based upon the number and amount of the projects that were not submitted by the April 17, 2009 deadline.

Second Tier Deadline (April 17 –May 19)

1) Project sponsors who do not meet the April 17, 2009 first tier RPC deadline are ineligible for any second tier funds that might be made available.

2) Caltrans and Metro will do an assessment of the total dollar amount of projects not submitted in the first tier shortly after April 17, 2009. Unused ARRA funds (cities that did not use their minimum allocation and failed to meet the April 17, 2009 first
tier RPC deadline) will be aggregated to determine the minimum size of a second tier program.

3) Projects sponsors that submitted complete RPCs in the first tier will be eligible to compete for funds in the second tier.

4) Any available second tier funds will be distributed based on the ratio of the population of second tier eligible cities or the County of Los Angeles to the total population of all second tier eligible cities and the unincorporated area of Los Angeles County.

5) Eligible tier two Project sponsors that are on the Metro February 6, 2009 Program.Metro.Net will have between April 17 to May 19 to submit their second tier RPCs to Caltrans for review, consistent with their population share of tier two funds.

6) The project sponsor has met the second tier deadline to receive their allocation of ARRA funds if and when Caltrans HQ approves the RPC by issuing an E-76 approval number by Monday, June 1, 2009.

All PES forms submitted to Caltrans by the cities and the County will be reviewed and processed upon receipt. This will enable the rapid processing of RPC’s by Caltrans upon 2nd tier reallocation of unused funds.

The TAC Subcommittee is recommending that the above process and deadlines be considered for the processing of projects for ARRA funding.
American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009

February 26, 2009

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Metro

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009

- The Recovery Act is a jobs preservation/creation bill
  - Transportation infrastructure is a secondary goal
- Use-it-or-lose-it provisions
  - Extremely tight deadlines for project delivery
  - No Federal process relief
- Unused funds will be redistributed
  - Redistribution within LA County
  - Inter-regional redistribution within California
  - Interstate redistribution between states
Consensus State Legislation Needed

- State legislation for Highway distribution:
  - 37.5% in Caltrans project selections: $935 M
    - Approx. $500 M to state hwy. maintenance (SHOPP)
    - Remaining $435 M to state hwy. capacity
      - Asking for North/South Split on state hwy. capacity
  - 37.5% in Regional project selections: $935 M
    - Metro staff recommendation: $100 M to I-405 and $20 M to I-5 N
  - 25.0% intended for City/Cnty selections: $623 M
    - Cities/County of LA: $315 M
  - Transportation Enhancements Activities: $77 M
    - LA County asking for regional selection (28% or $20 M)
    - Metro staff recommendation: 50% Metro and 50% Cities/County

Recovery Act Funding for LA County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Program</th>
<th>LA County Target</th>
<th>Project Selection</th>
<th>Funding Priority</th>
<th>Obligation Deadline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Capital (SBF)</td>
<td>$175 M</td>
<td>Metro (75%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>N Days***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Guideway Infrastructure (SBF &amp; BID)</td>
<td>$150 M</td>
<td>Metro (75%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>N Days***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Deals ($300)</td>
<td>150 M</td>
<td>LA DOT [State]</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>150 Days (Completion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinated Operational Costs to Regional Transportation Program</td>
<td>$630 M</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td>LA County project will be eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Surface Transportation Program, LA County</td>
<td>$200 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Transportation Program, County</td>
<td>$110 M</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Enhancements Projects</td>
<td>$12 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA County Public Works Capital Improvement Projects</td>
<td>$750 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Operations and Preservation Program Projects</td>
<td>$750 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Recovery Act Federal Supplemental funding was appropriated to the State and 100% awarded.
**Recovery Act Federal Supplemental funding was appropriated to the State and 100% awarded.

*Projects in Los Angeles County totaling $5 billion in necessary expenditures included in comprehensive state legislature passed legislation has bipartisan support.
### Recovery Act Highway Funding

**American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 Funding**

(All Numbers in Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>LA County</th>
<th>Districtwide (Economic Development)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Highway Infrastructure Investment - Total</td>
<td>$27,540</td>
<td>$244,400</td>
<td>$2,515</td>
<td>$2,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bipartisan Defense and Homeland Security, etc.</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Surface Transportation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Regional Surface Transportation Program</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
<td>$2,515</td>
<td>$2,515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. LA County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Regional Surface Transportation Program (FIP - 3G)</td>
<td>$271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Intercity (FIA) Federal Aid Secretaries (Brp. - 2GIA)</td>
<td>$188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Intercity (FIA) Regional Surface Transportation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>$188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Surface Transportation Enhancements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Surface Transportation, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. State Shares of Service Transportion Program</td>
<td>$17,010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Los Angeles Metro Area - Intercity</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Los Angeles Metro Area - NA - Intercity</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBIRP - Interm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Intercity (FIA) - Interm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Surface Transportation, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Surface Transportation, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subject to Federal Appropriation and remaining passage of Omnibus State Legislation

### Recovery Act Transit Funding

**American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 Funding**

(All Numbers in Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>LA County</th>
<th>Districtwide (Economic Development)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transit - Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Public Transit Operations &amp; Administration</td>
<td>$8,240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Local Access Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. LOCAL TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subject to Federal Appropriation and remaining passage of Omnibus State Legislation
Recommendation: State Law vs. Proposed Legislation Regarding Recovery Act Highway Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
<th>Existing Law</th>
<th>Proposed Legislation</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Cities/County of Los Angeles by Population</td>
<td>$215.0 M</td>
<td>$315.0 M</td>
<td>Increases by $100 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Transportation Enhancements Activities (Estimates)</td>
<td>Metro $6.0 M Others $0.0 M Total $6.0 M</td>
<td>Metro $10.0 M Others $10.0 M Total $20.0 M</td>
<td>Increases by approx. $8 M, 50%/50% Metro/Others split</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Interstate 405/Interstate 5 North Funding</td>
<td>I-405 $200 M I-5 N (Remainder TBD)</td>
<td>I-405 (Metro) $100 M I-5 N (Metro) $20 M “$63.7 M proposed from Private Placement Bond Reserve”</td>
<td>Freed-up Prop. 1B CMA funds split 50% Metro/50% State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation

“...to distribute any and all Highway funds coming to Los Angeles County under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 to the Cities and the County on a population share basis with a minimum of $500,000 to each local jurisdiction. After 60 days (tentatively set for April 20, 2009) from the Bill's enactment, unallocated Highway funds will then be distributed to the Cities, County and us on a first-come-first-served basis.”

A TAC representative is here to answer any questions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Policy Body approvals needed ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Approval of Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) by SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– SCAG had February 9, 2009 deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Policy body adjustments will be amended ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Caltrans approval of State TIP by early March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highway funds apportionments expected March 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transit funds apportionments by March 10th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 75-day LA County Highway/Transit deadline provides for re-allocation within County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Assistance Special Measures for Expediting Economic Stimulus Projects

Through conference call with District Local Assistance Engineers and HQ office chiefs, as well as other discussions among HQ staff, Local Assistance Program has identified the following special measures to help expedite the processing of Federal Economic projects. Some of the measures have been implemented to different extent. Others may be treated as best-practices and be recommended for implementation. These measures are based on the projected workload from the federal economic stimulus legislation that passed the House, HR 1.

Outreach working with the local and regional agencies

- DLA solicits questions from the local agencies and publishes responses on the Local Assistance website.
- DLAEs coordinate with RTPA and local agencies in identifying projects that can be delivered within the federal deadlines.
- DLAEs work with local agencies to coordinate early project actions such as, PES forms and field reviews, etc.
- DLA recommends the regions to combine projects into fewer large projects.
- DLA recommends the regions to choose projects with approved NEPA or close-to-NEPA approval.

Caltrans Internal Process Improvement

DLAEs

- Propose to assemble sample project request packages to local agencies,
- Send quick training packages to local agencies,
- Get proactively involved in local agency project selection,
- Get involved with the regional agencies for project selection,
- Provide advice on environmental,
- Conduct group project field reviews,
- Identify former and current Local Assistance employees to help with the expected peak workload,
- Flag and track Economic Stimulus project separately,
- Monitor workload for staff and redistribute workload as needed,

HQ

- Send Area Engineers to district to provide focused training on E-76 processing,
- Requested and received approval for "Self-directed" furlough for statewide Local Assistance staff. Apply to staff on an as-needed basis. Instructions have been distributed.
- Conduct webinar trainings,
• Identify former and current Local Assistance employees to help with the expected peak workload
• Minimize paperwork submitted by the districts. Although the local agencies will be required to submit all necessary documents, not all the documents will be submitted to HQ after districts review, only the essential documents will be forwarded to HQ Area Engineers for review.
• Create a special Federal Project Log Sheet to list only the essential documents.
• Working with IT, explore ways to use HQ file servers to along the districts to upload all required project documents,
• Make short-term out-of-class assignment for experienced Range D Assistance Area Engineers to allow them to sign E-76s,
• Temporarily blend district boundaries in assigning projects to be reviewed and processed,
• To shorten review time, ask Area Engineers to conduct their own review of E-76 packages without relying on Assistance AEs to review all the E-76 packages,
• For projects with substantially complete documents, initiate district/HQ concurrent reviews,
• Look at ways to better use the intranet for quick information sharing,
• Develop workload and budget document for estimation and justification of overtime needs,
• Hold regular meetings with the districts to provide update on development in federal legislation and department policy.

Working with Regulatory agencies FHWA/CTC

FHWA
• Meet with FHWA regularly to coordinate actions
• Propose special oversight risk management measure to help speed up processing of requests for projects funded with stimulus funds
  o Request delegation of E-76 approval, or faster FHWA review and approval of E-76s,
  o Request postponement of scheduled program/process reviews,
  o Request reduced depth of inactive project reviews,
  o Request categorical approval for less than three week advertising period for projects cost less than $1 M.

CTC
• Work with CTC staff and propose (may include implementing state legislations) streamline process, including delegation of allocation authority and fund distribution formula.
Comprehensive Regional Goods Movement Plan and Implementation Strategy

Study Introduction and Overview

---

Mike Jones
Metro Technical Advisory Committee
March 4, 2009

---

Project Overview

- Develop a Comprehensive Plan refining 2008 RTP and Regional Goods Movement System
- Build Upon Foundations of the MCGMAP
- Multi-Year, Multi-Phased Project
- Implementation Strategy
- Attempt to Resolve Compatibility and Connectivity Issues
Major Project Tasks

- Public Outreach Strategy
- Truck Trip Data Collection and Analysis
- Heavy Duty Truck Model Validation / Enhancement
- Industrial Warehouses and Facilities
- Evaluation & Refinement of the 2008 RTP
- Alternative Technology Assessment
- Environmental Mitigation Plan
- Finance and Implementation Plan
Attachment 4

Email to TAC on ARRA – TEA Funds dated
03/17/09
Dear TAC Members,

The Special TAC Subcommittee for the Economic Stimulus Program met this afternoon to review the list of projects that are eligible (based on Caltrans' review) for ARRA-TEA funds and to recommend a fund allocation process. Please see attached for the eligible projects.

The Subcommittee recommended the following:

1) Under the existing law, LA County will receive $12,850,626. Based on our Board's February 26th direction, Metro will allocate and program 50% of the funds and Cities and the County will allocate the other 50% of $6,425,313. The recommendation is to fully fund the Cities of Cerritos ($529,000), Culver City (350,000) and Rolling Hills Estate (500,000) projects and split the balance among the 8 remaining eligible jurisdictions. Therefore, $630,789 will be distributed to Cities of Bellflower, Calabasas, Claremont, El Monte, Los Angeles, Long Beach, Montebello and the County of Los Angeles.

2) If the proposed Legislation is approved, LA County should receive $18,421,470. Based on our Board's February 26th direction, Metro will allocate and program 50% of the fund and Cities and the County will allocate the other 50% of $9,210,735. The recommendation is to fully fund the Cities of Calabasas (650,000), Cerritos (529,000), Culver City (350,000), Long Beach (1,000,000) and Rolling Hills Estate (500,000) projects and split the balance among the 6 remaining eligible jurisdictions. Therefore, $1,030,289 will be distributed to Cities of Bellflower, Claremont, El Monte, Los Angeles, Montebello and the County of Los Angeles.

Metro staff will contact the eligible jurisdictions to confirm that they are able to complete the projects based on the funding allocation stated above. Project Programming Request form and TEA application for each of these project will need to be submitted to Metro by COB March 25th. If any jurisdiction is not able to fully use the funds, they need to notify us no later than Friday, March 20th and the available funds will be redistributed to the remaining eligible jurisdictions on the process identified above.

3/25/2009
If any TAC members have any questions, comments, issues, please contact Toye Oyewole ASAP. Because of the March 27th CTC deadline, we apologize that we could not bring to the full TAC to discuss. However, the item will be discussed at our April 1st TAC meeting.

Thanks!

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

**Fanny Pan**  
Transportation Planning Manager  
LACMTA | South Bay Area Team  
1 Gateway Plaza, MS 99-22-3  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
💌: panf@metro.net

🏆 Go Green! Please do not print this e-mail unless it is completely necessary.
Attachment 5

Board Report Item #43: Approve TAC Process to Implement 75-Day Deadline for RSTP Funds Provided to Cities and County of Los Angeles
SUBJECT: AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
AND FEDERAL FUNDING FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL PROJECTS

ACTION: APPROVE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE PROCESS TO
IMPLEMENT 75-DAY DEADLINE FOR REGIONAL SURFACE
TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM FUNDS PROVIDED TO CITIES AND
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

RECOMMENDATION

Approve the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) process in Attachment A to implement
the 75-day Los Angeles County deadline for up to $215 million (or up to $315 million with
proposed state legislation) of flexible federal Regional Surface Transportation Program
(RSTP) funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) to Cities
and the County of Los Angeles for eligible transportation capital projects (such process
establishes an interim deadline of April 17, 2009 for the Cities and the County of Los
Angeles to submit required grant paperwork to Caltrans District 7, after which any funding
not requested shall be reallocated to those Cities or the County of Los Angeles that had
submitted grant requests).

ISSUE

On February 17, 2009, the President signed economic stimulus legislation known as the
American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Consistent with the President’s intent to
spur the national economy as soon as possible, this federal economic stimulus legislation
includes “use-it-or-lose-it” provisions with extremely tight deadlines for project delivery. To
succeed in securing the maximum amount of federal funding possible, public agency
sponsors of eligible Los Angeles County transportation capital projects must be ready to
meet the tight delivery deadlines that Congress and the State of California will be enforcing.
Priorities and policies need to be established to allocate and program federal ARRA funds
provided to Los Angeles County in a manner consistent with the national policy goal of
preserving and creating jobs, while building critical transportation infrastructure.

POLICY IMPACTS

The ARRA is a jobs preservation and creation bill meant to address the nation’s economic
crisis by accelerating the construction of needed transportation infrastructure. As such, the
ARRA funding to be provided is accompanied by tiered deadlines meant to ensure
maximum use of the funds as early as possible on construction projects that preserve and create jobs. To succeed in securing ARRA funds, public agency sponsors of transportation capital projects must meet all applicable federal provisions (including, but not limited to, those pertaining to environmental clearance, reports, audits, labor protection, planning, Buy America, disadvantaged business enterprises, local preference prohibition, etc.), while concurrently expediting project delivery.

If any state fails to obligate its projects on time, other states or the U.S. Secretary of Transportation will have the opportunity to take the underutilized ARRA funds for other projects. Similarly, the State of California may allow regions and counties to take funds from other regions and counties that fail to deliver their projects. We believe that our best strategy to obtain any additional or bonus funding is to obligate our entire amount in a short time frame.

We have met with the Technical Advisory Committee several times to develop a methodology, described in Attachment A, for implementing the 75-day deadline established by the Board of Directors on February 26, 2009. Key aspects of this methodology are as follows (with an italicized bullet below that we have added for further clarity):

1. **First Tier:**
   - Project must be in the Program.Metro.Net database as of February 6, 2009;
   - For each project, project sponsor must submit “Request to Proceed with Construction Package” (RPC) to Caltrans District 7 by April 17, 2009;
   - Caltrans District 7 approves the RPC and transmits to Caltrans Headquarters;
   - Caltrans Headquarters approves the RPC by issuing an E-76 approval number by May 18, 2009;
   - Project sponsors who did not submit RPC(s) to Caltrans District 7 by April 17, 2009 are not eligible for second tier funds that may be made available;
   - Project sponsors who submit an RPC by April 17, but need to amend the RPC, may do so such that Caltrans Headquarters approves the amended RPC by May 18; and;
   - **If for any reason, Caltrans does not approve an RPC submitted in good faith for such approval, only the funds in that RPC are put at risk; the agency remains eligible for other Tier 1 and Tier 2 obligations represented by other RPC(s).**

2. **Second Tier:**
   - Unused ARRA funds from Cities who did not submit RPCs by the April 17 deadline are to be aggregated to determine the size of the second tier;
   - Project(s) must be in the Program.Metro.Net database as of February 6, 2009;
   - Project sponsor must submit RPC to Caltrans District 7 by May 18, 2009;
   - Caltrans District 7 approves the RPC and transmits to Caltrans Headquarters;
   - Caltrans Headquarters approves the RPC by issuing an E-76 approval number by June 1, 2009; and
   - Project sponsors who submit an RPC by May 18, but need to amend the RPC, may do so such that Caltrans Headquarters approves the amended RPC by June 1.
OPTIONS

The use-it-or-lose-it nature of the ARRA dictates that Los Angeles County act fast to secure its share of ARRA funds for its eligible transportation capital projects. Along with the Technical Advisory Committee, we considered a purely first-come-first-served approach to re-distributing unencumbered ARRA funds. We and the TAC concluded jointly that a purely first-come-first-served option would be insufficient to provide the Cities and County of Los Angeles to obligate all their funds before potential redistribution to other successful grantees.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

We believe that the TAC recommendation will best position Cities and the County of Los Angeles to successfully secure the funds programmed for them by the Board of Directors on February 26, 2009. The recommendation also will position Los Angeles County for the redistribution of ARRA funds within and among regions and states.

BACKGROUND

The ARRA defines an important role for urban regional transportation agencies, such as us, in the job preservation/creation and transportation infrastructure efforts. One of the responsibilities of that role is to ensure that projects using ARRA funds are included and identified in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Federal (Title 23 U.S.C. 134 (g) & (h)) and state (P.U.C. 130303) statutes require us to prepare a TIP for Los Angeles County. The TIP allocates revenues across all transportation modes based on the planning requirements of the Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century (TEA-21) and the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act - A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU).

We accomplish our TIP mandates, in part, by programming revenues consistent with our 2001 Long Range Transportation Plan for Los Angeles County and consistent with our Measure R expenditure plan. By correspondence dated January 26, 2009, we proceeded to address TIP requirements by requesting that public agency sponsors countywide submit their project nominations for ARRA funding, which entails providing information required for our TIP database found online at Program.Metro.Net.

For the Cities and County of Los Angeles, the Board of Directors has approved our recommendation to reserve and then distribute by population the $215 million (or $315 million under proposed legislation) in RSTP funds from the ARRA (with a minimum of $500,000 allocated to each jurisdiction). We have asked each public agency sponsor to identify their priority project(s), and we have included the highest priority projects in the required TIP amendment. We also are working with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) to allow us to include additional projects as necessary. Once the ARRA money is released, public agency sponsors would obligate their target shares on eligible projects on a first-come-first-served basis using the TAC process shown in Attachment A.
NEXT STEPS

The ARRA has several local, regional, state, and federal deadlines that must be met over the next 18 months. Together with TAC members, we will meet with Caltrans District 7 Local Assistance staff to implement the TAC process in Attachment A.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Summary of TAC Local, State, and Federal Deadlines

Prepared by: David Yale, Deputy Executive Officer for Regional Programming Programming and Policy Analysis
Carol Inge
Chief Planning Officer

Roger Snoble
Chief Executive Officer
ATTACHMENT A

March 2, 2009

To: Technical Advisory Committee

From: Jano Baghdanian, TAC member

Subject: Report from Subcommittee for American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Process

At the last TAC meeting, a subcommittee of TAC was formed to meet with Caltrans District 7 Local Assistance staff to discuss and recommend a “first-come, first-served” process for the submittal of projects that are eligible to receive funding under the ARRA.

On February 25, 2009 the TAC subcommittee (consisting of TAC members and staff from a number of cities, and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)) met with Caltrans Local Assistance staff at Caltrans District 7 and developed the following Los Angeles County ARRA process and deadlines for TAC’s consideration:

Eligibility to receive ARRA funds:

Metro has submitted a list of projects for each city and the County of Los Angeles that met the February 6, 2009 Program.Metro.Net deadline. The list submitted to the Caltrans Local Assistance staff for their use is based on an up to $315 million level of funding that is pending State proposed legislation. Without the state legislation, the list will have to be reduced to an amount up to $215 million countywide.

1) All project sponsors (cities and County of Los Angeles) that submitted projects by February 6, 2009 into the Program.Metro.Net database for inclusion in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) remain eligible to receive ARRA funding. Actual receipt of the funds is contingent upon delivering a federally eligible project (as interpreted by Caltrans) by the Metro deadlines discussed below.

2) Cities wishing to exchange their ARRA funds on a dollar-for-dollar basis with other cities can do so through March 13, 2009 by submitting the necessary changes into the Program.Metro.Net database. A simple letter signed by both parties to the exchange will be required prior to changing the Program.Metro.Net data.

3) No project additions to the Program.Metro.Net database are allowed, except for a limited number of cities that did not submit sufficient projects on February 6, 2009 due to a lack of knowledge about the ultimate funding level for the ARRA program or for cities seeking to execute the exchange described above.

4) Project priorities established by cities and the County of Los Angeles in the database by February 6, 2009 can be changed through March 6, 2009 to reflect policy body actions. Contact Program.Metro.Net staff to change any previously submitted project priorities.

Metro, Caltrans, and SCAG will make every possible effort to amend the Program.Metro.Net database, the Regional TIP, and the Federal State TIP, in time to enable cities and the County of Los Angeles to meet their project approval deadlines. Failure to submit the required data necessary for Regional and Federal State TIP approval by March 13, 2009 will make it impossible for Metro, SCAG, and Caltrans to accomplish the necessary amendments.

Caltrans Process

Based on a “first-come-first-served” approach adopted by the Metro Board on February 26, 2009, there will be a two tier deadline for processing of “Request to Proceed with Construction Package” (RPC) by Caltrans District 7 Local Assistance staff:

First Tier Deadline (March 6-April 17, 2009)

Project sponsors that are on the Metro list submitted to Caltrans District 7 will have between today and Friday, April 17, 2009 to submit their RPCs to Caltrans for review and approval. Project sponsors should only submit RPCs for
the project that are on the February 6, 2009 Program.Metro.Net list for first tier processing by Caltrans. If a submitted project is not on the list, Caltrans will hold it for possible future processing.

1) Each RPC approved by the Caltrans District 7 Local Assistance Program staff will be transmitted to Caltrans Headquarters and, as required, to the FHWA. The project sponsor has met the first tier deadline to receive their allocation of ARRA funds if and when Caltrans HQ approves the RPC by issuing an E-76 approval number by Monday, May 18, 2009.

2) Project sponsors that miss the April 17, 2009 first tier RPC deadline will be presumed to be unable to receive ARRA funds for those projects that were not submitted on time. A second tier of funding to be made available to other agencies will be created based upon the number and amount of the projects that were not submitted by the April 17, 2009 deadline.

Second Tier Deadline (April 17 - May 18)

1) Project sponsors who do not meet the April 17, 2009 first tier RPC deadline are ineligible for any second tier funds that might be made available.

2) Caltrans and Metro will do an assessment of the total dollar amount of projects not submitted in the first tier shortly after April 17, 2009. Unused ARRA funds (cites that did not use their minimum allocation and failed to meet the April 17, 2009 first tier RPC deadline) will be aggregated to determine the minimum size of a second tier program.

3) Projects sponsors that submitted complete RPCs in the first tier will be eligible to compete for funds in the second tier.

4) Any available second tier funds will be distributed based on the ratio of the population of second tier eligible cities or the County of Los Angeles to the total population of all second tier eligible cities and the unincorporated area of Los Angeles County.

5) Eligible tier two Project sponsors that are on the Metro February 6, 2009 Program.Metro.Net will have between April 17 to May 18 to submit their second tier RPCs to Caltrans for review, consistent with their population share of tier two funds.

6) The project sponsor has met the second tier deadline to receive their allocation of ARRA funds if and when Caltrans HQ approves the RPC by issuing an E-76 approval number by Monday, June 1, 2009.

All NES forms submitted to Caltrans by the cities and the County will be reviewed and processed upon receipt. This will enable the rapid processing of RPC's by Caltrans upon 2nd tier reallocation of unused funds.

The TAC Subcommittee is recommending that the above process and deadlines be considered for the processing of projects for ARRA funding.