Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Union Station Conference Room

1. Call to Order/Roll Call  
   Action (Alan Patashnick, Matthew Abbott)

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
   Information
   (Alva Carrasco)
   (Alex Gonzalez)
   (Carlos Rios)
   (Mark Yamarone)

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

4. Consent Calendar
   - Approval of Minutes
   - Attachment 3: Draft July 6, 2011 Minutes
   - Attachment 4: Draft July 19, 2011 Minutes
   Action

5. 2011 Call for Projects
   - Sponsor Appeals & TAC Recommendations
   - Approval of the 2011 Call for Projects
   - Attachment 5: TAC Recommendations from August 9th Appeals
   - 20 min
   Action
   (Rena Lum)

6. Los Angeles County Congestion Reduction Demonstration Program Update
   - 10 min
   Information
   (Kathleen McCune)

7. Legislative Update
   - Federal
   - State
   - 10 min
   Information
   (Michael Turner/Marisa Yeager)
8. CTC Update (Written Report to be Provided in Lieu of Oral Report)

9. State Route 710 Gap Environmental Document and the Action – Award EIR/EIS Contract 10 min Information (Michelle Smith)

10. Metro Green Line to LAX 10 min Information (Cory Zelmer)

11. Sustainability Program Update 10 min Information (Sarah Jepson)

12. Bicycle Program Update 10 min Information (Tony Jusay)

13. Congestion Mitigation Fee 5 min Information (Robert Calix)

14. Other Business

15. Adjournment

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

Please call Matthew Abbott at (213) 922-3071 or e-mail abbottm@metro.net with questions regarding the agenda or meeting. The next meeting will be on October 5, 2011 at 9:30 a.m. in the Union Station Conference Room.
Attachment 1

Subcommittee Agendas –

• Bus Operations
  ➢ July 12, 2011

• Local Transit Systems
  ➢ July 11, 2011

• Streets and Freeways
  ➢ July 14, 2011
  ➢ August 18, 2011

• TDM/Air Quality
  ➢ July 15, 2011
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Windsor Conference Room — 3rd Floor

1. Call to Order
   1 minute
   Action
   Joseph Loh

2. Approval of June 21, 2011 Minutes
   Action
   Joseph Loh

3. Chair’s Report
   • General Managers Meeting – Dana Lee
   • TAC Update – Dana Lee/Alva Carrasco
   • Operations – Corinne Ralph
   • Measure R Committee – Enny Chung
   Information

4. Legislative Report
   10 minutes
   Information
   Raffi Hamparian/Marisa Yeager/Michael Turner

5. FTA Updates
   10 minutes
   Information
   Jonathan Klein

6. 2011 Call for Projects - Preliminary Project Recommendations (see link attached)
   10 minutes
   Information
   Rena Lum/Michael Richmai

7. CMP – Biennial Transit Monitoring
   10 minutes
   Information
   Scott Hartwell
8. New Business

9. Prop A Workshop
   a. Prop A Incentive
   b. Prop A Local Return

   45 minutes

10. Adjournment

Information Items:

90-day Rolling Agenda
Summary of Invoices
Summary of EZ Pass Invoices
Subsidy Matrix
TDA-STA Claims Summary
TDA-STA Capital Claims Summary
Regional Pass Sales
Transit Monitoring – CMP Handouts

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

Please call ANNELLE ALBARRAN at 213-922-4025 or Quenisha Williams at 213-922-7474 if you have questions regarding the agenda or meeting. The next BOS meeting will be held August 16, 2011 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

OMB Conference Room – 24th Floor

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes – May 19, 2011
   (Attachment)

3. 2011 Call for Projects Update – Transit Capital

4. FY2012-16 Prop A Discretionary Incentive Sub-regional Paratransit Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
   (Handout – tracking of MOUs)

5. Adjournment
Thursday, July 14, 2011  9:30 a.m.

Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

Gateway Conference Room, 3rd Floor

1. Call to Order  
   Action (Nicole Rizzo)  
   1 min

2. Approval of Minutes  
   Action (Subcommittee)  
   Attachment 1: Draft May 19, 2011 and June 16, 2011 Minutes  
   Attachment 2: Sign in Sheet/Attendance Sheet  
   Attachment 3: 90-Day Rolling Agenda  
   1 min

3. Chairperson Report  
   Information (Nicole Rizzo)  
   5 min

4. Metro Report  
   Information (Fulgene Asuncion)  
   5 min

5. Caltrans Report  
   Information (Kirk Cessna)  
   5 min

6. State and Federal Legislative Update  
   (Written Report to be Provided in Lieu of Oral Report)

7. CTC Update  
   Information (Patricia Chen)  
   5 min

8. ITS Implementation Plan for Goods Movement  
   Information (Jon Grace)  
   10 min

9. 511 Program Update  
   Information (Anne Janda)  
   10 min
10. Capital Reserve Accounts for Local Jurisdictions  Information (Susan Richan)  
10 min

11. 2011 Recertification and Deobligation  Information (Fanny Pan) 
Attachment 4: Recertification List  
Attachment 5: Deobligation List  
Attachment 6: Extension List  
Attachment 7: Results of TAC Appeals Process  
15 min

12. 2011 Call for Projects Update  Information (Rena Lum)  
Attachment 8: TAC Appeals Protocol  
Attachment 9: TAC Appeals Fact Sheet  
5 min

13. 2011 Call for Projects Preliminary  Action  
Funding Recommendations  
(Rena Lum/Modal Leads)  
40 min

14. New Business  Discussion (Subcommittee)  
5 min

15. Adjournment  Action (Subcommittee)  
1 min

The next meeting of the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee will be held on August 18, 2011 at 9:30 a.m. on the 15th Floor, Windsor Conference Room. Please contact Fulgene Asuncion at (213) 922-3025 should you have any questions or comments regarding this or future agendas.

Agendas can be accessed online at: http://www.metro.net/about/sfs/
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

Union Station Conference Room, 3rd Floor

1. Call to Order
   1 min

   Action (Nicole Rizzo)

2. Approval of Minutes
   Attachment 1: Draft July 14, 2011 Minutes
   Attachment 2: Sign in Sheet/Attendance Sheet
   Attachment 3: 90-Day Rolling Agenda
   1 min

   Action (Subcommittee)

3. Chairperson Report
   5 min

   Information (Nicole Rizzo)

4. Metro Report
   5 min

   Information (Fulgene Asuncion)

5. Caltrans Report
   5 min

   Information (Kirk Cessna)

6. State and Federal Legislative Update
   (Written Report to be Provided in Lieu of Oral Report)

   Information (Patricia Chen)

7. CTC Update
   5 min

   Information (Rena Lum)

8. 2011 Call for Projects Update
   10 min

   Information (Tony Jusay)

9. Bicycle Program Update
   10 min
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Contact Person(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Green Construction Policy Update</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Cris Liban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sustainability Program Update</td>
<td>(Written Report to be Provided in Lieu of Oral Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Subregional Measure R Program Update</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Brian Lin / Fulgene Asuncion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CHP Representative Update</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Sgt. Cindy Pontes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>New Business</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Adjournment</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next meeting of the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee will be held on September 15, 2011 at 9:30 a.m. on the 15th Floor, Windsor Conference Room. Please contact Fulgene Asuncion at (213) 922-3025 should you have any questions or comments regarding this or future agendas.

Agendas can be accessed online at: [http://www.metro.net/about/sfs/](http://www.metro.net/about/sfs/)
Agenda

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (METRO)

**TDM/AIR QUALITY SUB COMMITTEE**

**Sierra Madre Conference Room,**
**16th floor**

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

2. Chairperson’s Report
   5 min

3. 2011 Call for Projects

4. 2011 TDM Awarded Projects

5. Motion on the TDM Staff Recommendation

6. New Business

7. Adjournment

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

Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Metro
Attachment 2

Subcommittee Actions
Disposition of July 2011 Subcommittee Actions

Bus Operations Subcommittee:

- Approved minutes for June 21, 2011

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:

- Approved minutes for May 19, 2011

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:

- Approved minutes for May 19, 2011
- Approved minutes for June 16, 2011

TDM/Air Quality Subcommittee:

- Subcommittee supported staff’s recommendation on the 2011 Call for Projects TDM Modal Category
- Motion to recommend all Reserve Funds available to projects through the 2011 Call for Projects be allocated to projects that scored above the dotted line in the Pedestrian Improvements and Bikeway Improvements modes.
Disposition of August 2011 Subcommittee Actions

Bus Operations Subcommittee:
- Did not meet in August

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:
- Did not meet in August

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:
- Approved minutes for July 14, 2011

TDM/Air Quality Subcommittee:
- Did not meet in August
Attachment 3

Draft July 6, 2011 TAC Minutes

July 6, 2011 Sign-In Sheets

TAC Member Attendance
Wednesday, July 6, 2011 9:30 A.M.

Meeting Minutes

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. Call to Order/Roll Call
Matthew Abbott (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 (Alva Carrasco)
- Last met on June 21, 2011
- Discussed Proposition A Funding Guidelines
- Next meeting is scheduled for July 12, 2011;
Local Transit Systems (Alex Gonzalez)
- Did not meet in June
- Next meeting is scheduled for July 14, 2011
Streets & Freeways (Nicole Rizzo)
- Last met on June 16, 2011
- Doug Failing (MTA) attended the meeting
- Discussed MTAs Green Construction Policy
- Discussed ways to make the Subcommittee more effective in its advisory roll to TAC
- Next meeting is scheduled for July 14, 2011
TDM/Air Quality (Mark Hunter)
- Did not meet in June
- Next meeting is scheduled for July 13, 2011

3. Chairperson’s Report
Mr. Patashnick reported that at its June 23rd meeting, the Board:
- Approved on Consent:
  - Authorized the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to award:
    - A one-year, firm fixed price contract to Simpson & Simpson to perform
      Package A of the fiscal year (FY) 2011 Consolidated Financial and
Compliance Audit of the programs, jurisdictions and agencies inclusive of Option 6 to perform audits of the operating data and Measure R funds of other Transit System Operators; and

- A one-year firm fixed price contract to Vasquez & Company to perform Package B of the FY 2011 Consolidated Financial and Compliance Audit of the programs, jurisdictions and agencies inclusive of Option 5 to perform Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) National Transit Database (NTD) Audits and Option 6 to perform audits of the operating data and Measure R funds of other Transit System Operators;

- The proposed Strategic Positioning (Categories 2 and 3) Projects amounting to $3.2 million for project development and $18.2 million in reserve funds for future stages of these projects to complete the first six-year funding allocation for the South Bay Measure R Highway Program;
  - Also approved programming of $2.2 million to the South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) for program administration and $4.4 million for program contingency; and
  - Authorized the CEO to execute any necessary agreement(s) for the SBCCOG to access these funds;

- Establishing Proposition C Capital Reserve Accounts for the Cities of Bell, Glendora, Lawndale, Redondo Beach and Walnut and Los Angeles County Unincorporated;
  - Amend the existing Proposition A and Proposition C Capital Reserve Accounts for the Cities of Beverly Hills, Lawndale, Lomita, Pasadena, Santa Monica and Temple City;

- The preliminary project funding strategy for the 2011 Countywide Call for Projects;

- Caltrans design and construction for the SR-2 Terminus and authorize the CEO to execute a Contribution Agreement with Caltrans to transfer the TEA-21 Earmark Funds and for Caltrans to reimburse MTA up to $200,000 for future community outreach activities;

- Approved on Discussion:
  - The Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) FY 2011-12 Budget and MTA’s Annual Work Program contribution totaling $51.7 million;
  - Authorizing the CEO to enter into a Funding Agreement with the Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG) in an amount not to exceed $200,000 for FY 11 for project delivery support services for I-710 South Corridor Project EIR/EIS, Air Quality Action Plan, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Implementation Plan for Goods Movement, West Santa Ana Branch Alternatives Analysis, I-605 Hot Spots Feasibility Study and I-710 Utility Relocation Studies;
  - Also authorized the execution of Third-Party Agreements with Southern California Edison and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to support Preliminary Engineering for the I-710 South Corridor Project EIR/EIS for a total amount for both agencies not to exceed $700,000;
• Received and Filed:
  o Report regarding the motion passed by the Los Angeles City Council approving the Wilshire Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Alternative A-1, and urging that the MTA Board support Alternative A; and
• Authorized the CEO to offer special fares on MTA transit services to help mitigate traffic during to the I-405 closure from July 16th – 17th. Approximately 20 Metro Lines will offer free fares. Information on reduced fares on MTA services can be found online at http://www.metro.net/projects/I-405/i405-special-transit-service/.

4. Consent Calendar
A motion to approve the June 1, 2011 minutes was made by Mohammad Mostahkami (League of Cities, Gateway Cities COG) and was seconded by Jano Baghdanian (LTSS). Steve Huang (League of Cities, South Bay Cities COG), Nicole Rizzo (League of Cities, North Los Angeles County) and Sgt. Cindy Pontes (California Highway Patrol) abstained. The motion was approved with no objections.

5. State and Federal Legislative Update (Marisa Yeager, MTA)
Ms. Yeager did not report.

6. 2011 Call for Projects Recertification/Deobligation/Extension (Fanny Pan, MTA)
Ms. Pan reported that MTA staff will go before the Board on the 2011 Call for Projects (Call) annual Recertification/Deobligation process on August 4th (July Board meeting was moved to August 4th). Staff will recommend recertifying $97.0 million (shown in Attachment 4), receive and file time extensions on 75 projects (Attachment 6) and deobligating $17.4 million (Attachment 5). The $17.4 million recommended for deobligation includes:
  • $2.93 million (4 projects) in cancelled projects (staff received a letter from the sponsors requesting the cancellations);
  • $0.37 million (3 projects) in project audit savings from previous years;
  • $7.87 million (2 projects) in projects that did not meet the Lapsing Policy; and
  • $6.23 million (8 projects) from project downscoping.

Ms. Pan reported that based on prior Board direction the deobligated amount in this cycle will be re-allocated within its own mode, except for the Signal Synchronization and Bus Speed Improvements mode. The first priority for this later mode ($0.984 million) will be to the County of Los Angeles Gateway Cities and San Gabriel Valley Traffic Signal Corridor projects and the City of Palmdale’s North County ITS project. The modal breakdown of the remaining deobligated funds is as follows:
  • $11.414 million in Regional Surface Transportation Improvements (RSTI);
  • $2.174 million in Pedestrian Improvements;
  • $1.513 million in Bikeway Improvements; and
  • $1.318 million in Transit Capital.

Ms. Pan reported that MTA staff concurs with the TAC recommendations given on the 35 projects that participated in the appeals process in June. Three projects were given two weeks to resubmit their Scope of Work (SOW):
- CFP# 8237 First Street Parking project (City of Long Beach). Staff reviewed the revised scope and concurred with the change in project location with certain special conditions (that a satisfactory long term agreement is reached, such as covenant or easement with the City that requires the developer to provide and ensure that 100 parking spaces are available for transit riders and allows for parking enforcement by the City). As this is the third location change, no further changes in scope or location will be allowed. Furthermore, the City is to complete California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements and entitlements before April 30, 2012 and provide a status report at the May 2012 TAC meeting. If these deadlines are not met, the project will be placed on the list for deobligation;
- CFP# 8046 La Tijera Bridge Widening over I-405 Freeway project (City of Los Angeles). Staff evaluated the proposed downscoping and accepted the scope change. The downscoping will result in a project savings of $3.049 million, which staff is recommending for deobligation; and
- CFP# 8052 San Fernando road Widening – Avenue 26 & Union Pacific Driveway near Elm Street project (City of Los Angeles). On June 14, 2011, the City notified MTA that they are canceling the project.

Ms. Pan reported that a motion is needed to approve the 2011 Call for Projects Recertification/Deobligation/Extension recommendations, and a volunteer TAC representative is needed to be present at the July 20th Planning & Programming (P&P) Committee @ 1:00 PM and at the August 4th Board meeting @ 9:00 AM.

**Motion**

Mr. Mostahkami made a motion to accept the recertification/deobligation/extension recommendations which was seconded by Larry Stevens (League of Cities, San Gabriel Valley COG). The motion passed with no objections.

Mr. Baghdanian volunteered to be the TAC representative at the July 20th P&P Committee meeting and August 4th Board meeting. There were no objections to the appointment of Mr. Baghdanian.

**7. 2011 Call for Projects (Rena Lum, MTA)**

Ms. Lum reported that MTA staff sent out an email blast on June 29th notifying Committee members that the Rainbow Report was available online. Staff mailed a hard copy of the Report to Committee members on July 1st. A series of special meetings will be held with TAC and the Subcommittees over the next two weeks to review the Rainbow Report. MTA staff will meet with BOS on July 12th, TDM/AQ on July 13th, Streets & Freeways in the morning on July 14th, LTSS in the afternoon on July 14th and TAC on July 19th. The modal leads will review the projects they recommended for funding and staff will seek action from each of the Subcommittees. Because the July Board meeting has been moved to August 4th, TAC appeals have been rescheduled to August 9th – 11th. The appeals will be held in a conference room at the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) building. Details and directions to the MWD building will be sent to Committee members via email. Agencies who wish to appeal must schedule their appeal by July 29th and will be required to complete a fact sheet (draft fact sheet shown in Attachment 9) which is due by August 4th.
Ms. Lum reported that MTA staff made minor changes to the draft TAC Call for Projects Roles and Responsibilities (Attachment 8). She reported that a special Subcommittee comprised of Mr. Baghdanian, Ken Husting (City of Los Angeles), Paul Maselbas (County of Los Angeles) and Sumi Gant (City of Long Beach) developed the following draft TAC guidelines on Call Funding Appeals (Revised draft TAC guidelines were presented to and approved by TAC on July 19th):

- Projects recommended for funding (above the line) by MTA staff will remain above the funding line unless the MTA Board decides otherwise;
- **As a first priority, TAC should first consider funding those qualifying projects for which funding is not available. This consideration should be made with or without an appeal. The second priority should be those projects below the qualifying line of 70. In this priority, only projects that have an appeal before TAC can be considered for funding. In other words, TAC cannot move a project below the line to above the line without an appeal;**
- All appealing project sponsors are required to complete and transmit an Appeal Fact Sheet to MTA 72 hours prior to the TAC appeal meeting, so that MTA staff can distribute to TAC members prior to the meeting. The Appeal Fact Sheet will be based on information contained in the submitted application including a brief project description, reason for appeal, MTA staff-recommended score along with the funding line score for that modal category, etc;
- A MTA representative for each modal category will be in attendance to answer TAC questions on the evaluation of appealed project. Please note that MTA staff can not change the staff recommended score;
- TAC can only consider the MTA Call for Projects evaluation criteria as the basis for evaluating appealed projects. New information cannot be introduced or distributed. Information presented as part of the appeal can only elaborate on or clarify information already presented in the submitted application. No handouts will be allowed;
- Questions from TAC members may be asked about an appealed project after the agency presents the project (3-minute presentation, 2 minute Q&A). However, TAC discussion of which projects merit funding will be held after ALL appeals are concluded;
- Because the reserve money may be federal funding, project sponsors must take into account that this type of money requires significant project sponsor processing time; and
- **TAC must be cognizant of the limited funding available in the reserve and modal deobligation amount, if applicable. TAC can only recommend funding up to those amounts.**

James Lefton (City of Los Angeles) stated that Committee members cannot properly determine whether a project should be moved ahead or behind another project based on a three-minute summary of a project without also hearing about the other applications in the same mode and how they compare. He suggested that TAC hear from appellants who feel they are worthy of funding and focus less on moving projects up or down due to the limited information. He added that because MTA staff reviewed every application, they are in a better position to suggest the projects that should receive funding. Ms. Lum responded that
the Rainbow Report includes a “Qualifying Line” (projects that scored 70 or more) for the RSTI, Pedestrian Improvements, Bikeway Improvements and Transportation Enhancements modes. All projects that scored 70 and above in those modes that did not receive funding can be considered the modal leads’ recommendations. Heather Hills (MTA) added that TAC and each of the Subcommittees will have a chance to review the Rainbow Report ahead of the appeals during special meetings conducted by MTA staff and the modal leads. In addition, the fact sheets will inform Committee members about the projects before the appeals are held. Mr. Baghdanian stated that in previous Call appeals, there was no additional money to award projects. For this Call, TAC does not have to move a project below the funding line in order to advance another project above the funding line. Ms. Lum stated that there is $3.3 million in reserve funds that can be allocated to any mode, as well as additional money that is to be allocated to the Call from the Deobligation process if approved by the Board.

Mr. Mostahkami asked why decisions are rendered after all of the appeals are heard rather than proceeding on a project by project basis. Ms. Hills responded that TAC has historically conducted the appeals in that order for logistical reasons and to ensure fairness.

Mark Hunter (TDM/AQ Subcommittee) asked if the money going back to the Call from the Deobligated projects will be decided by the appeals. Ms. Lum responded yes. Prior to the appeals, staff will distribute a summary sheet identifying how much money is available for the entire pot (from both the Deobligations and from the Reserve which can be used for any mode). Ms. Rizzo asked if projects can be downscoped if they applied for more money than what is available. Ms. Lum responded yes, TAC can recommend that an agency downscope their project if it is still an available project and the project sponsor when contacted by MTA staff agrees.

Ferdy Chan (City of Los Angeles) asked who decides which modes are allocated the $3.3 million. Ms. Hills responded that TAC will recommend how to allocate the money and MTA staff will either concur with that recommendation or not.

**Motion**
Mr. Stevens made a motion to approve the Draft TAC Appeals Protocol which was seconded by John Walker (County of Los Angeles). The motion passed with no abstentions or objections.

Ms. Lum reported that the Draft TAC Appeals Fact Sheet (Attachment 9) consists of two pages. MTA staff will complete the first page, which includes information from the project application. The second page (to be completed by the project sponsor) asks four questions that were developed by the TAC appointed Subcommittee:

- Reason for appeal;
- Is the project sponsor able to handle extensive federal funding requirements if applicable;
- When is environmental clearance expected to occur (if applicable), is ROW required, etc.; and
- Is the project sponsor committed to the escalated local match.
Mr. Stevens suggested that because of the uncertainty of redevelopment funds, project sponsors should include in the fact sheet if they intend to use redevelopment funds for their local match. Ms. Lum stated that staff can add that to the final question regarding commitment to local match. Steve Lantz (South Bay Cities COG) stated that all project sponsors should be asked for this information and not just those who are appealing because project sponsors who are above the funding line might not be able to provide. Ms. Hills stated that the issue of local match commitment will be addressed in the future when the project sponsor signs the funding agreement. Mr. Stevens stated that project sponsors received points for their local match which they might not be able to provide. Ms. Hills responded that the same uncertainty often happens with other kinds of local match as well. Mr. Lantz stated that asking that question now adds a new evaluation criterion that did not exist in the application. Mr. Mostahkami asked if it would be beneficial to TAC and MTA staff to ask project sponsors who are utilizing redevelopment funds for their local match if they will still be able to commit to the local match given the future uncertainty of redevelopment agencies. Mr. Hills responded that sponsors must commit to the local match in the application and once again when the project is approved. Mark Christoffels (City of Long Beach) stated that agencies still have a few months to decide what they are going to do with their Redevelopment Agency, so it is unfair to ask them that question. Mr. Walker stated that TAC cannot move a project below the funding line, so the question is not relevant for the TAC appeals.

Mr. Walker asked if the fact sheets will made available online. Ms. Lum responded that the fact sheets will be emailed to TAC members. Mr. Mostahkami asked if every agency who wishes to appeal must complete the fact sheet. Ms. Lum responded only the second page. MTA staff will complete the first page.

8. LACMTA Green Construction and Renewable Energy Policies (Cris Liban, MTA)

Green Construction Policy

Mr. Liban reported that the Green Construction Policy (Policy) was developed by MTA staff in response to a motion by Director Katz in December 2010. The motion states to “develop a draft clean green construction policy for MTA funded construction projects that is practical and cost effective emission reduction actions to be included in upcoming construction equipment purchases and procurements (including, but not limited to, upcoming Measure R transit and highway construction contracts and other construction contracts funded entirely or in part by MTA)”. To help develop the Policy, MTA staff conducted a nationwide survey of other agencies that have passed similar policies beginning in December 2010. Staff presented a draft policy to the Executive Management and Audit Committee (EMAC) in March 2011. Since March, staff has conducted separate meetings with various stakeholders that included non-profit environmental organizations, construction contractors, manufacturers of retrofit equipment’ as well as representatives of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).

Mr. Liban reported that in June 2011, staff presented the Policy to the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee. One concern raised during the meeting was that the Antelope Valley AQMD is not fully supportive of the Policy. Another concern raised was the issues that cities have regarding the nexus of the Policy. The Subcommittee also requested that staff report back to
the Board with an outreach plan. Since the Streets and Freeways meeting, the Policy has been revised and sent to the Executive Office for review. The revised Policy will apply to MTA projects and projects that take place on MTA properties and ROW only and will encourage local jurisdictions to adopt a similar policy of their own.

Mr. Liban reported that Mr. Patashnick forwarded him a motion concerning the Policy from the Southbay Cities COG Infrastructure Working Group (IWG) which requested a similar direction for the Policy. The revised Policy however, has gone above and beyond that request by encouraging local jurisdictions to adopt their own policy. MTA is available to be a resource for agencies that choose to develop their own policy. Staff will present the revised Policy to the EMAC on July 21, 2011.

Ms. Rizzo asked if Director Katz’s motion was unanimously passed by the Board. Mr. Liban responded yes. Ms. Rizzo stated that the Antelope Valley AQMD supports the efforts of the Policy; however, they do not have enough funds at this time to manage enforcement of the Policy.

Mr. Hustig asked if the Policy will apply to local jurisdictions with a project on MTA property. Mr. Liban responded that currently, it will not.

Patricia Hachiya (County of Los Angeles) asked if the updated Policy will be distributed via email to Committee members. Mr. Patashnick responded that the Policy will be emailed to TAC members once it becomes a public document.

Ms. Rizzo stated that at its June 16th meeting, the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee made a motion to recommend that TAC support the Policy as it applies to MTA, but to recommend more time for further outreach to be conducted to the COGs before the local agencies portion of the Policy is approved by the MTA Board.

Mr. Christoffels stated that he conducted outreach with Contractors who do business with the City of Long Beach regarding the draft Policy that was discussed with Streets and Freeways. The feedback from the Contractors was that the Policy would decimate the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) and Small Business Enterprise (SBE) programs because none of those businesses can meet the equipment standards. Mr. Liban responded that the Policy includes a list of four exceptions. Mr. Christoffels stated that he shared the exceptions with the Contractors and they were still concerned that it will affect DBEs. Mr. Liban responded that MTA conducted outreach with DBEs and found that many of those businesses rent equipment. He stated that the necessary equipment is readily available for them to rent.

Dennis Woods (League of Cities, Arroyo Verdugo Cities) stated that on Page 3 of the Policy it states that “Costs for complying with the policy shall not be considered by LACMTA in evaluating bids”, but further down the page it states that “staff will incorporate the requirements of this policy in all future procurement contracts”. He stated that those two sentences seem to contradict one another. Mr. Liban responded that the provisions of the Policy with respect to the construction equipment requirements will be incorporated into the
procurement documents. There is no plan to provide incentives for Contractors to purchase new green equipment.

Morgan Wyenn (Natural Resources Defense Council) asked if there is any opposition from Caltrans regarding the Policy. Mr. Liban responded that he has been invited to the Caltrans Executive Committee meeting on July 12th where he will discuss the Policy with Caltrans at that time. He stated that he does not expect any significant opposition from Caltrans.

Mr. Lantz stated that the South Bay COG IWG motion to TAC does not oppose moving forward with the Policy, but rather aims at finding a cost effective way to move forward. It also recommends additional outreach to be conducted to the cities. Mr. Liban responded that MTA will not ignore those requests. Instead of including requirements for cities in the Policy, MTA will now look to conduct outreach with cities in order to help them develop their own policy. Lynda Bybee (MTA) added that staff will discuss their plans to engage local jurisdictions at the Caltrans Executive Committee meeting on July 12th. She stated that she can be reached at bybeel@metro.net with any questions or suggestions.

Mr. Stevens stated that the Policy will have an adverse affect on small projects. The financial impact will be significantly greater than 0.3% for projects that are smaller than $150 million. Mr. Liban responded that he acknowledges the concern that the Policy will have an impact on smaller projects.

Mr. Stevens stated that the new California Green Building Code Requirements (which includes provisions for demolition debris, etc.) is not referenced in the Policy. He asked if these requirements should be included in the Policy. Mr. Liban responded that MTA has a Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling and Reuse policy which can be found online at www.metro.net/sustainability.

Motion
Mr. Christoffels made a motion to table the Streets and Freeways motion which was seconded by Mr. Stevens. The motion was opposed by Ms. Rizzo. Mr. Baghdanian and Mr. Hunter abstained. The motion passed.

Motion
Mr. Hustings made a motion to support the revised Green Construction policy which applies to MTA projects only, encourages local agencies to develop their own policy and recommends that MTA conduct outreach to local agencies within the County (either through the COG or to the individual agency) which was seconded by Mr. Christoffels. The motion passed with no abstentions or objections.

Renewable Energy Policy
Mr. Liban reported that the Renewable Energy policy was drafted in response to the motion by Directors’ O’Connor and Ridley-Thomas in March 2011. The policy will apply immediately to new MTA construction projects. For existing infrastructure, the policy will apply only after the infrastructure has been retrofitted to make it more energy efficient. MTA will consider the feasibility, selection and implementation of applicable renewable energy technologies at any of its facilities, ROWs and capital project sites based on the
following criteria: cost, environmental benefit, land use efficiency, peak shaving benefit, 
hedging benefit and local content use. Innovative financing strategies between MTA and 
third-party entities are encouraged. The Renewable Energy Policy also includes a reporting 
mechanism which stipulates that no later than 18 months after policy adoption and annually 
thereafter, MTA shall incorporate in the annual Sustainability Report the information 
generated from the implementation and operation of its renewable energy portfolio, 
including:
   1. A description of the renewable energy projects planned or deployed;
   2. Quantification of the resulting Greenhouse Gas emissions (GHGe), cost savings and 
      revenue generated (if any) resulting from the use of renewable energy technologies 
      and energy retrofits (in the case of existing buildings);
   3. A description of other appropriate measures of progress;
   4. A description of any implementation challenges; and
   5. Recommendations for any statutory or policy changes.

9. June Streets and Freeways Motion (Nicole Rizzo, MTA)
Ms. Rizzo reported that the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee made a motion at its June 
16th meeting to add a pedestrian representative as a voting member. In order to do so, TAC 
must ratify the amendment to the bylaws.

Mr. Stevens asked what the qualifications are to be considered a pedestrian representative. 
Mr. Patashnick responded that, according to the Streets and Freeways bylaws, 
representatives must be employees of the existing membership structure (16 voting and 
three ex-officio agencies/modal representatives) or employees of agencies who serve on the 
Subcommittee representing the Arterial ITS Working Group, Bicycle Coordination and 
TDM/Air Quality Subcommittee. The new representative must be a public sector employee.

Mr. Husting asked if it is possible to add a non-voting pedestrian representative to the 
Subcommittee if the parameters make it too difficult to add a voting member. Mr. 
Patashnick responded yes.

Motion
Mr. Huang made a motion to approve the addition of a pedestrian representative on the 
Streets and Freeways Subcommittee with the condition that once a representative is chosen 
it is brought to TAC for approval. The motion was seconded by Robert Brager (League of 
Cities, Las Virgenes Malibu COG). The motion passed with no abstentions or objections.

10. Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project (Fanny Pan, MTA)
Ms. Pan reported that staff is currently finalizing the Final Environmental Impact 
Study/Environmental Impact Report (FEIS/R). The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is 
in the process of reviewing the project, and final approval is expected in the next couple of 
weeks. Once the document is approved, staff will recommend that the MTA Board adopt the 
project and certify the environmental document. Once the Board certifies the FEIS/R, FTA 
will issue the Record of Decision (ROD).

Mr. Lantz asked if there has been any resolution with the FTA regarding crossing near the 
airport. Ms. Pan responded that the issue is currently being resolved. The Federal Aviation
Administration (FAA) is now a cooperative agency and is reviewing the FEIS/R. The FTA will sign off on the document once approved by the FAA.

11. CTC Update (Patricia Chen, MTA)
Ms. Chen reported on the June 22nd and 23rd CTC meeting:
- The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) inactive project list is released every 1-2 weeks, and agencies with a project that has not submitted an invoice in the prior year will lapse;
- Agencies can begin submitting FTA Flex Transfer projects that utilize Toll Credits;
- Regarding Proposition 1B funds, A Commissioner indicated she had heard that California State Treasurer Bill Lockyer was considering moving Bond proceeds out of transportation and into another department. Caltrans staff responded that they will be working with the Administration to inform them that the dollars are already at work and that it will be a bad idea to move the funds. To the extent that there are revenues that are not needed right away for existing allocation, they may make some new allocations – the priority being for the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) and Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) bond programs. CMIA projects will be a priority because of the statutory deadline where the project must be in construction by December 12, 2012 or the funds will lapse. PTMISEA projects will have priority because the program’s allocations have fallen behind other bond programs and needs to catch up;
- Staff presented the Draft 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Fund Estimate. The 2012 Fund Estimate reflects a positive number of $1.7 billion in new capacity statewide; and
- The following actions took place at the meeting:
  - Approximately $470 million of State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) funds was allocated to the Gerald Desmond Bridge replacement project;
  - There was a request to allocate $336 million in Trade Corridor Improvement Funds (TCIF) funds for the Alameda Corridor East (ACE) San Gabriel Trench. That request was deferred, but a Letter of No Prejudice (LONP) for $13 million was approved; and
  - The Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles (CRA/LA) Caesar Chavez project was approved for allocation (for preliminary engineering funds).

12. New Business
Mr. Patashnick reported that a special TAC meeting will be held on July 19th at 9:30 AM in the Union Station Conference Room to discuss the 2011 Call for Projects Preliminary Recommendations. He asked if, because TAC normally does not meet in August and the July MTA Board meeting has been moved to Thursday, August 4th, if there were any objections to canceling the August 3rd TAC meeting. There were no objections. Mr. Patashnick reported that TAC is scheduled to meet August 9th – 11th for the TAC Call for Project appeals.
David Feinberg (League of Cities, Westside Cities) stated that in anticipation of Carmageddon, Big Blue Bus is making a number of service changes which can be found online at www.bigbluebus.com.

13. **Adjournment**
Mr. Patashnick announced that the next TAC meeting is a special meeting on the Call for Projects and is scheduled for July 19, 2011 in the Union Station Conference Room, 3rd floor. If you have questions regarding the next meeting, please contact Matthew Abbott at (213) 922-3071 or email abbottm@metro.net.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>1. Marianne Kim/ Stephen Finnegan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (BOS)</td>
<td>1. Dana Lee/Joyce Rooney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Alva Carrasco/Lois Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>1. Alberto Angelini/Jimmy Shih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Kirk Cessna/Vijay Kopparam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVE ON ADA</td>
<td>1. Ellen Blackman/John Whitbread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1. Courtney Aguirre/Mark Christoffels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>1. James Lefton/Corinne Ralph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Ken Husting/Kang Hu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Gina Mancia/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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Patricia Hachiya/Travis Seawards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. John Walker/Allan Abramson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Patrick V. DeChellis/ Paul Maselbas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td>1. David Kriske/Dennis Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities COG</td>
<td>2. Mohammad Mostahkami/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes Malibu COG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td>3. Robert Brager/Ramiro Adeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
<td>4. Mike Behen/Nicole Rizzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td>5. Larry Stevens /Craig Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Cities COG</td>
<td>6. Steven Huang/Victor Rollinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. David Feinberg/Sharon Perlstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE (LTSS)</td>
<td>Jano Baghdanian/Kathryn Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Alex Gonzalez/Joe Barrios</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (Metro)</th>
<th>Alan Patashnick/Matthew Abbott Countywide Planning &amp; Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. John Drayton/Christopher Gallanes</td>
<td>Metro Operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY (SCARRA - Ex-Officio) | Anne Louise Rice/Karen Sakoda |

| SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SCAQMD - Ex-Officio) | Eynoné Drummonds/Kathryn Higgins |

| SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG - Ex-Officio) | Warren Whiteaker/Annie Nam |

| GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio) | Lupe Valdez/La Donna DiCamillo |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/AIR QUALITY SUBCOMMITTEE</th>
<th>Mark Yamarone/Phil Aker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Mark Hunter/Brooke Geer Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Randall Parcell</td>
<td>AGMD</td>
<td>309-298-2151</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rparcell@agmd.gov">rparcell@agmd.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Morgan Wyenn</td>
<td>NREDC</td>
<td>310-434-2300</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mwyenn@nrdc.org">mwyenn@nrdc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eds Liban</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>213/922-2091</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Libane@metro.net">Libane@metro.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Arthur Solikian</td>
<td>Ars</td>
<td>213/379-1551</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aconsul3y@yahoo.com">aconsul3y@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Steve Lantz</td>
<td>SBCCOG</td>
<td>213 494-8587</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lantzfamily517@yahoo.com">lantzfamily517@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kevin Minner</td>
<td>LATF</td>
<td>213-872-4461</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kevin.Minner@Elders.org">Kevin.Minner@Elders.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Arsen Mangasarian</td>
<td>LATF</td>
<td>763-972-4481</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Arsen.Mangasarian@Elders.org">Arsen.Mangasarian@Elders.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jeff Cappel</td>
<td>APAL</td>
<td>804-771-1718</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cappel@viaspace.org">cappel@viaspace.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Kim/Stephen Finnegan (A)</td>
<td>AUTO CLUB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Lee/Joyce Rooney (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alva Carrasco/Lois Smith (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgl. Cindy Pontes/Ofc. Spencer Badal (A)</td>
<td>CHP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto Angeli/Jimmy Shih (A)</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk Cessna/Vijay Kopparam (A)</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Blackman/John Whitbread (A)</td>
<td>CITIZEN REP ON ADA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Aguirre/Mark Christoffels (A)</td>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Lefton/Corinne Ralph (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Hustling/Kang Hu (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Mancha/Ferdy Chan(A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Hachiya/Travis Seawards (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Walker/Alan Abramson(A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick DeChelli/Paul Maselbas (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kriske/Dennis Woods (A)</td>
<td>ARROYO VERDUGO CITIES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Mostakhimi/Lisa Rapp (A)</td>
<td>LAS VIRGENES MALIBU CCG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Brager/Ramiro Adeva (A)</td>
<td>NORTH L.A. COUNTY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Behen/Nicole Rizzo (A)</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL VALLEY COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Stevens/ Craig Bradshaw (A)</td>
<td>SOUTH BAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Huang/Victor Rollingter (A)</td>
<td>WESTSIDE CITIES COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Feinberg/Sharon Perenstein (A)</td>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jano Baghdanian/Kathryn Engel (A)</td>
<td>LTSS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Gonzalez/Joe Barrios (A)</td>
<td>LTSS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Patashnick/Reuben Abbott (A)</td>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Drayton/Christopher Gallanes (A)</td>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Louise Rice/Karen Sakoda (A)</td>
<td>SCIRR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evinne Drummonds/Kathryn Higgins (A)</td>
<td>SCAGQMD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Whiteaker/Anne Nam (A)</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupe Valdez/LaDonna DiCamillo (A)</td>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Yamarone/Phil Aker (A)</td>
<td>TDM/AQ SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hunter/Brooke Geer Person (A)</td>
<td>TDM/AQ SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 4

Draft July 19, 2011 TAC Minutes

July 19, 2011 Sign-In Sheets
1. **Call to Order/Roll Call**
Matthew Abbott (Alternate Chair) called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m., took roll and declared a quorum was present.

2. **Revised TAC Appeals Protocol (Rena Lum, MTA)**
Ms. Lum reported that new to the 2011 Call for Projects (Call), staff has included a ‘qualifying’ line (shown as a solid line) in the Rainbow Report indicating the projects that scored 70 or above. Projects that placed above the qualifying line are eligible for funding. Four modes did not have enough money to fund all of the eligible projects in their mode: Regional Surface Transportation Improvements (RSTI), Pedestrian Improvements, Bikeway Improvements and Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA). Staff therefore included a ‘funding’ line (shown as a dashed line) in the Rainbow Report indicating the point at which insufficient funds were available for each particular mode. Due to the lack of funding in those four modes, projects between the two lines are not recommended for funding at this time. MTA staff is proposing that each of those projects should be considered first for funding by TAC when allocating money from the reserve funds and funds deobligated by Board action on August 4th from the 2011 Call Deobligation/Recertification process. MTA staff is proposing the following revision to the second bullet point in the draft TAC Appeals Protocol that was approved by TAC on July 6th:

- **As a first priority, TAC should first consider funding those qualifying projects for which funding is not available. This consideration should be made with or without an appeal. The second priority should be those projects below the qualifying line of 70. In this priority, only projects that have an appeal before TAC can be considered for funding. In other words, TAC cannot move a project below the line to above the line without an appeal.**

Larry Stevens (League of Cities, San Gabriel Valley COG) stated that if the total cost of projects between the lines is more than what is available from the reserve and deobligated funds, then the revised guidelines essentially remove the projects below the funding line.
from consideration. Part of the purpose of the appeals process is to consider funding meritorious projects that are below the funding line. Jim Lefton (City of Los Angeles) responded that the proposed changes will not preclude TAC from recommending projects below the funding line; they simply place a higher priority on those projects above the funding line. Because TAC members have not had a chance to review each of the applications, they should rely on MTA staff’s scoring.

John Walker (County of Los Angeles) asked if TAC will hear appeals before a recommendation is given on those projects between the two lines. Heather Hills (MTA) responded yes.

Mr. Stevens stated that regarding the revised changes, the words “first” and “second” imply a requirement rather than a degree of discretion. Mr. Lefton agreed with Mr. Stevens.

Ellen Blackman (Citizen Representative on ADA) stated that multiple projects in the Pedestrian mode placed below the Funding Line had scored well above 70. She noted that there were a lot of projects in other modes that barely scored 70 and placed above the funding line. She stated that it would be unfair for those high scoring Pedestrian projects to miss out on funding because they did not appeal. Ms. Hills responded that one of the concerns in developing the protocol was to keep projects below the Qualifying Line from jumping ahead of a project above the Qualifying Line.

Paul Maselbas (County of Los Angeles) asked for the logic behind the proposed changes. Toye Oyewole (MTA) responded that the proposed changes specifically state that projects between the two lines merit funding and do not need to appeal. Mark Christoffels (City of Long Beach) asked what happens if/when TAC recommends a project below the line for funding. Ms. Hills responded that MTA staff will either concur or not concur with that recommendation. TAC recommendations will be forwarded to the Board along with MTA staff response. Renee Berlin (MTA) added that TAC can only make funding recommendations for the dollar amount available in a particular mode using 2011 Deobligation funds and reserve dollars; however, TAC can recommend partial funding of a project. Gina Mancha (City of Los Angeles) asked if the revised protocol binds TAC members to fund the projects between the two lines. Mr. Patashnick responded no, only to consider them as a first priority for funding.

Motion
Ms. Blackman made a motion to approve the Revised TAC Appeals Protocol, which was seconded by Mr. Christoffels. Mr. Stevens opposed the motion. The motion passed with no abstentions.

3. 2011 Call for Projects Preliminary Recommendations (Rena Lum/Modal Leads, MTA)
Ms. Lum reported that:
- Over $104 million is available for the 2011 Call plus a reserve fund (available for any mode) of $3.3 million for a total of $107 million;
- 180 applications were received throughout all modes. Staff is recommending funding 64 projects. As in previous Calls, the requested funding was approximately three times the amount of available funds;
TAC appeals will take place from August 9th – 11th. Project sponsors wishing to schedule an appeal must do so with MTA by July 29th; On August 4th, the MTA Board will be hearing the 2011 Call deobligations. If staff recommendations are approved, an additional $16 million will be available (mode specific); and MTA staff will take the 2011 Call recommendations to the Board in either September or October and a Successful Project Sponsor Workshop will be held approximately one month later; MTA encourages unsuccessful applicants to contact the modal leads (after the Call recommendations are approved by the Board) to schedule an informative review of their application to help them identify ways to strengthen their application, if they wish to resubmit in the future.

Ms. Lum reported that the modal leads will give a brief presentation on their mode followed by the opportunity for questions and answers.

Pedestrian Improvements (Tham Nguyen, MTA)

Ms. Nguyen reported that:
- 33 applications were received (most out of all the modes) for a total funding request of $52.8 million;
- 13 projects scored 70 or above ($21.8 million); however only the top five projects placed above the funding line ($8.2 million). The remaining eight projects ($13.6 million) are not currently recommended for funding;
- The five projects recommended for funding generally provided good linkages between transit facilities and activity centers (such as employment, retail, commercial, etc.), had high transit ridership and pedestrian usage in the project area, had supportive land uses and the applicant had sustainability policies in place;
  - The types of pedestrian improvements generally included adding or widening sidewalks, installing landscaping, pedestrian lights, crosswalk enhancements, street furniture, curb extensions, bus stop improvements and wayfinding signage; and
- There is a possible $2.1 million available for the Pedestrian mode in deobligation money. It is highly recommended that TAC consider the remaining eight projects that scored above the qualifying line.

Ms. Blackman asked if the projects that were ranked above the line included improvements for pedestrians with disabilities. Ms. Nguyen responded yes, the 2011 Call included a checklist to evaluate how the project impacts pedestrians, bicyclists and/or ADA accessibility. The checklist was provided to each of the evaluators when scoring the applications.

Jano Baghdanian (LTSS) stated that the cost of the remaining eight projects between the lines in this mode is substantially more than what is available. Ms. Nguyen responded that it is possible to downscope or partially fund some of those projects. Temple City (F5616) indicated that their project would remain viable if downscoped. Mr. Baghdanian suggested that projects be downscoped to fund essential pedestrian improvements only (such as sidewalk widenings) and not non-essential improvements such as sidewalk furniture, street
lighting, etc. Ms. Blackman stated that sidewalk furniture and street lighting are essential for pedestrians. Mr. Stevens asked that if projects are going to be downscoped, what information will TAC receive that will allow members to evaluate that downscope. Ms. Lum responded that no new information will be allowed in the fact sheets; however, applicants were asked in the application if they would be able to downscope. Additionally, TAC members can verbally ask appellants for detailed information on which portion of the project is available to be downscoped during the appeals. Mr. Christoffels stated that TAC would be better served to have that information in advance of the appeals. David Kriske (League of Cities, Arroyo Verdugo Cities) asked if it is feasible to ask all appellants with projects between the lines to provide information on the minimum amount of money that is required for their project to remain viable. Ms. Hills responded yes. Sharon Perlstein (League of Cities, Westside Cities COG) stated that another option is for project sponsors to simply increase their local match. Victor Rollinger (League of Cities, South Bay Cities COG) stated that if TAC requires all of this new information for the appeals, it will have a domino effect throughout the entire Call.

Mr. Baghdanian asked if the deobligation money can be moved between modes. Mr. Patashnick responded no, it is mode specific.

**RSTI (Walt Davis, MTA)**
Mr. Davis reported that:
- 31 applications were received for a total of $88 million requested from MTA;
- Staff recommends funding nine projects for a total of $20.2 million (six of the nine projects recommended for funding were intersection improvements);
- In order to fund as many projects as possible, staff asked project sponsors to consider receiving less funds than requested (by 10-15%);
  - Six of the nine projects reduced the amount of funding they requested for a total savings of $2.8 million. Mr. Davis recommended that TAC allocate the $2.8 million back to those projects; and
- One project scored above the qualifying line, but due to the lack of funds was not recommended for funding.

Mr. Stevens asked how much deobligation money will be available for this mode. Mr. Davis responded that depending on the Board action on August 4th, up to $11 million will be available.

**Goods Movement (Michelle Smith, MTA)**
Ms. Smith reported that:
- The 2011 Call is the first Call to include Goods Movement as an individual mode (previously, Goods Movement was funded through RSTI);
- Funding in this mode is awarded to projects that support local, regional and state plans addressing goods movement problems throughout the County and improvement to systems and freight hubs serving, providing access to or supporting the transport of goods;
- A total of eight applications were received, requesting funding between $1 to $13 million. Three applications were from the City of Los Angeles, two from the Gateway Cities and three from South Bay Cities;
• The types of applications received ranged from access and operational improvements to bridge replacements;
• Staff is recommending two of the eight projects for funding:
  o F5204 Port of LA Rail System: Alameda Corridor Terminus/West Basin (City of Los Angeles); and
  o F5207 Alameda Street Downtown LA: Goods Movement, Phase I (City of Los Angeles);
• Two projects were disqualified:
  o F5200 Shoemaker Bridge Replacement (City of Long Beach) due to ineligible local match; and
  o F5202 I-110/C Street Interchange & National Highway System Project (City of Los Angeles) because it had already been awarded over 17% of total project costs through prior Calls; and
• The remaining four projects were deemed less competitive and not recommended for funding.

Mr. Stevens stated that according to the Rainbow Report, project F5201 (City of Carson) is requesting $-173,291 in FY 16. He asked if that is correct. Ms. Lum responded yes, the project expense in FY 16 is lower than the applicant’s match.

Signal Synchronization and Bus Speeds Improvements (Randy Lamm, MTA)
Mr. Lamm reported that:
• 19 applications were received for a total of $55 million ($72 million including local match)
• Staff recommends funding 15 projects for a total of $22.5 million; and
• Applications included the following types of work: signal synchronization, controllers, interconnect, detection, video cameras, computer and network equipment, centralized traffic control systems and bus signal priority.

Mr. Stevens asked how much deobligation money will be available in this mode. Ms. Berlin responded that no deobligation money is available in this mode.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) (Rufina Juarez, MTA)
Ms. Juarez reported that:
• 11 applications were received for a total of $10 million;
• Staff recommended funding six projects for a total of $3.7 million;
• Applications included the following types of projects: transportation amenities, parking and technology and innovation.

Mr. Stevens asked if there is any deobligation money in this mode. Ms. Juarez responded no.

Bikeway Improvements (Tony Jusay, MTA)
Mr. Jusay reported that:
• 26 applications were received for a total of $43.5 million. The funding mark for the mode is $15.5 million;
• Staff recommended funding 11 projects (two of those fell below the funding line);
• To help evaluate the projects, staff used the Board adopted 2006 Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP). The BTP identifies gaps in bicycle paths throughout the County, transit hubs where bicycle improvements are encouraged and policies that encourage using bicycles to transit; and
• The high scoring projects demonstrated innovative designs, such as road diets into downtown areas, etc.

Mark Yamarone (TDM/Air Quality) stated that staff is recommending more funding than is requested for project F5525 (City of Los Angeles). Ms. Lum responded that the project was split between the TDM and Bike modes and the amount requested may have been incorrectly indicated. There were not enough funds in the TDM mode to fund the total project so staff separated the bicycle components of the project and placed them into the bike mode.

Mr. Stevens asked if there is deobligation money for this mode. Mr. Jusay responded yes, approximately $1.5 million.

Transit Capital (Michael Richmai, MTA)
Mr. Richmai reported that:
• 28 applications were received for a total of $49 million;
• Staff recommended 11 projects for funding:
  o Recommended projects included: bus replacements, bus stop improvements and one maintenance facility;
  o For the bus replacements, staff used the average cost of the bus size and type. Most applicants came in with a higher cost so staff had to reduce the cost to the average cost;
  o For bus stop improvements, staff only funded stops that had regionally significant ridership; and
• There is approximately $1.2 million in deobligation funds in this mode.

Mr. Stevens stated that most of the projects received less funding than requested. Mr. Richmai responded yes, because those projects were asking for more than the average cost of the bus. Additionally, some projects had upgrades to their vehicles that were not eligible. Mr. Stevens asked if any of those projects will be appealing for more funds. Ms. Lum responded not at this time. Mr. Stevens asked if any of the projects that scored above the line are eligible for the deobligation money. Mr. Richmai responded that the City of Glendale (F5407) is eligible for the funds because they were partially funded.

Mr. Yamarone asked if staff can include the average bus cost in the application in future Calls. Mr. Richmai responded yes.

TEA (Reinland Jones, MTA)
Mr. Jones reported that:
• 24 applications were received for a total of $45 million;
• Staff recommended five projects for funding for a total of $2.6 million;
All five projects were asked to downscope or provide more local match;
- Three projects were downscoped 40% to 60%;
- The remaining two projects provided an increase in local match;
- One project fell between the lines;
- All five projects were beautification enhancement projects; and
- There is no deobligation money available in this mode.

Mr. Maselbas stated that project F5812 (City of Santa Monica) is recommended for more money than was requested in the Rainbow Report. He asked if that project was split with another mode. Mr. Jones responded no, the project had originally requested more funding but was awarded funding in the out-years with a higher escalation rate. Mr. Maselbas stated that projects recommended for funding in multiple modes should not receive more money than requested. Ms. Lum responded that no projects will receive more money than requested.

4. Other Business
Mr. Patashnick stated that the TAC appeals will be held on August 9th at 9:30 a.m. at the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) Building. Staff will email the agenda with directions in the next two weeks. MTA will validate parking for TAC members at Union Station only. MWD will not validate for parking in their lots. Ms. Lum added that staff will be on hand throughout Union Station to provide directions to MWD.

5. Adjournment
The next special TAC meeting is scheduled for August 9, 2011 in the Metropolitan Water District Building (700 North Alameda Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012), Conference Room 2-456. If you have questions regarding the next meeting, please contact Matthew Abbott at (213) 922-3071 or email abbottm@metro.net.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>1. Marianne Kim/ Stephen Finnegan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Dana Lee/Joyce Rooney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Alva Carrasco/ Lois Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (BOS)</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Alberto Angelini/ Jimmy Shih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Kirk Cessna/ Vijay Kopparam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Ellen Blackman/ John Whitbread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVE ON ADA</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Courtney Aguirre/ Mark Christoffels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. James Lefton/ Corinne Ralph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Ken Hustling/ Kang Hu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>3. Gina Mancha/ Ferdy Chan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>1. Patricia Hachiya/Travis Seawards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. John Walker/Allan Abramson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Patrick V. DeChellis/ Paul Maselbas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td>1. David Kriske/Dennis Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities COG</td>
<td>2. Mohammad Mostakhami/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes Malibu COG</td>
<td>3. Robert Brager/Ramiro Adeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td>4. Mike Behen/Nicole Rizzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
<td>5. Larry Stevens /Craig Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td>6. Steven Huang/Victor Rollinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Cities COG</td>
<td>7. David Feinberg/Sharon Perlstein</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE (LTSS) | 1. Jarno Haghdanian/Kathryn Engel  
| | 2. Alex Gonzalez/Joe Barrios |
| METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (Metro) | 1. Alan Patashnick/Matthew Abbott Countywide Planning & Development  
| | 2. John Drayton/Christopher Gallanes Metro Operations |
| SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY (SCRRA - Ex-Officio) | 1. Anne Louise Rice/Karen Sakoda |
| SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SCAQMD -- Ex-Officio) | 1. Evonne Drummonds/Kathryn Higgins |
| SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG -- Ex-Officio) | 1. Warren Whiteaker/Annie Nam |
| GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio) | 1. Lupe Valdez/LaDonna DiCamillo |
| TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/AIR QUALITY SUBCOMMITTEE | 1. Mark Yamarone/Phil Aker  
<p>| | 2. Mark Hunter/Brooke Geer Person |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kevin Minne</td>
<td>LAPD</td>
<td>213-872-9961</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kevin.Minne@lapd.org">Kevin.Minne@lapd.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Veronica Aguas</td>
<td>Advant Garde</td>
<td>226-657-7000</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vaquas@agj.com.co">vaquas@agj.com.co</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jeff Carpenter</td>
<td>APA</td>
<td>213-977-1718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Carlos Ruiz</td>
<td>City/SCC</td>
<td>310-732-9263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>19</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 5

TAC Recommendations from August 9th Appeals
I. Regional Surface Transportation Improvements (RSTI)

TAC Recommendation: Assign 2011 Call for Projects RSTI deobligation funds to restore full funding for six projects above the funding line [F5125 – Ramona Blvd. & Valley Blvd. Intersection Improvement (City of El Monte), F5115 – Avenue L Roadway Widening Project (County of Los Angeles), F5100 – SR57/60 Confluence, Grand Ave at Golden Springs Drive (City of Industry), F5101 – El Segundo Blvd. Improvement Project (City of Hawthorne), F5114 – Telegraph Road Traffic Throughput and Safety Enhancement (City of Downey) and F5121 – Balboa Blvd. Widening at Devonshire Street (City of Los Angeles)]; fully fund project #F5104 – Golden Valley Road Widening/Gap Closure over SR-14 (City of Santa Clarita) and fund project #F5111 – Colima Road – City of Whittier Limits to Fullerton Road (County of Los Angeles) using the remaining 2011 deobligation funds.

Staff Response: Concur with the TAC recommendation

II. Goods Movement Improvements

TAC Recommendation: Approve the preliminary staff funding recommendations for this mode.

Staff Response: Concur with the TAC recommendation

III. Signal Synchronization and Bus Speed Improvements

TAC Recommendation: Approve the preliminary staff funding recommendations for this mode.

Staff Response: Concur with the TAC recommendation

IV. Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

TAC Recommendation: Approve the preliminary staff funding recommendations for this mode.

Staff Response: Concur with the TAC recommendation
Vb. Bikeway Improvements

**TAC Recommendation #1:** Approve the preliminary staff funding recommendations for this mode. In addition to staff recommendations, TAC recommends using 2011 Bikeway Improvements mode deobligated dollars to fully fund projects #F5502 – Tourney Road Bike Lane and Orchard Village Road Bike Route (City of Santa Clarita) and #F5515 – Florence Metro Blue Line Station Bikeway Access Improvements (County of Los Angeles).

**Staff Response:** Concur with the TAC recommendation

**TAC Recommendation #2:** Use the remaining 2011 Bikeway Improvements mode deobligation funds to partially fund project #F5519 – Bicycle Friendly Streets (City of Los Angeles).

**Staff Response:** Concur with the TAC recommendation and will partially fund the project with the deobligation funds and 2009 LRTP Reserve funds

Vb. Pedestrian Improvements

**TAC Recommendation #1:** Approve the preliminary staff funding recommendations for this mode and use the 2011 Pedestrian Improvements mode deobligation funds to partially fund project #F5616 – Rosemead Boulevard Enhancement & Beautification Project (City of Temple City).

**Staff Response:** Concur with the TAC recommendation

VI. Transit Capital

**TAC Recommendation #1:** Approve the preliminary staff funding recommendations for this mode except for project #F5407 – Purchase of CNG Buses for Glendale Beeline Services (City of Glendale) for which two additional buses are recommended for funding using 2011 Transit Capital deobligation dollars.

**Staff Response:** Concur with the TAC recommendation

**TAC Recommendation #2:** Use the remaining 2011 Transit Capital deobligation dollars to partially fund project #F5414 – Avocado Heights and East Valinda Transit Vehicles (County of Los Angeles).

**Staff Response:** Concur with the TAC recommendation
VII. **Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA)**

**TAC Recommendation:** Approve the preliminary staff funding recommendations for this mode.

**Staff Response:** Concur with the TAC recommendation

**2009 LRTP RESERVE FUND**

**TAC Recommendation #1:** Fully fund project #F5620 – Expo Line – Transit/Pedestrian Linkages West (City of Los Angeles) using the 2009 LRTP Reserve Fund.

**Staff Response:** Concur with the TAC recommendation

**TAC Recommendation #2:** Use the remaining 2009 LRTP Reserve funds to supplement the 2011 Pedestrian Improvements, Transit Capital and RSTI deobligation funds for projects #F5616 – Rosemead Blvd. Enhancement & Beautification Project (City of Temple City), #F5414 – Avocado Heights and East Valinda Transit Vehicles (County of Los Angeles) and #F5111 – Colima Road – City of Whittier Limits to Fullerton Road (County of Los Angeles).

**Staff Response:** Concur with the TAC recommendation