Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Gateway Plaza Conference Room

1. Call to Order/Roll Call Action (Fanny Pan, Matthew Abbott)

2. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees Information
   - Bus Operations (Joyce Rooney)
   - Local Transit Systems (Ryan Thompson)
   - Streets and Freeways (Nancy Villasenor)
   - TDM/Air Quality (Mark Yamarone)
   Attachment 1: Subcommittee Agendas
   Attachment 2: Subcommittee Actions
   5 min

3. Chairperson’s Report Information
   - January Board Recap (handout) (Fanny Pan)
   - Supplemental Call for Project Deobligations
   - CMP Annual Local Conformance Findings

4. Consent Calendar Action
   - Approval of Minutes
   Attachment 3: Draft January 2, 2013 Minutes

5. Post Measure J Information
   Attachment 4: January Board Report (Martha Welborne/Renee Berlin)
   10 min

6. Measure R Local Return Guidelines Action (Terry Matsumoto)
   10 min

7. MAP-21 5339 Formula Grants Information (Cosette Stark)
   10 min

8. East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Information (Walt Davis)
   Attachment 5: January Board Report
   10 min
9. 2013 Call for Projects  
   Information  
   5 min  
   (Rena Lum)

10. Short Range Transportation Plan  
    Information  
    5 min  
    (Rena Lum)

11. LACMTA Green Construction Policy  
    Information  
    10 min  
    (Cris Liban)

12. Legislative Update  
    Information  
    Federal  
    State  
    15 min  
    (Michael Turner/Marisa Yeager)

13. CTC Update  
    Information  
    5 min  
    (Patricia Chen)

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

15. Regional Airport Connectivity Plan  
    Information  
    Attachment 6: January Board Report  
    10 min  
    (Chris Haskell)

16. I-605 “Hot Spots” Feasibility Study  
    Information  
    Attachment 7: January Board Report  
    10 min  
    (Ernesto Chaves)

17. Other Business

18. Adjournment

TAC Minutes and Agendas can be accessed at: [http://www.metro.net/about/tac/](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 March 6, 2013 at 9:30 a.m. in the William Mulholland Conference Room.
Attachment 1

Subcommittee Agendas – January 2013

• Bus Operations
  ➢ January 15, 2013

• Local Transit Systems
  ➢ January 31, 2013

• Streets and Freeways
  ➢ January 17, 2013

• TDM/Air Quality
  ➢ Did not meet in January
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
Mulholland Conference Room-15th Floor
9:30 am

1. Call to Order (1 minute) Action Joyce Rooney

2. Approval of December 4, 2012 Minutes (1 minute) Action BOS

3. Chair’s Report (5 minutes) Information Joyce Rooney

4. FTA Updates (10 minutes) Information Jonathan Klein

5. Legislative Report (10 minutes) Information Raffi Hamparian/Marisa Yeager Michael Turner

6. FAP Update (5 minutes) Information Carlos Vendiola

7. Measure R Local Return Guidelines (10 minutes) Information Terry Matsumoto

8. Mobile Validator Update (10 minutes) Information David Sutton/Cary Stevens

9. FTA 5339 Funding Allocation Process (15 minutes) Action BOS
10. BOS Chair, Vice Chair and TAC Representatives Nominations
Action
(10 minutes) BOS

11. New Business Information
All

12. Adjournment

Information Items:

- 90-day Rolling Agenda
- Summary of Invoices FY 2012
- Summary of EZ Pass Invoices
- Subsidy Matrix FY11-12
- TDA-STA Capital Claims
- TDA-STA Claims
- Regional Pass Sales
- Measure R Local Return Bonds Jan13

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

Please call ANNELLE ALBARRAN at 213-922-4025 or Ilda LICON at 213-922-2805 if you have questions regarding the agenda or meeting. The next BOS meeting will be tentatively held on February 19, 2013 at 9:30 am in the Mulholland Conference Room, 15th Floor of the Gateway Building.
Thursday, January 31, 2013, 1:30PM

Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE

Heritage Conference Room – 13th Floor

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes – November 29, 2012
   (Handout)

3. MAP-21 and the future of FTA 5317 and FTA 5310

4. Wheelchair Securement

5. Measure R Working Group Update

6. New Business, Date of Next LTSS Meeting (Feb 21 or 28)
   Adjournment

Action
Ryan Thompson, Chair

Action
Ryan Thompson, Chair

Information
Ashad Hamideh, Metro

Information
Daniel Levy, Metro

Information
TBD

Ryan Thompson
Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

**Mulholland** Conference Room, 15th Floor

1. Call to Order  
   *Action (Bahman Janka)*  
   *1 min*

2. Approval of Minutes  
   *Action (Subcommittee)*  
   Attachment 1: Draft November 15, 2012 Minutes  
   Attachment 2: Sign in Sheet/Attendance Sheet  
   Attachment 3: 90-Day Rolling Agenda  
   *1 min*

3. Chair Report  
   *Information (Bahman Janka)*  
   *5 min*

4. Metro Report  
   *Information (Fulgene Asuncion)*  
   *5 min*

5. Election of Subcommittee Chair & Vice Chair - Subcommittee  
   *Action (Subcommittee)*  
   *10 min*

6. State and Federal Legislative Update  
   *Information (Raffi Hamparian/ Marisa Yeager/Michael Turner)*  
   *10 min*

7. Caltrans Report  
   - FY13-14 Caltrans Transportation Planning Grants  
   *Information (David Sosa/ Charles Lau)*  
   *10 min*

8. CTC Update  
   *Information (Patricia Chen)*  
   *10 min*

9. Short Range Transportation Plan  
   *Information (Rena Lum)*  
   *5 min*
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong> 2013 Call for Projects</td>
<td>Information <em>(Rena Lum)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10 min</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> Sepulveda Pass Corridor System Planning Study</td>
<td>Information <em>(Roger Martin)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10 min</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> City of Long Beach Bike Infrastructure and Safety</td>
<td>Information <em>(Allan Crawford, City of Long Beach)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>20 min</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong> New Business</td>
<td>Discussion <em>(Subcommittee)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5 min</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.</strong> Adjournment</td>
<td>Action <em>(Subcommittee)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1 min</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next meeting of the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee will be held on February 21, 2013 at 9:30 a.m. on the 15th Floor, William Mulholland 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/)
Attachment 2

Subcommittee Actions
Disposition of January 2013 Subcommittee Actions

Bus Operations Subcommittee:

- Approved minutes for December 4, 2012
- Adopt a position that the new Bus and Bus Program Fund Section 5339 be allocated 100% to the Capital Allocation Procedure (CAP) and 5307 Funds continue to be allocated through the CAP without an off-the-top set-aside for JARC and Metro and Municipal Operators can continue to implement JARC programs including, if possible, operating funds at their discretion
- Approved nominations for Joyce Rooney (Chair), Ian Dailey (Vice-Chair) and Lois Smith (Secretary)
- Approved new TAC alternates: Susan Lipman for Joyce Rooney and Jane Leonard for Ian Dailey
- Moved to convene a Working Group to help modify the current inter-agency transfer policy

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:

- Approved minutes for November 29, 2012

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:

- Approved minutes for November 15, 2012
- Approved nominations for Bahman Janka (Chair) and Steve Forster (Vice-Chair)

TDM/Air Quality Subcommittee:

- Did not meet in January
Attachment 3

January 2, 2013 TAC Minutes

January 2, 2013 Sign-In Sheets

TAC Member Attendance
Wednesday, January 2, 2013 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
Bus Operations Subcommittee (BOS) (Joyce Rooney)
- Last meet on December 4, 2012
- Alva Carrasco announced her resignation from the City of Montebello. Elections for new TAC representation will occur during the January meeting.
- Subcommittee discussed Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century (MAP-21) funding allocations
- Next meeting will be held on January 15, 2013

Streets & Freeways (Nancy Villasenor)
- Last met on November 15, 2012
- Beginning in February, Nancy Villasenor will provide agenda reports to TAC in place of Carlos Rios.
- Next meeting is scheduled for January 17, 2013

TDM/Air Quality
- Did not meet in December

Local Transit Systems (LTSS) (Ryan Thompson)
- Last met on November 29, 2012
- Update on:
  - MAP-21 funding allocations
  - Transit security and MTA citation procedures
- Next meeting is scheduled for January 17, 2013.

3. Chairperson's Report (Fanny Pan, MTA)
A handout was distributed in lieu of an oral report. Ms. Pan announced that Zaki Mustafa (City of Los Angeles) is replacing Kang Hu as one of the primary TAC representatives for the
City of Los Angeles. Ken Husting will become the alternate. David Sosa (Caltrans) is a new TAC member representing Caltrans, and Vijay Kopparam will remain as the alternate.

Larry Stevens (League of California Cities, San Gabriel Valley COG) asked if Item #80 on the December Board recap pertains to new billboards or to the replacement of old billboards? Renee Berlin (MTA) clarified that the contract is for advertisements on Metro bus and rail cars, as opposed to billboards.

4. Consent Calendar
A motion to approve the November 7, 2012 minutes was made by Mohammad Mostahkami (League of California Cities, Gateway Cities COG) and seconded by Robert Brager (League of California Cities, Las Virgenes Malibu COG). Paul Maselbas (County of Los Angeles) and John Walker (County of Los Angeles) abstained. The minutes were approved with no objections.

5. Welcome Remarks (Martha Welborne, Executive Director of Countywide Planning)
Ms. Welborne welcomed everyone back for the New Year and thanked everyone for their hard work.

6. Changes to Measure R Local Return Guidelines (Terry Matsumoto, MTA)
Mr. Matsumoto reported that MTA has updated guidelines and procedures for Cities and the County that want to borrow against their Measure R Local Return funds. Essentially this is a procedural matter, as the policy statement is already clear that jurisdictions are permitted to borrow using Measure R funds. Mr. Matsumoto stated that as the changes are a deliberative process, he is only presenting a draft of the guidelines at this point, and will seek concurrence at a later date so that he can take it to the Board for adoption. He stated that he will incorporate certain revisions to the draft guidelines (an email containing the revised draft guidelines was sent to TAC members on January 3, 2013).

Joyce Rooney (BOS) stated that when the guidelines were originally drafted, a Working Group comprised of LTSS and BOS members worked on drafting some of the language. She asked if MTA’s intent is to submit the revised draft back to the Subcommittees for review? Mr. Matsumoto responded that he would abide by whatever TAC would like to do.

Alex Gonzalez (LTSS) asked if the draft guidelines will be taken to the Board before TAC and the Subcommittees have a chance to comment? Mr. Matsumoto responded no, he will wait until TAC convenes the Working Group and reaches concurrence. Ms. Pan stated that a Working Group can be formed in the next two weeks and Mr. Matsumoto will bring the item back to TAC in February.

7. Measure R Highway Operational Improvements Project List (Arroyo Verdugo, Las Virgenes/Malibu, and South Bay Subregions) (Lan Saadatnejadi, MTA)
Ms. Saadatnejadi stated that MTA has been working with the Arroyo Verdugo, Las Virgenes/Malibu and South Bay Cities Subregions to develop a list of new projects to utilize the Measure R Highway Operational Improvements subfunds for the second five years (FY-2015 to 19). The first five years of projects has been programmed, and projects are being
implemented. The list of projects will be submitted to the Board for approval, and once approved, the Cities will be eligible to receive Measure R subfunds.

Ms. Pan (MTA) stated that the project list will be available by the end of next week and will be emailed to the TAC members.

8. CTC Update (Patricia Chen, MTA)
Ms. Chen reported that at its December 5th meeting, the CTC:

- Approved all nine actions to address Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) savings issues affecting the I-5 North and South projects. The actions restore $167 million of a potential $178 million loss. Item 25 from the December 2012 Board Report contains further information;
- Anne Mayer, Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), announced that they are opening bids for the Metrolink 24-mile Perris Valley Line Extension from Downtown Riverside to Perris;
- Mark Watts, Executive Director of Transportation California, spoke about an initiative to increase the vehicle license fee, reinstating it to 1.65% of the vehicle value. The increased fee would be dedicated to reducing congestion by improving and modernizing transportation systems through augmenting the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP); and
- Next meeting is January 8, 2013. The deadline for requests for the March 5, 2013 meeting is January 7, 2013.

9. 2013 Call for Projects (Rena Lum/Diego Cardoso, MTA)
Ms. Lum informed the Committee that the 2013 Call for Project (Call) applications are due to MTA by January 18, 2013 at 3 P.M. The drop-off location for the applications will be the Plaza level of the Metro Headquarters building, and not the mail room as in previous years. Potential Transportation Alternative (TA) funded projects (bike, pedestrian and Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) modes) are required to submit their Scope of Work (SOW) and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) Transportation Enhancement (TE) application to the Community Conservation Corps (CCC) for review. Successful sponsors may also need to submit the updated TE application in October 2013. Ms. Lum briefly reviewed the Call schedule which calls for Board approval of the modal funding marks in the spring. In June, staff will present the preliminary project recommendations to the Board. Final recommendations will be taken to the Board for adoption in September 2013.

Mr. Cardoso stated that the TEA program was changed by MAP-21 to “Transportation Alternatives”. The TEA, Safe Routes to School and Recreational Trails programs have been combined under MAP-21. Overall funding has been cut by about 10%, with 50% of the new program allocated to the State and 50% to be allocated through the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO). TEA is still in effect for the duration of 2013 and it is unclear if a new federal program will be implemented in the near future. Therefore, it is important to focus on projects in 2013. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has indicated that they will give priority to TEA funded projects to which MTA has already committed.
money. MTA will work with SCAG and those localities that have projects programmed in 2013 to keep those projects moving.

Ferdy Chan (City of Los Angeles) asked if projects are ineligible for TA funding under the new guidelines, will MTA swap TA money with local money if the project is viable? Mr. Cardoso responded that he has been working on a solution to program funds in order to reduce the impact as much as possible.

Mr. Chan stated that there are some compatibility issues when using a different version of Microsoft Word to complete the 2013 Call application. Ms. Lum responded that they strongly encourage applicants to use the online application and that the Word document is meant as a back-up.

10. Short Range Transportation Plan (SRTP) (Rena Lum, MTA)
Ms. Lum reported that MTA staff is working on the Financial and Travel Demand Modeling. Some of the short-term challenges staff faces are funding for operations and maintenance as well as the State of Good Repair. MTA may be reaching out to the COGs again to request their project lists for inclusion in the subregional elements of the SRTP. The final staff recommendations will reflect the Board adopted priorities and sequencing consistent with Measure R and the 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). MTA staff hopes to complete a draft SRTP by Fall 2013 and outreach will be conducted with all subregions at that point.

11. LACMTA Green Construction Policy (Cris Liban, MTA)
Mr. Liban discussed the timeline of the Green Construction Policy Implementation over the last year and a half. During this timeframe, there have been nine reconstruction policy trainings geared towards helping local partners understand Green Equipment regulations as well as educate them on what the Policy is about. The intent of the training was to prepare the region for the ongoing and upcoming regulations the Air Resources Board (ARB), Air Quality Management District (AQMD) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have in effect. Many of the EPA and ARB regulations begin in 2014.

Mr. Liban stated that in May 2012, MTA completed a Metro Projects Cost and Compliance Analysis. Based on this analysis, MTA’s threshold for compliance internally was $2-3 million. At this point, it is unclear if this figure is significant outside of the organization and additional analysis is being completed to determine if this threshold is something other jurisdictions should consider.

Mr. Liban stated that in September 2011, there was evidence that some of MTA’s equipment and projects were not in compliance. As a result, MTA initiated an ARB Compliance Review and it found that MTA was generally in compliance. As an option of the review, MTA did a full inventory of all equipment. This inventory is currently being completed and should be available to the public by the end of January.

Mr. Liban stated that the website for the Metro Green Construction Policy is almost complete and should be live by the end of January 2013. He will navigate through a complete website tour at the next TAC meeting.
Mr. Liban stated that the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor project is the first major capital project that contains Metro Green Construction Policy provisions. In February 2013, MTA will provide an oral update to the Board of Directors on the implementation of the Green Construction Policy for MTA Projects and projects that are constructed on MTA right-of-way.

Mr. Mostahkami asked when the Crenshaw/LAX project will be going out for bid? Mr. Liban responded that the bids were due on December 6, 2012, and the contract will be awarded in the Spring of 2013.

Mr. Mostahkami asked how MTA will evaluate the differences in results between projects that use the green construction methods versus those that do not? Mr. Liban responded that MTA is implementing the policy in such a way that there is no incentive for the contractor to use green equipment. The actual bid itself is a form in which the contractors must include all pieces of equipment they foresee using during the project. During project implementation, MTA staff and consultants will be inspecting for compliance with AQMD, EPA or ARB standards. If found not to be in compliance, there are a series of steps MTA will take in order to ensure compliance.

12. Airport Metro Connector (Cory Zelmer, MTA)
Mr. Zelmer reported that in October 2012, the Board of Directors approved a motion directing staff to provide a report on how MTA could accelerate the Airport Metro Connector Project so that revenue operations could begin in 2020. The Crenshaw/LAX Project provides a starting point for which the Airport Metro Connector line can connect passengers from the area of Aviation/Century to the LAX terminals. The LRTP allocated $200 million through Measure R to support this project. Additional funding sources, primarily from the Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA), need to be identified and secured to accelerate revenue operations by 2020.

Mr. Zelmer reported that the Alternatives Analysis (AA) study was completed in April 2012. The environmental document has been put on hold at the request of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) until LAWA completes their Specific Plan Amendment Study (SPAS). Staff is currently working with LAWA on the Airport Metro Connector and will eventually coordinate with the FAA and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to initiate the environmental process. LAWA recently announced that they are moving forward with their preliminary recommendations for the SPAS Locally Preferred Alternative.

13. Sepulveda Pass Corridor Systems Planning Study (Roger Martin, MTA)
Mr. Martin stated that the Sepulveda Pass Study Corridor extends for 30 miles from the San Fernando Valley to LAX. As part of this study, MTA looked at transit, highway and combinations of both. As this is only a feasibility study, an AA and eventually an environmental study will be required to move forward with any of the concepts identified in this study.

Mr. Martin reported that the study findings show that up to 49% of the traffic through the Sepulveda Pass enters or exits between the US-101 and the I-10 Freeways. Capacity upgrades would therefore best serve this 9-10 mile segment. Findings also show that study concepts could accommodate increases in travel through the Sepulveda Pass of between 11% and 29%.
Mr. Martin stated that on December 13, 2012, the Metro Board approved the Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor as a candidate for further consideration as a Public-Private Partnership (P3) delivery project. More information on the Study can be found at http://www.metro.net/projects/sfv-405/sepulveda-pass-corridor-systems-planning-study-fcr/.

14. Metro ExpressLanes Update (Kathleen McCune, MTA)
Ms. McCune reported that the High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes have been in operation on the I-110 Freeway since November 10, 2012. The largest issue has been getting the word out that drivers need a FasTrak to use the new ExpressLanes. FasTrak customer rates continue to rise. The HOT lanes on the I-10 are entering system testing. MTA anticipates that the I-10 ExpressLanes will be operational before the end of February 2013. The second lane of the project has already been opened for traffic and MTA hopes to see freeway efficiency improvements.

With regards to other Congestion Reduction Demonstration (CRD) program elements, Ms. McCune stated that all transit partners are operating their buses on the I-110 since the November 10, 2012 opening. Once the I-10 HOT lanes open, Foothill Transit will be operating the CRD funded buses for the 1-year demonstration project. The El Monte station opened in October 2012 and has been doing well and all of the transit improvements funded through the CRD program are also up and running. The LADOT Express Park program has finished the first two phases of their program. They are now starting Phase three, which is primarily installing dynamic message signs.

Mr. Chan stated that the second lane on the I-10 has worked very well in reducing traffic congestion. He asked how the Caltrans 2-passenger carpool lane between Baldwin Park and the I-605 will connect with the new ExpressLanes. Ms. McCune responded that during the construction of the ExpressLanes, the Caltrans carpool lanes will have to merge into the general purpose lanes. However, the Caltrans carpool lanes will connect with the ExpressLanes after construction is completed.

15. Legislative Update (Michael Turner/Marisa Yeager, MTA)
Mr. Turner and Ms. Yeager did not report.

16. Other Business
Marianne Kim (Automobile Club of California) distributed the 2013 Traffic Legislation Report depicting all changes to the California vehicle code. Ms. Kim also noted that the speed setting guidelines/policies are available and will bring copies to the next TAC meeting.

17. Adjournment
Ms. Pan reported that the next regularly scheduled TAC meeting is February 6, 2013 in the Gateway Plaza Conference Room, on the 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>BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (BOS)</td>
<td>1. Dana Leg/Joyce Rooney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Alva Carrasco/Lois Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>1. Alberto Angelini/Jimmy Shih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. David Sosa/Vijay Kopparam</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. Nancy Villasenor/Dave Roseman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>1. James Lefton/Corinne Ralph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Zaki Mustafa/Ken Hustling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Ferdy Chan/Shirley Lau</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. Leon Freeman/Troy Evangelho</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>3. Robert Brager/Ramiro Adeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
<td>4. Nicole Rizzo/Mike Behen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley COG</td>
<td>5. Larry Stevens/Craig Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td>6. Robert Newman/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Cities COG</td>
<td>7. Robert Beste/Ted Semaan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. David Feinberg/Sharon Perlstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE (LTSS)</td>
<td>1. Ryan Thompson/Kathryn Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Alex Gonzalez/Joe Barrios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (Metro)</td>
<td>1. Fanny Pan/Matthew Abbott Countywide Planning &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. John Drayton/Christopher Gallanes Metro Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY (SCERRA - Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Anne Louise Rice/Karen Sakoda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG -- Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Eyvonne Drummonds/Kathryn Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Warren Whiteaker/Annie Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Lupe Valdez/LaDonna DiCamillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/AIR QUALITY SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>1. Mark Yamarone/Phil Aker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Mark Hunter/Brooke Geer Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Bruins</td>
<td>LACBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jono Baghdarian</td>
<td>JB Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Meany</td>
<td>SRTSWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Kim/Stephen Finnegan (A)</td>
<td>AUTO CLUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Rooney/Susan Lipman (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Dailey/Jane Leopard (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgt. Cindy Pontes/Ofc. Christian Cracraft (A)</td>
<td>CHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto Angelini/Jimmy Shih (A)</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Sosa/Vijay Kopparam (A)</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Blackman/John Whitbread (A)</td>
<td>CITIZEN REP ON ADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Villasenor/Mark Christoffels (A)</td>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Lefton/Corinne Ralph (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaki Mustafa/Ken Husting (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferdy Chan/Shirley Lau (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon Freeman/Troy Evangelho (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Walker/Allan Abramson (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Mostahkami/Rita Amiri (A)</td>
<td>GATEWAY CITIES COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Brager/Ramiro Adeva (A)</td>
<td>LAS VIRGENES MALIBU COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Behen/Nicole Rizzo (A)</td>
<td>NORTH L.A. COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Stevens/Craig Bradshaw (A)</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL VALLEY COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Newman/Randy Artex (A)</td>
<td>SAN FERNANDO VALLEY COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick DeChellis/Paul Maselbas (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kriske/Dennis Woods (A)</td>
<td>ARROYO VERDUGO CITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Mostahkami/Rita Amiri (A)</td>
<td>GATEWAY CITIES COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Drayton/Christopher Gallales (A)</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyvonne Drummonds/Kathryn Higgins (A)</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Whiteaker/Annie Nam (A)</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupe Valdez/LaDonna DiCamillo (A)</td>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Yamarone/Phil Aker (A)</td>
<td>TDM/AQ SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hunter/Brooke Geer Person (A)</td>
<td>TDM/AQ SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Post Measure J
SUBJECT: POST MEASURE J

ACTION: APPROVE POST MEASURE J ACTIONS

RECOMMENDATION

Approve continuation of first, second, and third decade Measure R project development work while we seek a viable financial strategy to allow acceleration of Measure R projects.

ISSUE

Among the referenda on the November 6, 2012 ballot was Measure J, which would have extended the 2008 voter approved Measure R half-cent sales tax for an additional 30 years and would have allowed for the acceleration of construction on transit and highway projects in Los Angeles County. While 66.11% of 2.8 million Los Angeles County voters were in favor of Measure J, the measure still failed because it was approximately 16,000 votes short of the required two-thirds vote necessary for special purpose tax measures.

Since the passage of Measure R in 2008, through various LACMTA Board of Directors (Board) actions and adopted policies, staff was directed to proceed with the planning and environmental analysis of all Measure R projects including those scheduled for delivery in the second and third decades, with the hope that financing could be secured to deliver these projects earlier than scheduled in the adopted 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Without Measure J, however, alternative strategies must be explored to comply with the direction of the Board.

DISCUSSION

The Measure R expenditure plan included 12 transit projects and 16 categories of highway projects to be delivered over its 30 year time frame. The transit projects are more defined than the highway projects, in that specific project scope, cost, sequencing and delivery dates were identified. This sequencing was adopted by the Board in the 2009 LRTP and a cost control process and policy was adopted in March 2011.
Based on Board direction, planning and environmental work was budgeted and then began on the 12 transit projects and 16 highway categories while viable acceleration strategies were concurrently explored. In April 2010, the Board adopted a policy defining the parameters for staff to evaluate viable acceleration strategies for the Measure R projects. Per Board direction, only strategies which enabled the full 30 years of projects to be delivered in 10 years were pursued. To this end, planning and environmental work began on the 12 transit projects and 16 highway categories.

Of the Measure R transit projects, several first decade projects are either opened, under construction or about to start construction. These first decade projects are all proceeding. Several of the second and third decade transit projects, however, are now well along in the planning phases and are at critical milestones where a decision to proceed with work or not is needed. (See Attachment A for the current status of Measure R transit projects.)

As for the Measure R highway projects, four of the 16 categories are fully funded in the first decade and construction is underway. The remaining 12 project categories are either divided into smaller projects for implementation in accordance with the adopted LRTP, or in the planning or environmental phases positioned for advancement through Public-Private Partnerships (P3) without impacting other projects in the adopted LRTP. (See Attachment B for the current status of Measure R highway categories.)

Concurrent with the project development efforts, various financial mechanisms and approaches were developed and proposed to the federal government and others. These included: the potential of P3 for both transit and highway projects, expanding the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) program, creating a Master Credit Agreement (MCA) as part of the TIFIA program, and creating a Qualified Transportation Improvement Bond (QTIB) program. There were also efforts to attract low interest loans from sovereign wealth funds, and proposals were reviewed from various underwriting firms for combined borrowing against Measure R and Propositions A and C funds. The most recent attempt to increase MTA's bonding capacity and to accelerate all projects was the Measure J proposal combined with TIFIA.

Without Measure J, some combination of these previously explored strategies or new strategies will be needed to accelerate the Measure R program of projects. For example, the passage of Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) by the U.S. Congress this year included both an expansion of the TIFIA program and allowed the use of MCAs for a program of projects. Building upon this partial success will require a new strategy, in combination with the TIFIA enhancements. The specific strategic options for acceleration are discussed below.

Continued Acceleration Options

The Board can instruct the staff to continue to explore acceleration through some or all of the following strategy options or it could decide to suspend these efforts.
Creation of a Federal America Fast Forward Transportation Bonds Program

The portion of the LACMTA America Fast Forward initiative that did not get adopted into law in MAP-21 was our policy proposal to create a new class of qualified tax credit bonds for transportation projects, both highway and transit. To date, Congress has authorized qualified tax credit bond programs totaling in excess of $35 billion for forestry, conservation, renewable energy projects, energy conservation, qualified zone academies and new school construction. The creation of an America Fast Forward Transportation Bond program would represent a sixth class of qualified tax credit bonds. The new bond program would be national in scope, with a proposition that the U.S. Congress authorize $45 billion for America Fast Forward allocated evenly at $4.5 billion annually. Previously, this proposal faced a series of challenges in the U.S. Congress, especially from those officials in the U.S. House and Senate who were skeptical of creating a new sixth class of qualified tax credit bonds. We are eager to again advance the idea of establishing and funding an America Fast Forward Transportation Bonds program during the anticipated lame-duck session of the 112th Congress this November and the coming 113th Congress.

Focus on Future Federal Transportation Authorization

MAP-21 is a two-year authorization that expires on September 30, 2014. Discussions concerning an extension are expected to begin in Congress almost immediately. Staff will continue to work with our Federal partners to create new authorization that best meets the needs of our Board-approved LRTP.

Further Exploration of P3 Opportunities

In September 2008, the Board adopted a P3 Workplan which set the stage for identifying P3 candidates from among the projects included in the 2009 LRTP. The P3 program has placed particular emphasis on identifying projects that could attract private investment capital and thus allow for accelerated and less expensive project delivery. P3s are primarily a financing and delivery system that may allow accelerated project delivery through flexible financing and leveraging of public funds. However, P3s may also provide significant project funding in cases where new sources of revenue, such as net-positive user charges or tolls, can be generated by the project.

In June 2012, an initial screening of P3 candidate projects was presented to the Board. Through that screening process as well as subsequent exploration, the P3 program has thus far generated Business Plans for six of the Measure R projects, and recommendations are being provided for the following highway and multi-modal projects to be delivered as P3s to accelerate their delivery: High Desert Corridor, SR 710 North Gap, I-710 South Freight Corridor, the Accelerated Regional Transportation Improvements (ARTI) bundle of highway projects, and the Sepulveda Pass Corridor. If directed by the Board, staff will pursue these projects as P3s and any others where net-positive user charges or tolls could be generated by a project.
For some of the highway projects, implementation of tolling strategies on managed lanes and/or truck-only lanes can generate significant new revenue and accelerate projects, in addition to positively affecting congestion. Utilizing low interest loans and flexible repayment terms are opportunities provided by P3 project delivery methods, due to the new revenue streams that can supplement funding provided through Measure R, Propositions A and C, and TIFIA.

**Combination of Borrowing from Propositions A and C with Long-Term Bonds**

Long-term borrowing in combination with TIFIA enhancements will require an alternate source of funds in the years beyond 2039, the current end date for Measure R. Without Measure J, only those portions of Propositions A and C that are not needed for local return, operations, and state-of-good repair could be used. However, if the Board of Directors were to assume that a ballot measure similar to Measure J were to pass before 2039, then Proposition A and C funds anticipated to be needed for operations and state of good repair could be pledged now in anticipation of realizing voter approval of such a ballot measure. Since over half of the Measure R transit project costs are for underground work, and Proposition A and C cannot be used for such work, there are a number of issues to be worked out between the various local, state, and federal funding rules before we can thoroughly brief the Board of Directors on the viability of these options. We anticipate being in a position to brief the Board in March 2013.

**Further Discussions with Sovereign Wealth Funds**

We had previously determined that a series of sovereign wealth fund loans over an entire decade for approximately $8 billion averaging at a 2.17% rate of interest would be sufficient to accelerate all 12 transit projects in Measure R. However, favorable terms for a loan of this size were not available from any of the sovereign wealth funds we met with late in 2011. The Board could ask us to offer better terms to such lenders, such as participation in the work to be performed, to attract the low interest loans required. To the extent that a project has federal funds included, however, we would not be able offer such favorable terms due to federal requirements.

**Pursue Various Actions with the State of California**

In November, both Los Angeles and Alameda County voters considered but ultimately did not pass local sales tax measures. In both cases the votes were within one percent of the 66.67% margin to approve such measures. Since that time a number of transportation stakeholders in California have discussed the possibility of lowering the vote threshold for transportation specific taxes to 55%. On Monday, December 3, 2012, State Senator Carol Liu introduced SCA 4 which would do exactly that. The measure will now proceed through the legislative process and Metro staff will bring it to the Board for their consideration. If the measure is approved in this legislative session it would not be on a ballot until 2014. Additionally, transportation stakeholders in California are also discussing a number of additional measures such as transportation related fees and a
potential bond measure all of which could help to accelerate completion of Metro’s Board approved program of projects.

Create Another Acceleration Measure for a Future County Ballot

With statewide interest in lowering the vote threshold for transportation specific taxes to 55%, efforts could be initiated to create another acceleration measure for the County ballot in 2014. MoveLA and other organizations which supported Measure J are already proceeding to undertake steps to initiate a future campaign.

Continued Advancement of Second and Third Decade Projects

With the likelihood that one or more of the acceleration options listed above will be successful within the next few years, the Board should also instruct the staff to continue to advance second and third decade projects so that they will be ready to proceed into construction when funds are available. The status of individual projects is described below.

Westside Subway

There are three sections of the Westside Subway Extension. All three sections were included in the Final Environmental Impact Statement/Report (FEIS/R) that was certified by the Board and approved by the FTA. This project is moving toward construction and without Measure J or its replacement, only the first section to La Cienega can be built in the first decade. The remaining sections would be built in the second and third decades. The Transit Project Delivery Department will proceed with the procurement of a Design/Build contractor for the first section only, and with the negotiation of a Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) for that section (with provisions for FFGA amendments to cover the future sections). Construction on the first section is expected to start in the spring of 2014. Since a Federal Record of Decision has been received, staff recommends that it would be in MTA’s best interest to finalize the PE (already well underway) in order to complete the Design/Build packages for Sections 2 and 3 so they are ready for advertisement when funding sources are identified. There is a high probability of losing the engineering talent working on this project if design is stopped on Sections 2 and 3 immediately. Staff estimates that $16.1 million will be required to complete this work. (Approval of the finalization of PE for Sections 2 and 3 of the Westside Subway Extension is the subject of a separate board report.)

Airport Metro Connector

The Airport Metro Connector project is a second decade project in the LRTP. However, the Measure R Expenditure Plan allows for the acceleration of this project if the Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) provides funding. The Alternatives Analysis phase of work has been completed and was received by the Board in April 2012. We have not begun the draft environmental analysis due to on-going discussions with LAW, the FTA, and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). Recently, LAWA committed to
using an Automated People Mover (APM) within the Central Terminal Area and they identified three potential locations where the APM could connect with Metro's light rail system. Therefore, staff recommends that we continue to work with LAWA and continue with the technical analysis that will become the basis of the draft environmental work. The environmental work will begin once the FTA and FAA give clearance to begin. At the December 2012 Board meeting, staff was instructed to study the possibility of using a P3 approach in order to accelerate this project. That study will also be undertaken.

**South Bay Green Line Extension**

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Bay Green Line Extension has been completed and is being reviewed by the FTA. In order to proceed with this project, we need to get the agreement of the FTA to distribute the DEIS/R to the public even though a viable financial plan for acceleration is not yet in place, which is required by the FTA. The staff recommendation is to work with the FTA to determine a path that will allow the project to move forward. This may include proceeding with public distribution and review of the DEIS/R, followed by proceeding with final environmental work and initiation of Advanced Preliminary Engineering. Staff estimates that $13 million will be required to complete this work.

**Eastside Gold Line Phase 2 Extension**

The Eastside Gold Line Extension Phase 2 is in much the same situation as the South Bay Green Line Extension. This project is also a third decade project and its DEIS/R is being reviewed by the FTA and the Cooperating agencies. As above, in order to proceed with this project, we need to get the agreement of the FTA to distribute the DEIS/R to the public even though a viable financial plan for acceleration is not yet in place. Similar to the South Bay Green Line Extension, the staff recommendation is to work with the FTA to determine a path that will allow the project to move forward. Staff estimates that $15 million will be required to complete this work.

**West Santa Ana Branch**

The West Santa Ana Branch Corridor is the Los Angeles County portion of a 34-mile corridor that also stretches into Orange County. This project is a second decade project. SCAG is leading the AA work on this project because it spans two counties. The AA phase of work is complete and will be taken to the SCAG Regional Council in February 2013. If the SCAG Regional Council approves the AA recommendations, we assume that Metro would then lead further efforts on the portion of the Corridor in Los Angeles County, and OCTA would lead any further efforts in Orange County. The staff recommendation is to begin work on an Alternatives Analysis Refinement Study on the Los Angeles portion of this project once SCAG has approved AA. Staff estimates that $4 million will be required to complete this study.
Sepulveda Pass Corridor

The last of the twelve Measure R transit projects is the Sepulveda Pass Corridor. We have completed the Systems Planning Study and have identified the possibility that there is potential for new revenues from net-positive user charges or tolls. At the December 2012 Board meeting, the Board approved proceeding with testing the viability of a P3 approach through the selection of a private sector developer for the project through a Pre-Development Agreement. With private sector financing, there is the possibility that the project can be accelerated. Any private sector financing would be based on anticipated revenues generated from a toll facility that would link the San Fernando Valley to the Westside. If a P3 effort can fully finance this project, it is possible that the Measure R funds budgeted ($1 billion) could be reallocated to other projects.

Highway Projects

Countywide Soundwall Construction

Complete the on-going construction projects and continue to explore the feasibility of constructing Packages 10 and 11 as part of the bundled highway improvement projects in the Accelerated Regional Transportation Improvements (ARTI) package using P3 as a delivery mechanism.

Interstate 5 Capacity Enhancement from I-605 to Orange County Line

Complete the on-going construction projects on the first four segments and work with the State of California and the Gateway Cities subregion to identify funding options for the last segment.

Highway Operational Improvements in Arroyo Verdugo (AV) and the Las Virgenes/Malibu (LV/M) subregions

Complete the delivery of the Board approved project list and continue to work with the AV and LV/M subregions to develop new project lists for the un-defined portion of Measure R.

Interstate 405, I-110, I-105, and SR-91 Ramp and Interchange Improvements (South Bay [SB])

Complete the delivery of the Board approved project list and continue to work with the SB subregions to develop new project lists for the un-defined portion of Measure R.

Interstate 5 North Capacity Enhancements from SR-14 to Kern County Line

Complete the construction of Phase 1 (truck lanes from SR-14 to Pico Canyon), continue to explore feasibility of delivering Phase 2a (High Occupancy/Express lanes...
from SR-14 to Parker Road) as part of the ARTI package using P3 as a delivery mechanism.

**Interstate 605 Corridor “Hot Spot” Interchanges**

Continue to work with the Gateway Cities subregion to identify, develop and deliver new projects consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

**State Route 710 North Gap Closure**

Complete the environmental document consistent with the LRTP.

**Interstate 710 South and/or Early Action Projects**

Complete the environmental document for I-710 South and the delivery of the Board approved list of I-710 Early Action Projects consistent with the LRTP.

**State Route 138 Capacity Enhancements**

Complete the delivery of the Board approved project list.

**DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

The recommended actions will not impact the safety of our employees and/or customers.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

For the Measure R transit and highway programs combined, the FY 2013 budget includes over $200 million for planning, environmental clearance, and preliminary engineering from various funds sources. This level of commitment was established consistent with delivering projects on an accelerated schedule. Going forward, it is anticipated that the continuation of these budgeted expenditures would be supported by the U.S. DOT if they believe that a promising accelerated financial plan has been identified and is under development. If the Board continues to favor acceleration for all projects, then identifying a viable acceleration strategy will become increasingly urgent as we near final environmental clearance for projects in the second and third decade. After environmental clearance, it is estimated that these documents will have a shelf-life of approximately three years.

Pending direction from the Board, each Department Head will be responsible for returning to the LACMTA Board of Directors with project specific budget revisions that reflect this continuation of our project development strategy.
ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board could decide not to continue the planning and environmental analysis on all Measure R second and third decade projects pending the identification of specific financing mechanisms to deliver these projects early. In the near term, this alternative is not recommended since we anticipate aggressively pursuing a viable financial plan. Pursuing this alternative should only occur when the Board determines that a viable project acceleration strategy does not exist.

The Board could also decide not to pursue P3 as a mechanism to advance project delivery. This alternative is not recommended since the Board would forego opportunities for new revenue sources that could close the gaps in several key transportation improvement projects in Los Angeles County.

NEXT STEPS

If instructed by the Board, staff will complete the phases of work on the second and third decade projects, as described in this report. We will also meet with the various project stakeholders and community groups involved with each project to inform them of the status and revised schedules of each project. Staff will also keep the Board apprised of the status of each project as work is finalized.

In March 2013, we will return to the Board with a specific path forward for project acceleration.

ATTACHMENTS

A. Status of Measure R Transit Projects
B. Status of Measure R Highway Categories

Prepared by: Martha Welborne, FAIA, Executive Director, Countywide Planning
(213) 922-7267
Douglas R. Failing, P.E. Executive Director, Highway Program
(213) 922-6840
David Yale, Executive Officer, Countywide Planning
(213) 922-2469
Renee Berlin, Executive Officer, Countywide Planning
(213) 922-3035
Lan Saadatnejadi, Executive Officer, Highway Program
(213) 922-7337
Michael Turner, Director, State Affairs
(213) 922-2122
Raffi Haig Hamparian, Director, Federal Affairs
(213) 922-3769
Kathleen Sanchez, Manager, Public-Private Partnership Program
(213) 922-2421
Martha Welborne, FAIA
Executive Director, Countywide Planning

Douglas R. Failing, P.E.
Executive Director, Highway Program

K. N. Murthy
Executive Director, Transit Project Delivery

Arthur T. Leahy
Chief Executive Officer
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East San Fernando Valley North-South Rapidways
SUBJECT: EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY NORTH-SOUTH RAPIDWAYS

ACTION: APPROVE CONTRACT MODIFICATION AND NAME CHANGE

RECOMMENDATION

A. Authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to:

1. Execute modification No. 2 to Contract No. PS-4370 2622 with KOA Corporation (Contractor) in the firm-fixed amount of $1,090,851 to complete the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the East San Fernando Valley North-South Rapidways project increasing the total contract value from $4,556,307 to $5,647,158;

2. Increase Contract Modification Authority to Contract No. PS4370-2622 with the Contractor in the amount of $218,170;

The Procurement Summary is provided as Attachment A.

B. Approve changing the name of the project from East San Fernando Valley North/South Rapidways to East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridors; and

C. Receive and file the alternatives being moved forward into the DEIS/R. Attachment B contains the Alternatives Analysis (AA) Study Executive Summary. The full report is available at www.metro.net/eastsfvtransit.

ISSUE

In May 2010, the Board directed us to serve as the lead agency for the environmental clearance for the East San Fernando Valley North-South Rapidways (Project). The City of Los Angeles is the co-lead. In April 2011, the Board approved a contract with KOA Corporation to complete the AA, DEIS/R and Conceptual Engineering (CE) for the Project. In March 2012, the Board was informed that during the outreach process, comments were received requesting an expansion of the study area to also evaluate Sepulveda Boulevard as well as Van Nuys Boulevard for possible alignments, and also to study the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station as a possible northern
origin/terminus point. Also, that contract modification No.1 for $449,941 was executed using Contract modification authority to complete the AA for the expanded study area.

As the Project transitions into its DEIS/R phase, a second contract modification is needed to extend the Project period-of-performance by 14 months and to enable the Contractor to environmentally clear sections of the expanded study area that are outside of the original study limits. These areas include: Sepulveda Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line (MOL), and an alignment along San Fernando Road that leads to the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station. Board authorization to execute the contract modification and increase the modification authority is being requested. In addition, Board approval is required to change the Project name to the “East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor” to eliminate confusion with the public and to clarify that the study considered a broad range of transit solutions. This report also provides the results of the AA study and the alternatives being advanced to the environmental review phase.

DISCUSSION

This Measure R Project is in the constrained element of the 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) with a revenue operation date of 2018. The study area extends approximately 11 miles, bounded by Ventura Boulevard to the south and the I-210 Freeway to the north. East to west the study area extends approximately from Fulton Avenue to the I-405 Freeway. The population density and the transit dependent population density in the overall study area are both more than twice that of the densities of the urbanized area of Los Angeles County. The study area map is provided as Attachment C.

Alternatives Analysis Phase

As the initial phase in the project development process, the AA involves identifying a wide range of alternatives that can reasonably achieve the Project goal of improving north-south transit service in the heavily transit dependent eastern San Fernando Valley. In addition to the required Transportation System Management (TSM) and No-build alternatives, many build alternatives were considered that evaluated the following:

- **Modes:** Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Streetcar
- **Alignments:** Van Nuys Boulevard, Sepulveda Boulevard, or a hybrid of both
- **Configurations:** Median, curb, or side running

The AA phase used a two-tiered screening process. For Tier I, the feasibility of the various modes, alignments, and configurations were evaluated. The primary factor in this level of evaluation was whether the existing roadway width could accommodate the requirements of a dedicated transitway, while permitting a minimum of two through multi-purpose traffic lanes along with either on-street parking or a bike-lane.
The Tier II screening focused on understanding how the alternatives compared to one another in terms of basic characteristics, performance, and capital costs. Factors such as proximity to primary destination points, travel time savings, capacity, ridership, and preliminary planning level capital cost estimates were identified for each alternative.

Community Outreach

Our outreach to the general public and stakeholder groups has been robust with 10 Community Meetings held during the AA phase. Early in the process, three community meetings were held along the Van Nuys Corridor. Comments received from those meeting resulted in the study area being expanded to include the Sepulveda Boulevard Corridor and the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station as an alternate Project origin/terminus point. After the study area was expanded, three community meetings were held, two along the Sepulveda Boulevard Corridor and one in the City of San Fernando.

In October 2012, after the Project alternatives had been narrowed to six build alternatives, a series of four community meetings were held. In total, more than 175 stakeholders attended and approximately 660 comments were received providing input on modal, alignment, and configuration preferences. To advertise meetings, notices were placed in newspapers, take-ones were made available on area buses, project posters were placed in gathering spots throughout the study area, and flyers were hand delivered to high density locations. Social media such as a project web page, project video, Facebook page and Twitter feeds were also used to distribute information and to receive stakeholder input. We also presented the study at meetings hosted by other organizations including more than 20 stakeholder groups such as business groups, local government associations and neighborhood groups. In general, stakeholders preferred an alignment on Van Nuys Boulevard, the incorporation of bicycle facilities, and LRT as a mode.

Alternatives Advanced to the DEIS/R

Based on the technical analysis and stakeholder input, two build alternatives are being advanced to the draft environmental review phase (Attachment D):

- LRT – Extends along Van Nuys Boulevard from Ventura Boulevard north to San Fernando Road. The alignment would turn northwest on San Fernando Road and transition to Truman Road before terminating at the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station; and
- BRT – Includes a primary alignment that would extend along Sepulveda Boulevard from Ventura Boulevard north to the Metro Orange Line (MOL), then turn east along the MOL to Van Nuys Boulevard. From there it would proceed north on Van Nuys Boulevard to San Fernando Road where it would transition into mixed-flow lanes for its final leg to the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station. Additionally, variations of the alignment to be advanced include:
terminating dedicated bus service at the Van Nuys, or Sepulveda Boulevards MOL stations.

During the DEIS/R phase, appropriate phased implementation options also may be explored.

Alternatives Eliminated from Further Analysis

The following alternatives were eliminated from advancing into the DEIS/R process:

- **Streetcar** – It was determined that due to operation in mixed flow traffic, this mode would not increase operation efficiencies. Although it operated on tracks similar to LRT, the mode lacked the speed and capacity improvements that LRT realized. It also had little community support;

- **Sepulveda Boulevard** – Other than the southern segment, this alignment failed to link with many primary destination points, would realize less boardings than an alignment primarily on Van Nuys Boulevard, and was opposed by the community in the northern section of the alignment;

- **I-210 Freeway Terminus Point** – An alignment to this location failed to link with local/regional bus or rail service and lacked the ridership potential when compared with an alignment terminating at the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink station. The Station provides regional and local linkages, a park-and-ride, bus layover facilities, and garnered greater community support;

- **Curb and side running configurations** – The median running configuration proved most advantageous in terms of operation efficiencies and safety as curb and side running configurations would conflict with motorists navigating right turns into numerous businesses, driveways and at intersections.

Funding

The Constrained element of the 2009 LRTP reserves $170.1 million for the Project. For the alternatives advanced to the DEIS/R phase, preliminary capital cost estimates range between $250 million (BRT) and $2.3 billion (LRT) Year of Expenditure 2018 dollars. Given the significant funding shortfall associated with the alternatives, opportunities for cost reductions and project phasing will need to be identified during the DEIS/R phase and subsequent project development phases. The Project could be eligible for Federal Small Starts funds, which can be pursued for projects costing less than $250 million.

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

The requested Board actions have no impact on the safety of our employees or patrons.
FINANCIAL IMPACT

The FY13 budget contains $3,104,419 to complete the AA and initiate the DEIS/R, including community outreach. Funding is included in cost center 4370, project 465521 (East San Fernando Valley North-South Rapidways). Since this is a multi-year project, the Cost Center Manager and Executive Director Countywide Planning will be responsible for budgeting costs in future years.

Impact to Budget

The source of funds is Measure R Transit Capital dollars designated for the Project. These funds are not eligible for bus and/or rail operating and capital expenses.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board could choose not to authorize the CEO to execute the contract modification and contract modification authority. This is not recommended as this is a first decade Measure R project and not authorizing the contract modification would delay the Project’s environmental clearance.

The Board also could choose not to change the Project’s name. This option is not recommended as the word “rapidway” confuses the public and does not reflect the complexity of the options being considered.

NEXT STEPS

Upon Board approval, we will execute the contract modification with the Contractor and will coordinate with the Federal Transit Administration to initiate the federal environmental clearance process. We will incorporate the name change into all Project materials. As the study progresses, we will update the Board.

ATTACHMENTS

A. Procurement Summary
B. Alternatives Analysis Study Executive Summary
C. Study Area map
D. Build Alternatives to be advanced to the DEIS/R phase

Prepared by: Alan Patashnick, Director, (213) 922-3080
Renee Berlin, Executive Officer, (213) 922-3035
Jody Feerst Litvak, Community Relations Manager, (213) 922-1240
Michelle Lopes Caldwell  
Chief Administrative Services Officer

Martha Welborne, FAIA  
Executive Director, Countywide Planning

Arthur T. Leahy  
Chief Executive Officer
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January Board Report

Regional Airport Connectivity Plan
SUBJECT: REGIONAL AIRPORT CONNECTIVITY PLAN

ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE

RECOMMENDATION

Receive and file this report responding to the July 26, 2012 Board Motion directing staff to develop an Implementation Plan that addresses rail connections to five Southern California airports: Burbank Bob Hope (BUR), Long Beach (LGB), LA/Ontario International (ONT), Los Angeles International (LAX) and LA/Palmdale Regional (PMD).

ISSUE

On July 26, 2012, the Board approved a motion (Chair Antonovich) directing the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to prepare a Regional Airport Connectivity Plan (RACP) that would integrate our region’s airports into our regional transportation system. The RACP incorporates a review of current and future transit options, input from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) on funding and support, a response from Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) on expediting construction of the Airport Metro Connector, and an overview of coordination and funding with partner agencies. Attachment A contains the RACP.

DISCUSSION

Approach

The approach to developing the RACP is to set the foundation for continued efforts to improve airport connectivity. Staff reviewed the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), SCAG 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) and had discussions with various departments within our agency and with the airports’ staff to gather information on other projects addressing ground access. From this, projects have been identified for each of the five airports and categorized into one of five phases: existing, approved (in implementation phase), environmental phase, LRTP constrained and other opportunities.
The RACP incorporates input from various external agencies and constituencies. Input was also gathered from each of the Service Sector Councils in September. Throughout this period we also consulted with SCAG staff and its Aviation Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) as well as with the airport authorities and FAA. Input received from these sources included updates on existing transit services and plans for future transit services, requirements for accessibility when transferring between airport terminals and rail stations, clarifications on current projects and their status, suggestions for how to connect key corridors, and information regarding new facilities such as parking structures and consolidated rental car facilities in various stages of development.

Coordination with SCAG is especially important, as SCAG has responsibility for regional planning for airports and associated airport ground access. It is thus important to build upon SCAG’s efforts, especially as they relate to the comprehensive update of the Aviation Work Program and the Airport Ground Access Element being undertaken for the 2016 RTP/SCS. This will avoid duplication of work programs and initiatives.

Current Planning Efforts Affecting Airport Connectivity

**Burbank Bob Hope (BUR)**

BUR benefits from having two Metrolink corridors, the Antelope Valley and Ventura County Lines, within one mile of the airport. In addition, BUR provides van service through a contract with SuperShuttle to both the downtown Burbank Metrolink Station and the North Hollywood Station (for connections to the Metro Red Line and Metro Orange Line). Projects currently underway leverage existing Metrolink rail corridors to further improve rail transit connectivity with BUR. The Regional Intermodal Transportation Center (RITC) is being constructed by the airport and accommodates a bus transfer facility. In addition, the new Metrolink Hollywood Way Station and the Antelope Valley Line Infrastructure Improvement Strategy will also improve rail connectivity with BUR. Currently in the environmental phase is the California High-Speed Rail – Los Angeles to Palmdale corridor, with a station in the vicinity of Hollywood Way under consideration. Finally, new planning efforts, such as the airport authority’s Ground Access Study and Metro’s Countywide Bus Rapid Transit and Street Design Improvement Study (BRT/SDIS) may identify future opportunities. The Ground Access Study is the more definitive guide for ground transportation at BUR and is scheduled to begin in early 2013 and be completed in summer 2014. The findings of the BRT/SDIS are expected to be presented to the Board in Spring 2013.

**Long Beach (LGB)**

LGB has the farthest distance from the nearest rail transit line and station (Metro Blue Line Willow Station is 4.3 miles away) among all five airports. In addition, LGB has the lowest current passenger volume (3.0 million annual passengers) among the four operating airports and has a cap on the total number of daily flights (41) that restricts its future growth. Transit access to LGB is primarily by three local bus connections to the nearest existing rail stations and downtown Long Beach. Two of the routes operated by Long Beach Transit have low service frequencies in off-peak times (once an hour).
and do not operate on weekends. In 2013, Long Beach Transit will commence a new service, Route 176, that will also serve the LGB terminal. Given the distance of LGB to existing rail systems and the limitation on flights, the market to support rail service is limited.

LA/Ontario International (ONT)

ONT has several commuter rail lines with at least three rail stations nearby. There are three projects that would improve rail connectivity between ONT and the regional rail network. The San Bernardino Line Strategic Study is underway to identify infrastructure improvements that would improve service on the Metrolink San Bernardino Line and is scheduled to be completed in late 2013. The implementation of the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extensions 2A, 2B, and 2C would provide a direct rail connection between ONT and many parts of the San Gabriel Valley. Phase 2A is under construction and the other two phases are in various stages of planning with funding for construction yet to be determined. In addition, the current alignment of the California High Speed Rail – LA to San Diego Corridor would run adjacent to ONT and the California High Speed Rail Authority has undertaken an Initial Ontario Airport Study, which is examining the feasibility of locating a High Speed Rail station at ONT. The City of Ontario has been discussing the possible transfer of the airport with LAWA, the current owner/operator. The results of these discussions could impact future ground transportation strategies.

Los Angeles International (LAX)

LAX is currently connected by bus shuttles to the Metro Green Line and to the LAX City Bus Center located near Lot C and by three FlyAway bus services to regional destinations around Los Angeles County. The Metro Green Line connection is being improved by the Metro Crenshaw/LAX Line, which is scheduled for award of a design/build contract in 2013, with completion targeted for late 2018. Upon completion of the Metro Crenshaw/LAX Line, a new station located at the intersection of Aviation and Century Boulevards (Aviation/Century) will be 1.5 miles from the LAX Central Terminal Area (CTA) and will be connected to the CTA by bus. LAWA’s Specific Plan Amendment Study (SPAS) and Metro’s Airport Metro Connector project are concurrently exploring connections to the CTA from the Aviation/Century Station. MTA and LAWA are working together to develop mutually agreeable solutions at LAX. LAWA has identified three general areas (Crenshaw/LAX Aviation/Century Station, eastern edge of the Central Terminal Area (either at the site of their existing Administration Building or adjacent to Terminal 1, or an intermediate location near their proposed Intermodal Transfer Facility) for a potential connection between our light rail system and their proposed Automated People Mover (APM) system. We are continuing our technical work with LAWA to explore these locations. Attachment B contains the letter from LAWA.
Access to PMD by rail is primarily by the Metrolink Antelope Valley Line, which lies three miles to the west of the airline terminals. There is currently no scheduled airline service at PMD. Improvements to transit at PMD primarily focus on regional and long-distance rail service. The Antelope Valley Line Infrastructure Improvement Strategy, with initial findings presented to the Board in March 2012, is being pursued to implement infrastructure improvements that would improve rail service, enhance safety, and reduce travel times on the Metrolink Antelope Valley Line. Two other projects are in the environmental phase. The California High Speed Rail – Los Angeles to Palmdale corridor is considering a station in the vicinity of the Metrolink Palmdale station. The High Desert Corridor project, currently in the draft environmental clearance phase, has alternatives that provide a high-speed rail connection to either or both the California High Speed Rail project/Metrolink and XpressWest, a proposed high-speed train service to Las Vegas. The draft environmental documents are scheduled for release in late 2013. Finally, the City of Palmdale is anticipated to assume ownership of the terminal and parking lots at PMD from LAWA (summer 2013). The City has expressed a desire to undertake a Ground Access Study, once the transfer is finalized.

Partner Agencies Coordination and Funding Efforts

SCAG

SCAG is the major partner in planning for ground transportation access to airports on a regional scale. SCAG is beginning an update to its RTP/SCS, which is scheduled for adoption in 2016. This will involve a major update to its Aviation Work Program, and especially to the Airport Ground Access Element, which reviews the existing ground access systems and identifies highway, arterial, local street and public transportation projects that have the potential to improve ground access to all airports in the region. To support this effort, SCAG will soon be forming an Aviation Subcommittee to its Transportation Committee to guide the Regional Aviation Work Program for the 2016 RTP. Among its technical efforts, SCAG will be updating their Airport Passenger Demand model which evaluates ground access needs at each of our region’s airports. Staff will work closely with SCAG during the preparation of the 2016 RTP/SCS Airport Ground Access Element. We will also transmit to SCAG the RACP for potential incorporation into their effort.

Airport Authorities and FAA

Coordination with local airport authorities, with oversight by FAA, is required to advance projects and secure funding. Only airport owners can initiate decisions to move forward with projects on their property and to apply for authority to use airport-related funds. The use of airport-related funds such as the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) and Passenger Facility Charges (PFC) is overseen by FAA and is tightly defined by federal regulations. At a minimum, projects must be determined to support the capacity, safety,
or security of the affected airport. FAA will need to be consulted on a case-by-case basis as projects advance.

Report from LAWA

LAWA provided a letter explaining their efforts in support of its commitment to a robust connection between LAX and the Metro Rail system (Attachment B). LAWA is currently developing and will be adopting a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for their SPAS EIR in early 2013. Final action on the SPAS by the Board of Airport Commissioners, the City of Los Angeles Planning Commission, the Los Angeles City Council, and the County Airport Land Use Commission is anticipated by summer 2013. Representatives from LAWA are anticipated to be present at the January 24, 2013 Board meeting to provide further updates on the status of their efforts.

General Themes for Airport Ground Access Improvements

In considering the entire picture concerning ground access improvements at airports, the following should be considered:

- There is much work already underway on extending rail transit to airports and improving existing transit options in general (including both bus and rail). A number of projects, either directly related to airport connections or indirectly related, are already under construction or are in the environmental review phase, with various target completion dates. Other projects have been identified in strategic planning efforts. Planning studies are underway that may provide greater clarity on appropriate investments to serve regional airports and will be brought to the Board upon completion.

- The busiest airports with the highest number of flights and annual passengers demonstrate the strongest potential ridership for supporting the development of rail transit connections. There is a significant range of passenger volumes at airports. LAX has the highest at 61.8 million annual passengers (MAP). LGB has the lowest among operating airports at 3.0 MAP. PMD has no scheduled commercial flights operating now.

- There are changing institutional structures at a number of airports. Both ONT and PMD have been managed by LAWA as part of a regional airport system. At PMD, LAWA is in the process of transferring the facility to the City of Palmdale. Local governments within San Bernardino County near ONT are also advocating for a similar change in management. Changes in management present an opportunity to strategically re-assess the ground transportation access to these airports and to address changes in passenger volume that may result from the evolving roles of the airports.

- Partnerships have been key to advancing a number of projects that will improve airport connectivity. Partnerships have been developed and coordination among
agencies is already occurring between MTA and the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority on the BUR Ground Access Study, the Regional Intermodal Transportation Center (RITC) project, and the Metrolink Antelope Valley Line Hollywood Way Station. In addition, MTA and LAWA are working together to ensure provisions are in place for the Crenshaw/LAX Line for future ground access improvements to the LAX terminals and on the Airport Metro Connector project to bring rail into the terminals.

NEXT STEPS

Staff will work closely with SCAG during the preparation of the 2016 RTP/SCS Airport Ground Access Element. We will also be meeting with the various Councils of Governments (COGs) to obtain input on rail connectivity to the airports in their respective sub-regions. Furthermore, we will continue our partnership with the various airport authorities and cities as their respective Ground Access Studies and airport capital projects move forward. As the various studies progress, we will keep the Board updated. Additionally, recommendations generated from the studies will be considered, as appropriate, in future updates of the LRTP.

ATTACHMENTS

A. Regional Airport Connectivity Plan
B. Letter from LAWA

Prepared by: Chris Haskell, Transportation Planning Manager, (213) 922-6908
Roderick Diaz, Director, (213) 922-3018
Renee Berlin, Executive Officer, (213) 922-3035
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January Board Report

I-605 Hot Spots Feasibility Study
SUBJECT: I-605/SR-91/I-405 CORRIDORS “HOT SPOTS” FEASIBILITY STUDY - FINAL REPORT AND PROJECT DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE

RECOMMENDATIONS

Receive and file I-605/SR-91/I-405 Corridors "Hot Spots" Feasibility Study and project development strategy.

ISSUE

Measure R designated $590 million for congestion “hot spots” relief improvements along the I-605, SR-91 and I-405 Corridors in the Gateway Cities subregion. In September 2010, the Board awarded a contract to RBF Consulting to complete a feasibility study of I-605 and traversing corridors (I-405, SR-91, I-105, I-5 and SR-60) to identify congestion “hot spots” and develop preliminary improvement concepts. The study also included major arterial intersections adjacent to the freeways. The feasibility study was completed in December of 2012. A series of capacity and operational improvement concepts were developed to address congestion “hot spots” along these corridors.

These preliminary improvement concepts were packaged according to five general congestion areas identified by the study (each congestion area contained more than one “hot spot”, see Attachment C). Preliminary improvement concepts were also developed for 33 arterial intersections in the Study Area. The I-605/SR-91/I-405 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the I-605 Corridors Cities Committee (CCC) approved the results of the Feasibility Study and recommended proceeding with the preparation of Project Study Reports – Project Development Support (PSR-PDS) documents for the four preliminary improvement concept packages that are within the Gateway Cities subregion. The preparation of these PSR-PDS will allow Metro and the Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG) to identify individual improvement projects that can be funded through Measure R.
BACKGROUND

The I-605/SR-91/I-405 Corridors "Hot Spots" Feasibility Study is a corridor improvement planning effort that built on all of the previous study investments made by Metro and the GCCOG. The SR-91/I-605 Needs Assessment Study (2005) and the SR-91/I-605/I-405 Initial Corridor Studies (2007) concluded that significant growth in traffic volumes were going to generate severe congestion hot-spots throughout the Gateway Cities corridors and that substantial transportation system improvements would be necessary to mitigate the capacity and operational deficiencies. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and a Corridor Cities Committee (CCC) were formed by the SR-91/I-605/I-405 corridors cities to provide technical and policy direction for the development of future transportation improvements. A city consultation process was initiated, which yielded the SR-91/I-605/I-405 Guiding Principles approved by the Gateway Cities COG Board of Directors in 2007. These studies provided a foundation for understanding the mobility demands of the three freeway corridors, the complete range of multi-modal improvement needs, and how the improvement projects should be shaped to accommodate the needs and concerns of the Gateway Cities.

Measure R designated $590 million for congestion “hot spots” relief improvements along the I-605, SR-91 and I-405 Corridors in the Gateway Cities subregion. In September 2010, the Board awarded a contract to RBF Consulting to complete a feasibility study of I-605 and traversing corridors (I-405, SR-91, I-105, I-5 and SR-60) to identify congestion “hot spots” and develop preliminary improvement concepts.

Feasibility Study

The SR-91/I-605/I-405 Congestion Hot Spots Feasibility Report (Feasibility Report) has been prepared to achieve four principal objectives:

1. Identify freeway and arterial transportation projects that most effectively reduce existing and forecast congestion in the SR-91/I-605/I-405 corridor (See Attachment A);
2. Develop a recommended hybrid master plan of proposed freeway improvement concepts to identify congestion “hot spots” freeway improvement projects that can deliver the maximum benefit with a good cost/benefit assessment;
3. Recommend freeway transportation improvement projects for immediate advancement to the first phase of the formal Caltrans project development process, the Project Initiation Document (PID) phase; and
4. Provide Metro and the Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG) a long-range transportation planning and project development management tool.

The direction (guiding principles) of the I-605 CCC elected officials with respect to the freeway was to improve the freeways but stay within the existing State R/W. Therefore, as a starting point geometric plans for the freeways in the study area were developed as follows.
Using a comprehensive amount of existing traffic data, the project team completed an analysis of existing and future forecast traffic operations and mapped existing accident locations and rates for all freeways in the study area. Each of the congestion “hot spots” for the existing and no-build alternative were identified, located and quantified.

The project team then developed improvement concept plans, which include freeway widening (where feasible), auxiliary lanes, interchange reconfigurations, ramp closures (limited locations) and operational improvements. In select locations, where studied freeway improvements were determined to be of limited value to congestion relief, no existing or no-build conditions were maintained. Meetings were then held with the TAC members to review, provide input and comments and to finalize these freeway concepts and also proposed intersection improvement plans for the forty most congestion intersections within the study area (see Attachment A). Preliminary cost estimates were prepared for all improvement concepts by freeway corridor and by segment within each freeway corridor to estimate rough order of magnitude cost estimates of individual component parts of the freeway corridors. The estimated total project cost to improve the three freeway corridors is $2.2 – 2.7 billion.

An effectiveness analysis of the freeway improvement concepts was performed to determine how each concept improves (or provides a solution for) the specific congestion problem area, and the magnitude (or extent) of the congestion improvement. Attachment B illustrates the results of this analysis.

From the improvement concept plans for all three corridors, individual congestion hot spot "relief" projects were developed and then analyzed together. This analysis was then used to develop a list of recommended projects for project development packages.

As part of the Feasibility Study, a high-level assessment was also conducted to evaluate the inter-relationships between the GCCOG projects and aid in the development of the concept plan. Further detailed work on those interrelationships between GCCOG and adjacent subregions will be performed in the upcoming Gateway Cities Transportation Strategic Plan Phase II and help the subregion in determining future transportation infrastructure investments in the Gateway Cities.

**Project Development Packages**

The PSR-PDS is an initial scoping resourcing document that must identify the key issues of the transportation deficiency, any major elements that should be investigated and the resources needed to complete the Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA&ED) studies for any subsequent projects.

The recommended PSR-PDS project development packages are illustrated in Attachment D and include:

- Congestion Area No. 1 for the SR-91/I-605 Interchange
- Congestion Area No. 2 for I-605 from the SR-91 Interchange north to the Gateway Cities boundary
• Congestion Area No. 3 for the I-710/SR-91 Interchange
• Congestion Area No. 4 for the I-405/I-605 Interchange
• Congestion Area No. 5 for I-605 north of the Gateway Cities Boundaries

Project Development Strategy

Measure R only provides $590M for these improvements, which is well short of the total project costs. For now, with the TAC and the CCC recommendations, staff will move forward with the preliminary freeway improvements for more detailed planning, environmental analysis and/or initial design as follows:

• Prepare PSR-PDS documents for Congestion Area No. 1 (SR-91/I-605 Interchange area) and Congestion Area No. 2 (I-605, SR-91 Interchange to Gateway Cities Boundary)

• Defer preparation of PSR-PDS for Congestion Area No. 3 (I-710/SR-91 Interchange area) until a Preferred Alternative for the I-710 Corridor Project is identified and approved;

• Defer PSR-PDS for Congestion Area No. 4 (I-405/I-605 Interchange area) until OCTA finalizes its decision on improvements to I-405 in Orange County and continue coordination with City of Long Beach and Gateway Cities Council of Governments on proposed freeway improvement options.

• Transmit information for Congestion Area No. 5 (I-605/SR-60) to San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments for their information and use.

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

The I-605 Hot Spots Feasibility Study – Final Report will have no impact on safety of Metro’s patrons or employees.

NEXT STEPS

• Prepare Project Study Report-Project Development (PSR-PDS) documents for Congestion Area No. 1 (SR-91/I-605 Interchange area) and Congestion Area No. 2 (I-605/I-105/I-5, north to the Gateway Cities boundary);

• Defer preparation of PSR-PDS for Congestion Area No. 3 (I-710/SR-91 Interchange area) until the I-710 Corridor Project design is confirmed;

• Coordinate with OCTA, GCCOG, South Bay COG, City of Long Beach and Caltrans on a project development strategy for Congestion Area No. 4 (I-405/I-605
Interchange area). This strategy will have to consider OCTA's final decision on improvements to I-405 in Orange County and the results of Metro's I-405 Express Lane Feasibility Study.

- Transmit information for Congestion Area No. 5 (I-605/SR-60) to San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

The existing RBF contract contains contract options to complete up to three Project Initiation Documents for the next steps. Metro staff will proceed, under the authority provided to the CEO at the award of the existing RBF contract (No. PS4603-2582), to negotiate and execute these contract options to prepare PSR-PDS. Furthermore, Metro staff will continue to work with the GCCOG and the TAC and CCC to continue advancing arterial improvement projects.

ATTACHMENT

A. I-605/SR-91/I-405 Corridors Feasibility Study Area Map
B. Freeway Congestion Hot Spot Segment Improvement Analysis Summary Map
C. PSR-PDS Congestion Areas Recommendations Map

Prepared by: Lucy Olmos, Transportation Planner (213) 922-7099
Ernesto Chaves, Transportation Planning Manager (213) 922-7343
Douglas R. Failing, P.E.
Executive Director, Highway Program

Arthur T. Leahy
Chief Executive Officer