Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

William Mulholland Conference Room

1. Call to Order/Roll Call  
Action (Fanny Pan, Brian Lam)

2. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees  
   Bus Operations  
   Local Transit Systems  
   Streets and Freeways  
   TDM/Sustainability  
   Attachment 1: Subcommittee Agendas  
   Attachment 2: Subcommittee Actions  
   5 min

3. Chairperson's Report  
   • March Board Recap (Handout)
Information (Fanny Pan)

4. Consent Calendar  
   • Approval of Minutes  
   Attachment 3: Draft March 4, 2015 Minutes
Action

5. TIMED AGENDA 9:40-9:55 AM  
   TOD Grant Round 4 Appeals  
   Attachment 4: TOD Planning Grant Guidelines  
   Attachment 5: Appeal Protocol  
   Attachment 6: Project Fact Sheets
Action (Elizabeth Carvajal/Rufina Juarez)

6. Countywide Strategic Truck Arterial Network  
   10 min
Action (Philbert Wong)

7. Approval of Appeal Process for FTA Section 5310  
   Attachment 7: Draft Appeal Guidelines  
   10 min
Action (Annelle Albarran)

8. Wayfinding Signage Pilot Grant Program Guidelines  
   Attachment 8: Draft Guidelines Summary  
   10 min
Action (Fulgene Asuncion)
9. Metro Long Range Transportation Plan Update  
   Information  
   (Robert Calix/Steven Lee)  
   5 min

10. Call for Projects  
    Information  
    (Rena Lum, Brad McAllester)  
    5 min

11. Complete Streets Policy Update  
    Attachment 9: Complete Streets Resolution (Sample)  
    Attachment 10: Complete Streets Recommended  
    Information  
    (Tham Nguyen)  
    10 min

12. SCAG 2016 RTP/SCS Update  
    Information  
    (Courtney Aguirre, SCAG)  
    5 min

13. Cap and Trade Update  
    Information  
    (Will Ridder/Jacob Lieb)  
    5 min

14. CTC Update  
    (Handout to be distributed in lieu of oral report)

15. Legislative Update  
    Federal  
    Information  
    (Michael Turner/Raffi Hamparian)  
    State  
    15 min

16. Other Business

17. Adjournment

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

Please call Brian Lam at (213) 922-3077 or e-mail lamb@metro.net with questions regarding the agenda or meeting. The next meeting will be on May 6, 2015 at 9:30 a.m. in the William Mulholland Conference Room.

Please note that the May 6, 2015 meeting will include the 2015 TAC Call for Projects Deobligations Appeals and will likely last until the afternoon.
Attachment 1

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

3. Metro Report
   (5 minutes) Information
   Annelle Albarran

4. Approval of February 17, 2015 Minutes
   (1 minute) Action
   BOS

5. Revised Guidelines for FTA 5307 Discretionary Funds Allocation
   (5 minutes) Information
   Joyce Rooney/Jane Leonard

6. FTA Update
   (10 minutes) Information
   Jonathan Klein/Charlene Lee Lorenzo

7. Coordinated Plan for Los Angeles County
   (10 minutes) Information
   Ashad Hamideh

8. Section 5310 Appeals Process
   (5 minutes) Information
   Annelle Albarran
9. Regional Transfer Policy Update
   (10 minutes) Information
   Kelly Hines

10. Cap and Trade Program
    (15 minutes) Information
    Jacob Lieb

11. Transportation Development Credits
    (Toll Credits)
    (10 minutes) Information
    Jeeseong Chung

12. Access Services Update
    (10 minutes) Information
    Andre Colaiace/Eric Haack

13. Legislative Update
    (15 minutes) Information
    Raffi Hamparian/Marisa Yeager
    Michael Turner/Patricia Soto

14. FAP Required Documents
    (5 minutes) Information
    Carlos Vendiola

15. New Business
    Information
    All

16. Adjournment

Information Items:

   90-day Rolling Agenda  
   Summary of Invoices FY 2015  
   Summary of EZ Pass Invoices  
   Subsidy Matrix FY 2015  
   TDA-STA Capital Claims  
   TDA-STA Claims  
   Regional Pass Sales

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

Please call ANNELLE ALBARRAN at 213-922-4025 or JOHN GREEN at 213-922-2837 if you have questions regarding the agenda or meeting. The next BOS meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 21, 2015, at 9:30 am in the Mulholland Conference Room, 15th Floor of the Metro Headquarters Building.
NOTE TIME: 1:30 PM

Thursday, March 19, 2015, 1:30 P.M.

Agenda – REVISED 2

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE

TAP Conference Room – 4th Floor

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes – (Handout)

3. Regional Transfer Policy

4. LRTP/Ballot Measure – This was approved by email

5. Access Service Petition for Rulemaking

6. FTA Section 5310 Program Appeals Process

7. NTD Update

8. Prop A 5% Incentive FY16 - 2nd DRAFT

9. New Business, Date of Next LTSS Meeting

Action
Sebastian Hernandez, Chair

Action
Sebastian Hernandez, Chair

Discussion
Kelly Hines, Metro

Information
Sebastian Hernandez, Chair

Action
Eric Haac, Access Service

Action
Annelle Albarran, Metro

Information
Pari Ahmadi, Metro

Information
Susan Richan, Metro

Sebastian Hernandez
Agenda

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

*Mulholland* Conference Room, 15th Floor

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

2. Approval of Minutes  
   Attachment 1: February 19, 2015 Minutes  
   Attachment 2: Sign-in Sheet/Attendance Sheet  
   Attachment 3: 90-Day Rolling Agenda  
   Action *(Subcommittee)*

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

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

5. Caltrans Update  
   5 min  
   Information *(Caltrans)*

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

7. Countywide Strategic Truck Arterial Network  
   10 min  
   Action *(Philbert Wong)*

8. Call for Projects Update  
   10 min  
   Information *(Rena Lum)*
9. Metro Long Range Transportation Plan Update  
   Information (Robert Calix/Steven Lee)

10. SCAG Regional Transportation Plan Update  
    Information (Courtney Aguirre - SCAG)

11. Cap and Trade Overview  
    Information (Jacob Lieb)

12. Connected Vehicle Projects in Los Angeles  
    Information (Kiel Ova – Traffic Technology Services, Inc.)

13. Complete Streets Policy Update  
    Information (Tham Nguyen)

   Attachment 4: Complete Streets Resolution (Sample) 
   Attachment 5: Complete Streets Recommended Elements

14. CTC Update  
    Information (Patricia Chen)

15. Active Transportation Program Update  
    Information (Patricia Chen/Erina Hong)

16. Transportation “101” – Gas Tax Basics  
    Information (Patricia Chen/Waqs Rehman – LA County)

   Attachment 6: State Gas Tax Chart

17. New Business  
    5 min

18. Adjournment  
    1 min

The next meeting for the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee will be held on April 16th at 9:30 a.m. on the 15th floor, 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/
Disposition of Subcommittee Actions

March 2015

Bus Operations Subcommittee:

- Approved the:
  - February 17, 2015 meeting minutes; and
  - FTA Section 5310 Program Appeals Process
- Passed a motion to submit a letter of support on behalf of BOS to the Department of Transportation in support of Access’ Petition for Rulemaking.

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:

- Approved the:
  - February 26, 2015 meeting minutes;
  - Access Services Petition for Rulemaking; and
  - FTA Section 5310 Program Appeals Process

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:

- No actions were taken.

TDM/Air Quality Subcommittee:

- Did not meet in March.
Attachment 3

March 4, 2015 TAC Minutes

March 4, 2015 Sign-In Sheets

TAC Member Attendance
Meeting Minutes

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. Call to Order/Roll Call
Brian Lam (Alternate Chair) called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m., took roll and declared a quorum was present.

2. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees
   Bus Operations Subcommittee (BOS)
   - Last met on February 17, 2015
   - Received updates on:
     o Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2
     o Revised Guidelines for FTA 5307 Funds Allocation
     o Access Services
     o Cap and Trade
     o TAP
   - Next meeting is scheduled for March 17, 2015

   Local Transit Systems Subcommittee (LTSS)
   - Last met on February 26, 2015
   - Received updates on:
     o Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)/Potential Ballot Measure
     o Coordinated Plan
     o National Transit Database (NTD)
     o FY 16 Prop A 5% Incentive
   - Approved a motion to recommend the following to Metro and the LRTP/Ballot Measure TAC Working Group:
     o Current funding is not sufficient to meet the needs and projected growth for local transit operators. The Local Transit Systems Subcommittee is recommending that the Ballot measure and Long Range Transportation Plan include additional dedicated operating and capital funds to address the transit funding shortfall and transit service gaps in our communities as well as
support these systems providing regional connectivity and feeder service to transit in Los Angeles County.

- Next meeting is scheduled for March 19, 2015

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee
- Last met on February 19, 2015
- Received updates on:
  - 2015 Call for Projects
  - Metro Subregional Planning Area Boundary Changes
  - Regional Bikeshare
  - Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)
  - First/Last Mile Wayfinding Signage Pilot Grant Program
- Next meeting is scheduled for March 19, 2015

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Sustainability Subcommittee
- Last met on February 11, 2015
- Received updates on:
  - Cap and Trade
  - First/Last Mile Trainings
  - First/Last Mile Wayfinding Signage Pilot Grant Program
  - Urban Greening
  - Active Transportation Program (ATP)
  - LRTP/Potential Ballot Measure
- Approved revised TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee Bylaws
- Next meeting is scheduled for April 15, 2015

3. Chairperson’s Report (Fanny Pan, Metro)
A handout of the February 26th Metro Board meeting recap was distributed in lieu of an oral report.

Ms. Pan reminded TAC that the TOD Grant Appeals will occur during the April 1, 2015 TAC meeting. She reported that staff is preparing for the 2015 Call Recertification/Deobligation process. The TAC Call for Projects Deobligation Appeals will occur during the May 6, 2015 TAC meeting. Please be aware that this meeting will likely last until the afternoon.

Ms. Pan welcomed Anne Perkins-Yin (LTSS) who replaced Alex Gonzales as primary LTSS representative. Ms. Pan announced that Mark Hunter (City of Santa Clarita) will be replacing Sarah Magana Withers (City of Lynwood) on the LRTP/Potential Ballot Measure TAC Working Group.

4. Consent Calendar
A motion to approve the February 4, 2015 TAC minutes was made by Jane Leonard (BOS) and seconded by Mark Yamarone (TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee). The minutes were approved with no objections.
5. TDM/Sustainability Bylaws Revision (Mark Yamarone, TDM/Sustainability Chair)
Mr. Yamarone reported that the Subcommittee and staff have revised the TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee Bylaws to reflect the Subcommittee’s focus beyond air quality to the broader scope of sustainability. He noted that the membership of the Subcommittee had not changed.

Ms. Leonard asked if the Subcommittee will still acknowledge air quality elements and emission reduction? Mr. Yamarone replied yes.

Allan Abramson (County of Los Angeles) asked for a red-lined version of the Bylaws. Mr. Yamarone provided a red-lined version for review.

Ferdy Chan (City of Los Angeles) asked if these Bylaw changes only affect the TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee? Ms. Pan replied yes.

Motion
A motion to approve the revised TDM/Sustainability Subcommittee Bylaws was made by Joyce Rooney (BOS) and seconded by Marianne Kim (Automobile Club of California). The motion was approved with no objections.

6. Metro Long Range Transportation Plan Update (LRTP) (Robert Calix, Metro)
Mr. Calix reported that the LRTP team is coordinating with the Mobility Matrix team to incorporate the Subregional projects/programs identified in the Mobility Matrix into the LRTP update. Staff is currently preparing technical information such as demographics and growth projections that will support the LRTP. The LRTP update will take approximately two years.

7. FTA Section 5310 Update (Annelle Albarran, Metro)
Ms. Albarran reported that in January 2015, the Board directed staff to coordinate with TAC to establish an appeals process for all future competitive grant programs. This includes the FTA Section 5310 Program that provides funding to non-profit agencies and local government agencies for capital and operating projects for seniors and individuals with disabilities. Staff is currently finalizing the Section 5310 TAC Appeals Guidelines and will be seeking TAC approval at the April 1st meeting.

Ms. Pan asked when the FTA Section 5310 Appeals will be held? Ms. Albarran replied that applications are due on March 27, 2015 and the Appeals process would take place in June 2015.

Ms. Rooney asked if the FTA Section 5310 Appeals process is going to be similar to the TAC Call for Projects Appeal? Ms. Pan replied yes.

8. Coordinated Plan for Los Angeles County Update (Ashad Hamideh, Metro)
Mr. Hamideh reported that in accordance with Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), projects funded under the FTA Section 5310 Program must be included in a Coordinated Plan. To meet this requirement, staff has begun updating the 2008 Coordinated Plan to include 2016-2019. The Coordinated Plan will comprise of all urbanized areas (UZAs) within Los Angeles County which includes Lancaster-Palmdale, Los Angeles-Long Beach-
Anaheim, and Santa Clarita UZAs. There are four elements of the Coordinated Plan: 1) assess existing services and providers; 2) assess existing and future needs through 2019; 3) identify strategies, priorities or activities to meet those needs or gaps; and 4) to prioritize projects and activities for funding recommendation and project implementation.

Mr. Hamideh reported that the Coordinated Plan’s target populations are seniors, persons with disabilities, persons of low income, and veterans. Extensive outreach will be conducted with stakeholders. Nine stakeholder forums and community focus groups are currently scheduled throughout Los Angeles County: Lancaster – March 9th; Newhall, Santa Clarita – March 10th; West Covina – March 16th; Glendale – March 16th; Culver City – March 17th; Torrance – March 17th; Downey – March 18th; and Metro Headquarters – March 19th. Mr. Hamideh noted that staff is interested in hosting a forum in the San Fernando Valley and asked for volunteers in the San Fernando Valley who would like to host a forum and community focus group.

The Draft Coordinated Plan will be released for a 30-day public comment period in mid-May 2015. At that time, staff will conduct public hearings throughout Los Angeles County. Staff will go to the Board for adoption of the Coordinated Plan on July 23, 2015.

Sebastian Hernandez (LTSS) asked who is the target audience for the stakeholder forums? Mr. Hamideh replied that staff would like a mix of clients from the target populations (i.e., seniors, persons with disabilities, persons of low income, and veterans) to participate.

Ms. Kim asked how much space is needed for the forum and focus groups? Mr. Hamideh replied approximately 30 people for the forum and 20 people for the focus group.

Ms. Kim asked if the forum and focus groups have to be held in a public space? Mr. Hamideh replied no.

9. First/Last Mile Wayfinding Signage Pilot Grant Program (Teresa Wong, Metro)
Ms. Wong reported that on November 13, 2014, the Board directed the creation of a two-year Wayfinding Signage Pilot Grant Program to implement components of Metro’s First/Last Mile Strategic Plan. The Pilot Program provides $500,000 for FY 16 and FY 17 ($250,000 for each year). Staff is currently developing guidelines for project eligibility, scoring criteria, and the application process. Currently, eligible activities will include design, fabrication, and installation of wayfinding signage within one-mile of an existing Metro fixed guideway station that will be in operation by FY16. The evaluation criteria currently has five components: demonstration of project need, project readiness, consistency with Metro’s Station Wayfinding Guidelines, integration with other First/Last mile strategies, and local match. Staff anticipates seeking Board approval of the Guidelines in April 2015 (This was later changed to May 2015). There will be an outreach effort once the application is developed. The application is tentatively anticipated to be released in the summer. The pilot program will be evaluated at the end of the second year.

Ms. Pan commented that the TDM/Sustainability and Streets and Freeways Subcommittees have provided input on the draft program guidelines.
Larry Stevens (League of California Cities – San Gabriel Valley COG) asked is the grant for development of a wayfinding plan or implementation? Ms. Wong replied that the grant is for implementation.

Mr. Stevens asked for clarification on when the fixed-route station has to be operational to qualify for the grant? Ms. Pan replied by the end of FY 16 (June 30, 2016). A system map or list of eligible fixed guideway stations will be available once the application is finalized.

Mr. Stevens asked if this grant is only for wayfinding signage for Metro Rail? Ms. Pan replied Metro Rail, the Metro Orange Line, and Silver Line are eligible.

Ms. Rooney asked what are the funding years? Ms. Wong replied FY 16 and FY 17.

Mr. Stevens asked for clarification on what projects are eligible for the grant. Ms. Wong replied that the design, fabrication, and installation of new wayfinding signage is eligible. Maintenance or replacement of a sign is ineligible.

Mr. Hunter asked if Metrolink stations are eligible? Ms. Pan replied no, only Metro stations are eligible during the pilot program.

Arsen Mangasarian (City of Los Angeles) asked what the funding source is and why this grant is separate from the Call? Ms. Pan replied staff is still identifying the funding source. Ms. Wong added that the First/Last Mile Wayfinding Signage Pilot Grant Program was directed as a separate motion.

Mohammad Mostahkami (League of California Cities – Gateway Cities COG) asked does Metro have Wayfinding Signage Design Guidelines? Ms. Pan replied yes, the Station Wayfinding Signage Guidelines were sent to all jurisdictions in December 2014. (The Guidelines were redistributed to TAC members via email on March 4th)

Mr. Mostahkami asked what is the local match requirement? Ms. Pan replied that staff is still developing the criteria, but the current recommendation is 15% local match.

Valerie Watson (Pedestrian Coordinator) asked whether the signage is required to direct people to a Metro station or if it could also direct people to local destinations within walking distance to the station? Ms. Pan replied yes, the sign could also include wayfinding to local destinations in addition to the Metro station. If local destinations are included on the sign, Metro will fund a proportion of the sign rather than the entire sign.

Ms. Watson asked if all the typologies in the Wayfinding Signage Guidelines are eligible in the pilot grant program? Ms. Pan replied yes, but if directions to the Metro station are only a portion of a larger sign, Metro will only fund a proportion of the cost.

Mr. Abramson asked what are the goals of the Wayfinding Signage Guidelines? Ms. Pan replied that the guidelines aim to create a uniform, consistent messaging, increase visibility and awareness of transit stations.
Mr. Abramson asked if the Wayfinding Signage Guidelines are part of the overall uniformed station design work? Ms. Pan replied that the Wayfinding Signage Guidelines are for signage on non-Metro owned right-of-way (ROW). Mr. Abramson commented that the Wayfinding Signage Pilot Grant Program seems as though it provides funds for cities to provide wayfinding signage to Metro stations, but if the sign includes wayfinding to local destinations Metro will not fund that portion. Ms. Pan replied that she will review with management.

Ms. Watson encouraged Metro to edit the First/Last Mile Wayfinding Signage Pilot Grant Program guidelines to fully fund wayfinding signage that directs people to a Metro station as well as to local destinations since both destinations have a strong influence on people's accessibility to transit.

Ms. Leonard asked if Expo Line stations are eligible? Ms. Pan replied yes.

Mr. Abramson noted that some communities have developed identities in their signage for communities and are creating specialized wayfinding signage and logos for those communities. He asked if the wayfinding signs are required to follow the Metro Wayfinding Signage Guidelines? Ms. Pan replied that following the Wayfinding Signage Guidelines is at the city’s discretion, but additional points will be awarded during the evaluation process for signage that follows the Metro guidelines. (It was later clarified that Cities must follow the Metro Wayfinding Signage Guidelines in order to be eligible for the Wayfinding Signage Pilot Grant Program).

Mr. Stevens asked if TAC will be able to review, comment, and approve the Wayfinding Signage Pilot Grant Program Guidelines once they are finalized? Ms. Pan replied that staff is soliciting TAC feedback today, then will finalize the Program Guideline for Board approval in April.

Mr. Chan asked if this grant program can be used to supplement existing grants approved by Metro? Ms. Pan replied if a project received funding from the Call, that same project cannot be applied for through the First/Last Mile Wayfinding Signage Grant Program. Mr. Chan asked if a previously awarded project did not have a signage element, could the project seek funding through this grant? Ms. Pan replied that she will clarify this question in the guidelines.

Ms. Leonard requested that TAC be allowed to review the guidelines in order to provide more effective feedback. Ms. Pan replied that staff will check to see if the Board item can be postponed a month to allow for a more thorough TAC review. Ms. Watson echoed Ms. Leonard’s desire for TAC to review the draft guidelines before it is presented to the Board for approval. (The Board item was postponed until May)

Mr. Mostahkami commented that a competitive grant program may not be the most cost effective means to get Metro wayfinding signage installed. He recommended that Metro use this funding to hire a contractor to work directly with the cities to install signs.

Mr. Stevens commented that First/Last Mile planning should be implemented during the environmental review phase of the transit corridor projects so that the First/Last Mile
improvements are part of the project rather than an after-thought. He noted that First/Last Mile improvements should be a standard rather than a policy.

10. Call for Projects (Rena Lum, Metro)
Ms. Lum reported that staff is in the process of evaluating the 2015 Call for Projects applications received and is continuing to follow up on outstanding issues. Staff is ensuring all projects have a 20% minimum Local Match and that projects using Measure R Highway Operation Improvement Funds (MRHOIF) as a Local Match have identified only 20% of the total project cost, as MRHOIF cannot be used as an overmatch.

Staff anticipates that preliminary recommendations will be available in June 2015.

11. CTC Update (Patricia Chen, Metro)
Ms. Chen reported that the CTC did not meet in February. During the January 22, 2015 meeting, the CTC discussed the Board of Equalization change to the price-based excise tax on gas from $0.18 to $0.125 per gallon, which will impact the 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and FY 16 Highway Users Tax Account (HUTA). The Active Transportation Program (ATP) guidelines are scheduled for adoption on March 26, 2015.

Jessica Meaney (Investing in Place) reported that the Annenberg Foundation and LA n Sync is providing grant writing assistance to applicants who are submitting ATP projects within Los Angeles County. Applicants must apply for assistance by March 18, 2015.

Ms. Chen reported that the Cap and Trade Inter-City Rail Capital Program applications are due April 10, 2015 and Low Carbon Transit Operations Program applications are due April 15, 2015.

Mr. Chan voiced concern that Caltrans is conducting eligibility review for projects that have already been awarded or have funds allocated which has caused issues with certain projects. Ms. Watson suggested that the eligibility review should be done before any scoring takes place. Ms. Chen replied that she will voice these concerns to CTC staff.

12. Airport Metro Connector (Cory Zelmer, Metro)
Mr. Zelmer reported that on June 26, 2014, the Board selected a preferred alternative to be further evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Metro issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on February 6, 2015 to begin the environmental review process. Staff is coordinating closely with the Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) their landside Ground Access Plan which includes an Automated People Mover (APM).

The preferred alternative that the Board selected in June 2014 is for a new transit station located near Aviation Blvd. and 96th Street on the Crenshaw/LAX Line, which is scheduled to open for revenue operation in 2019. This new station would be located approximately one-quarter miles north of the planned Crenshaw/LAX Line Aviation/Century station. The location of this new station coincides with LAWA’s planned APM system. The LAWA APM will extend east from the LAX terminal area to a planned Intermodal Transportation Facility (ITF), cross Metro Rail at Aviation Blvd/96th Street, and end at a planned Consolidated Rent-a-Car facility
(CONRAC) located east of Aviation Blvd. Mr. Zelmer noted that an APM connection to an airport is fairly common and can be seen in San Francisco, Oakland, Phoenix, and Miami.

Mr. Zelmer reported that the new station is proposed to be served by the Crenshaw/LAX Line and the existing Green Line. Under the proposed operating scenario, the Green Line would provide two services, one that would extend north to serve the 96th Street Station and one that would continue south to Redondo Beach. Staff is also evaluating consolidation of the LAX City Bus Center and the bus terminal at Aviation/Imperial to the new transit center building at 96th Street. The preferred alternative will also include passenger pick-up and drop-off, pedestrian and bicycle amenities, and clear wayfinding signage. The transit center building may house functions that serve both Metro and LAWA and will connect Metro Rail and the LAWA APM together by housing the two systems in one building. A Request for Proposal (RFP) to procure design and engineering services for the transit center building was released on February 6, 2015.

Staff is working closely with LAWA to coordinate the environmental, design, and construction phases of the two projects.

Ms. Rooney asked if the existing LAX City Bus Center located at Lot C would be relocated under LAWA's plan? Mr. Zelmer replied that staff is proposing to relocate those services to the new AMC 96th Street Station. Staff is working with LAWA to preserve bus connections at the planned ITF, as there is a desire by municipal bus operators to maintain access and bus stops at the ITF.

Ms. Leonard asked if the proposed maintenance facility is for rail or bus? Mr. Zelmer replied that it is a light rail maintenance facility.

Mr. Stevens asked what are the projected costs? Mr. Zelmer replied that a cost estimate can be made once a design team begins more detailed design of the station. Mr. Stevens asked if the cost estimate will be within the $200 million funded by Measure R? Mr. Zelmer replied yes.

Mr. Stevens asked if the LAWA APM will be using Metro funds? Mr. Zelmer replied no. The APM is part of a larger program of airport improvements including terminal improvements, the ITF, and CONRAC. These improvements will be LAWA funded and will not use any AMC funding.

Ms. Rooney asked what year will the new station open? Mr. Zelmer replied that the LRTP has the AMC project scheduled for 2028, however, the Board has been interested in accelerating the project delivery date to 2019 in coordination with the opening of the Crenshaw/LAX Line. More recently, staff has analyzed opening in coordination with LAWA's APM in 2023. Mr. Zelmer noted that the Board will need to act on accelerating delivery to meet that timeframe.

Mr. Hernandez asked if the Board wants to open the station in 2019, but the APM will not open until 2023, how will airport bound patrons get from the new station to the terminal area? Mr. Zelmer replied under that scenario a shuttle bus connection will need to be utilized. Staff's report to the Board will detail the pros and cons of each project schedule.
13. Legislative Update (Raffi Hamparian/Marissa Yeager, Metro)

Federal

Mr. Hamparian reported that the Obama Administration launched a one year pilot program to permit local hiring for projects funded through the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The pilot program allows local hiring for transportation projects using Federal FY 15 funds. Metro’s Board of Directors has made federal local hire reform a priority since September 2011 by adding the goal of reforming federal local hire rules to the America Fast Forward initiative.

Mr. Hamparian reported that the President’s Budget included approximately $330 million in New Starts funds for Metro. The current extension of MAP-21 expires on May 31, 2015 and it is unclear whether Congress will adopt a long term surface transportation bill before the expiration. The Appropriations Process has begun and Congress is voting on a rail bill. An issue that will be addressed deals with grade separation projects, which have been grossly underfunded under MAP-21.

Ms. Kim asked how long is the local hire pilot program? Mr. Hamparian replied one year. Ms. Kim asked is there a cap on the number of projects allowed to qualify in the pilot program? Mr. Hamparian replied that he is unsure.

Mr. Mangasarian asked how close is the federal government to developing guidelines to govern autonomous vehicles? Mr. Hamparian replied that he has not heard of any laws regarding autonomous vehicles, but will update TAC when there is a notice of proposed rule making.

State

Ms. Yeager reported that the state successfully introduced over 3,000 bills during this year’s legislative session. Four notable bills that Metro is sponsoring include: SB 767, which will authorize another half-cent sales tax for transportation in Los Angeles County; SB 391, which will increase penalties for assaulting a transit operator; AB 318, which will expedite release of items in the lost and found program; and AB 754, which is currently a placeholder bill regarding exempting businesses near transit construction from taxes during construction.

Staff will report to the Board on March 19, 2015 to recommend action on the following bills: AB 194 – High Occupancy Toll lane authorization process (staff is recommending support of the bill); AB 210 – High Occupancy Vehicle access (staff is recommending to work with author); AB 318 – Lost and Found (staff is recommending support of the bill); AB 338 – potential sales tax measure (staff is recommending opposition of the bill); SB 9 – Cap and Trade for Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (staff is recommending support or work with the author).

14. Other Business

Mr. Mostahkami requested that a Cap and Trade update be added to subsequent TAC meetings in order to update the members on Metro’s plans for working and partnering with jurisdictions on obtaining future available Cap and Trade funds, and to provide updates on when additional Cap and Trade Investment Plan programs adopt their guidelines. (Item will be agendize for April TAC)
Ms. Leonard reported that April 9, 2015 is Stand Up 4 Transportation Day which encourages local counties, state, and national support to urge Congress for a long term transportation bill. APTA, Metro, and many local jurisdictions are involved.

**Adjournment**
Ms. Pan reported that the next scheduled TAC meeting is April 1, 2015 in the William Mulholland Conference Room, on the 15th floor. If you have questions regarding the next meeting, please contact Brian Lam at (213) 922-3077 or email lamb@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>BICYCLE COORDINATOR</td>
<td>1. Rich Dilluvio/Michelle Mowery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Joyce Rooney/Susan Lipman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Jane Leonard/Gloria Gallardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (BOS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>1. Alberto Angelini/Jimmy Shih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Vijay Kopparan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. David Sosa/Vijay Kopparan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVE ON ADA</td>
<td>1. Ellen Blackman/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1. Nathan Baird/Derek Wieske</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</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. Queen Mangasarian/Dan Mitchell/Carlos Rios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Ferdy Chan/Kevin Minne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>1. Tina Fung/Ayala Ben-Yehuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. John Walker/Inez Yeung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Patrick V. DeChellis/Allan Abramson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES</td>
<td>1. David Kriske/Roubik Golanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td>2. Mohammad Mostahkarni/Lisa Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities COG</td>
<td>3. Robert Brager/Ramiro Adeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes Malibu COG</td>
<td>4. Mike Behen/Allen Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Los Angeles County</td>
<td>5. Larry Stevens /Craig Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley COG</td>
<td>6. Robert Newman/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley COG</td>
<td>7. Robert Beste/Ted Semaan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities COG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Cities COG</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. Sebastian Hernandez/Kathryn Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Anne Perez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (Metro)</td>
<td>1. Fanny Pan/Brian Lam Countywide Planning &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Diane Corral-Lopez/Vacant Metro Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDESTRIAN COORDINATOR</td>
<td>1. Valerie Watson/Dale Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH REPRESENTATIVE (Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Susan Price/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY (SCRRA - Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Anne Louise Rice/Karen Sakoda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SCAQMD - Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Eyvonne Drummonds/Kathryn Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG - Ex-Officio)</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/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Solikien</td>
<td>AVS Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica McEary</td>
<td>Investing in Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doreen Morrison</td>
<td>MTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Kim/Stephen Finnegans (A)</td>
<td>AUTO CLUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Dilluvio/Christel Mowery (A)</td>
<td>BICYCLE COORDINATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Rooney/Joseph Lipman (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Leonard/Gloria Gallardo (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgt. Dave Neims/Off. Christian Cracraft (A)</td>
<td>OSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto Angeli/Jimmy Shih (A)</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Sosa/Vijay Kopparam (A)</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Blackman/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>CITIZEN REP ON ADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Bair/Derek Wieseke (A)</td>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James LeF lon/Constance Ralph (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Mitchell/Carlos Rios (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferdy Chan/Keven Minne (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Fung/Alysa Ben-Yehuda (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Walker/inez Yeung (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick DeChellis/Allan Abramson (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kriske/Roubik Golaniian (A)</td>
<td>ARROYO VERDUGO CITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad MostaMali/Lisa Rapp (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/Allen Thompson (A)</td>
<td>NORTH LA. COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Stevens/Craig Bradshaw (A)</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL VALLEY COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Newman/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>SAN FERNANDO VALLEY COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Beste/Ted Semmaan (A)</td>
<td>SOUTH BAY CITIES COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Feinberg/Sharon Peristen (A)</td>
<td>WESTSIDE CITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian Hernandez/Kathryn Engel (A)</td>
<td>LTSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Perkins/ Joe Barrios (A)</td>
<td>LTSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanny Pan/Brian Lam (A)</td>
<td>METRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Corral-Lopez/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>METRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Watson/Dale Benson (A)</td>
<td>PED COORDINATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Price/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH COORDINATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Louise Rice/Karen Sakoda (A)</td>
<td>SCRRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eywonne Drummonds/Kathryn Higgins (A)</td>
<td>SCAQMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Whiteaker/Annie Naim (A)</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupe Valdez/LaDonna DiCamillo (A)</td>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Yamamoto/Phil Aker (A)</td>
<td>TDM/SUST SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hunter/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>TDM/SUST SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 4

TOD Planning Grant Program Guidelines
Round 4
I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Through the Transit Oriented Development Planning Grant Program ("Program"), the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority ("Metro") provides funds to local governments to encourage the development and adoption of land use regulations that promote sustainable, transit-oriented design principles. Calls for applications will typically be held biennially in even-numbered years.

Transit Oriented Development (TOD) projects take advantage of proximity and access to public transit through appropriate density, reduced reliance upon private automobiles, and enhanced walkability. Such development may increase the accessibility and utilization of public transportation. This program will provide funds to local governments to adapt their existing general plans, specific plans, zoning, and other ordinances to encourage such sustainable development forms.

II. PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The primary objectives of the Program are to provide funding to:

- Increase access to transit by assisting local governments to accelerate the adoption of TOD regulatory frameworks;
- Improve the transit network and increase utilization of public transit by reducing the number of modes of transportation necessary to access regional and local transit lines;
- Further the reduction in greenhouse gases through encouraging in-fill development along transit corridors and transit use; and
- Support and implement sustainable development principles.

III. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Cities and the County of Los Angeles with land use regulatory jurisdiction:

- Within ½ mile of Metrolink Stations in Los Angeles County and/or adjacent and relevant transit corridors
- Within ½ mile of the existing, planned, or proposed Metro rail or bus rapid transit stations and/or adjacent and relevant transit corridors

Applicants seeking funds along transit corridors MUST demonstrate the corridor’s relevancy to the development of TOD around the station area. The corridor may, for example, connect the station area to significant activity centers, carry significant pedestrian traffic to and from the station area, and/or connect the station area to other areas with significant transit service.
IV. ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

Funding is for proposals that will result in the elimination of regulatory constraints to TOD projects and the development of specific regulatory documents that promote TOD and can be adopted by governing bodies, such as:

- New or amended specific plans;
- New or amended ordinances;
- New or amended overlay zones;
- New or amended general plans;
- Transit Village Development Districts; and
- Environmental studies required to support the new or amended regulatory documents.

Such regulatory changes will encourage development near transit stations, provide for appropriate density given the immediate access to transit, reduce dependency on the private automobile and provide for strong pedestrian and bicycle connections between development sites and transit.

V. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposal will be evaluated according to the following criteria and associated scores.

Section 1– Project Scope (up to 55 points)

a. Project Area/Targeted Communities (Up to 5 points):
   - Concise and clear description of the project area, targeted communities, and specific transit stations and/or corridors the project will impact.
   - The station and/or corridor significance to the local community and larger region including importance for the transit network and ridership.

b. Regulatory Constraints (Up to 15 points):
   - Clear description of the specific regulatory constraints and/or general land use challenges/ barriers in the project area.
   - Degree to which constraints and barriers are those which the Program was created to address (i.e. outdated parking requirements, height or density restrictions, lack of bicycle and pedestrian access and utilization incentives, etc.).

c. Proposed Regulatory Documents (Up to 20 points):
   - Clear description of the regulatory documents that will require revision and/or new regulatory documents. Documents may include a community’s general plan, zoning ordinances, parking codes, specific plans, Transit Village District documents, etc.
   - Extent to which regulatory documents promote Program objectives.
d. **Impact of Proposed Regulatory Changes (Up to 15 points):**
   - Thoroughness in explaining how the regulatory changes directly mitigate the constraints previously identified.

**Section 2 – Public Participation** (up to 10 points)

a. **Outreach Plan (Up to 5 points):**
   - Clear identification of all impacted communities and stakeholders affected by the proposed regulatory changes.
   - Demonstration of a well thought out public participation and outreach program necessary to bring the regulatory changes forward.

b. **Community and Policy Maker Support (Up to 5 points):**
   - Demonstration that community stakeholder and policy maker support for the types of regulatory changes being proposed exist. This could be evidenced by prior actions implementing similar changes elsewhere in the community, specific direction by elected officials, letters of support, etc.

**Section 3 – Future Implementation** (up to 10 points)

a. **Opportunity Sites (Up to 5 points):**
   - Ability to link regulatory changes with the near term potential for implementing TOD through the availability of suitable opportunity sites, particularly if controlled by the applicant.

b. **Next Steps (Up to 5 points):**
   - Demonstration of a well thought out long term plan for building a successful TOD area once grant funded regulatory changes are adopted.

**Section 4 - Project Implementation Plan** (up to 25 points)

a. **Project Schedule, Tasks, and Budget (Up to 20 points):**
   - Schedule demonstrates the overall approach for project completion and that the project can be completed in 36 months.
   - Principle tasks that will be undertaken to complete the project are identified, reasonable, and realistic.
   - Overall expenditures (local and grant) as well as expenditures per task are both realistic and highly cost efficient, maximizing the impact of the funds requested.

b. **Project Management (Up to 5 points):**
   - Clear description of team composition, including the roles and responsibilities of city/county staff and/or consultants.

A panel of LACMTA staff will evaluate all applications. Applicants who do not receive award will have an opportunity to appeal to Metro’s Technical Advisory Committee following Board of Directors’ action on staff recommendations for
award. After LACMTA Board of Directors’ action, unsuccessful applicants will have an opportunity to appeal to Metro’s Technical Advisory Committee. Unsuccessful applicants will receive an email by LACMTA notifying them of the opportunity to appeal. Unsuccessful applicants interested in presenting their appeal should reply to LACMTA’s project manager.

VI. ELIGIBLE COSTS

a. Applicants will develop and submit a budget as part of the application. Funds awarded will not exceed the budget submitted and may be less if the key objectives can be achieved at lower costs. Any cost overruns shall be the responsibility of the applicant.

b. Both third party consulting costs and internal staff costs for staff directly providing services with respect to the project will be eligible for funding. Such eligible costs shall not include overtime costs.

c. Costs associated with community outreach and meeting CEQA requirements are eligible costs.

VII. NON-ELIGIBLE COSTS

a. Costs such as equipment, furniture, vehicles, office leases or space cost allocations, food or similar costs.

b. Applicant staff overtime costs, mileage reimbursements, and use of pool cars.

VIII. GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CONDITIONS

a. **Duration of Grant Projects.** Projects’ schedules must demonstrate that the projects can be completed, including related actions by the governing body (if any), within 36 months of award.

b. **Governing Body Authorization.** Completed TOD Planning Grant Program applications must include authorization and approval of the grant submittal and acceptance of award by the governing body, if required, within three months of notification of award.

c. **Grant Agreement.** Each awarded applicant must execute a Grant Agreement with Metro. The Agreement will include the statement of work, including planning objectives to be achieved, the financial plan reflecting grant amount and any local match, if applicable, as well as a schedule and deliverables. The schedule must demonstrate that the project will be completed within 36 months from the date of execution.

d. **Funding Disbursements.** Funding will be disbursed on a quarterly basis subject to satisfactory compliance with the expenditure plan and schedule.
as demonstrated in a quarterly progress/expense report supported by a detailed invoice demonstrating the staff and hours charged to the project, any consultant hours, etc. An amount equal to 5% of each invoice will be retained until final completion of the project and audits. In addition, final scheduled payment will be withheld until the project is complete and approved by Metro and all audit requirements have been satisfied. All quarterly reports will be due on the last day of the months of October, January, April, and July.

e. **Audits.** All grant program funding is subject to Metro audit. The findings of the audit are final.

**IX. Deobligation of Funds.** Grantee must demonstrate timely use of the Funds and effective implementation of project scope of work by:

i. Executing the Agreement within sixty (60) days of receiving formal transmittal of the Agreement from LACMTA.

ii. Meeting the Project milestone and deliverable due dates as stated in the Project Schedule and Budget (Attachment A), Scope of Work (Attachment B), and Project Milestones Schedule (Attachment D2).

iii. Timely submitting of the Quarterly Progress/Expense Reports (Attachment D1) as defined in Part II, Section 2 of the Agreement and the Reporting and Expenditure Guidelines (Attachment C); and

iv. Expending funds granted within thirty-six (36) months from the date the Grant Agreement is fully executed.

v. Procuring contract/consultant to complete grant Scope of Work (Attachment B) within six (6) months of agreement execution with LACMTA.

vi. Notifying LACMTA as soon as grantee is aware of any changes and circumstances which alter the eligibility of the Board approved project.

In the event that timely use of funds and effective implementation of the project scope of work is not demonstrated, the Project will be reevaluated by LACMTA as part of its annual budget recertification of funds/TOD Planning Grant Program Deobligation process and the Funds may be deobligated and reprogrammed to another project by the LACMTA Board of Directors. Prior to LACMTA Board of Directors’ action to deobligate funds, Grantees recommended for deobligation will have an opportunity to appeal to Metro’s Technical Advisory Committee. Grantees will receive a letter by LACMTA notifying them of the opportunity to appeal. Grantees interested in presenting their appeal should reply to LACMTA’s project manager.
Attachment 5

Technical Advisory Committee
Appeal Protocol
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TAC Roles and Responsibilities: TAC is an advisory committee. Metro staff can concur, reject or recommend alternatives to the TAC recommendations. TAC’s role and responsibility is to provide an objective, technical, and countywide perspective. To ensure TAC’s countywide role, these protocols shall govern.

- The Alternate TAC member shall only participate in the meeting when the primary TAC member is not present.
- Ex-officio members are not allowed to vote.
- For projects for which their respective agency has submitted an application(s) or appeal(s), TAC members and/or Alternates are prohibited from providing oral testimony.
- TAC members and/or Alternates should not participate in TAC discussion concerning project(s) their agency sponsored so as not to be perceived as taking an advocacy role.
- Motion seconds should be made from an agency/jurisdiction/League of Cities/TAC Subcommittee representative other than the agency/jurisdiction/League of Cities/TAC Subcommittee representative that originated the motion.
- Any discussion involving the public will be allowed when acknowledged and determined appropriate by the TAC Chairperson.
- TAC discussion and motion development is intended for TAC members’ participation only.
Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Planning Grant Program
Guidelines on Funding Appeals

- Projects recommended for funding (above the line) by Metro staff will remain above the funding line unless the Metro Board decides otherwise.

- All appealing project sponsors are required to complete and transmit an Appeal Fact Sheet to Metro 72 hours prior to the TAC appeal meeting, so that Metro 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, and Metro staff recommended score along with the funding line score.

- Metro staff will be in attendance to answer TAC questions on the evaluation of appealed project. Please note that Metro staff cannot change the staff recommended score.

- TAC can only consider the Metro TOD Planning Grant Program evaluation criteria as the basis for evaluating appealed projects. Information presented as part of the appeal can only elaborate on or clarify information already presented in the submitted application so long as the same project limits and scope of work are maintained. 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.

- TAC must be cognizant of the limited funding available in the SRTP for the TOD Planning Grant Program and deobligation amount, if applicable. TAC can only recommend funding up to those amounts.

- Inadequate staffing, downscoping, or a request for less funding are not valid grounds for an appeal since these factors were considered during the application process.
Attachment 6

TOD Grant Round 4
Fact Sheets
LACMTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
Transit Oriented Development Planning Grant Program
Award Appeal Fact Sheet
April 1, 2015

To be completed by LACMTA from the submitted application

Project Sponsor: City of Glendora  
Funding Line Score: 70

Project Title: Glendora Station Area: TOD Update for Route 66 Corridor Specific Plan

Transit Lines(s)/Stations(s)/Corridors(s) (see map attached): Glendora Station on Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase 2B

Project Description Summary: Specific Plan Update for area surrounding Gold Line Glendora Station. According to the application, though the proposed project area currently includes elements that lay the foundation for a successful TOD area, such as development incentives that allow for increases in height and density for projects that provide mixed use and lot consolidation, it lacks uniform, formal language to facilitate active transportation and complete streets concepts. As a result the City of Glendora would like to improve and expand the current street scape element of the current Route 66 Corridor Specific Plan to incorporate complete street and first/last mile concepts.

Project Financial Summary:

| Grant Funds Requested | $ 300,000 |
| Local Match – Cash (If any) | $50,000 |
| Local Match – In-Kind (If any) | $0 |
| Other Sources (If any) | $0 |
| Total Project Cost | $ 350,000 |

Evaluation Criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Scored</th>
<th>Maximum Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1 - Project Scope</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Project Area/Targeted Communities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Regulatory Constraints</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Proposed Regulatory Documents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Impact of Proposed Regulatory Changes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2 - Public Participation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Outreach Plan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Community and Policy Maker Support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3 - Future Implementation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Opportunity Sites</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Next Steps</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4 - Project Implementation Plan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Project Tasks, Schedule, and Budget</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Project Management</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LACMTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
Transit Oriented Development Planning Grant Program
Award Appeal Fact Sheet
April 1, 2015

To be completed by project sponsor, based on the submitted application

Project Sponsor: City of Glendora  
Funding Line Score: 70

Project Title: Glendora Station Area – TOD Update for Route 66 Corridor Specific Plan

Reason for Appeal – New information is not allowed (500-character limit):

The City of Glendora feels that the application submitted is worthy of a higher score than was given based on the need to update the Route 66 Specific Plan to include improved TOD and Active Transportation requirements in order to prepare for the Glendora Gold Line Station which will become a central point along the corridor. We feel that our application presented a valid argument for the need of improved TOD development language as well as bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure guidelines to bridge 1st Mi./Last Mi. connectivity gaps to ensure the highest contribution to future ridership.
LACMTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
Transit Oriented Development Planning Grant Program
Award Appeal Fact Sheet
April 1, 2015

To be completed by LACMTA from the submitted application

Project Sponsor: City of Palmdale
Funding Line Score: 70

Project Title: Palmdale Downtown District Zoning Overlay

Transit Lines(s)/Stations(s)/Corridors(s) (see map attached): Palmdale Metrolink Station

Project Description Summary: The proposed project is the formulation of a Downtown District Zoning Overlay. The proposed project includes the development of a Zoning Overlay, creation of a multimodal downtown circulation plan, and preparation of a programmatic EIR. The intent of the overlay is to increase mobility, vitality, and transit-oriented development (TOD) in Palmdale's downtown, as well as to define multimodal transportation corridors connecting the Palmdale Metrolink Station to the downtown. The project will also complement development in the adjacent Palmdale Transit Village Specific Plan (PTVSP) area and the future High-Speed Rail Station.

Project Financial Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Funds Requested</th>
<th>$401,370</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Match – Cash (If any)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match – In-Kind (If any)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources (If any)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$401,370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1 – Project Scope</th>
<th>Scored</th>
<th>Maximum Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Project Area/Targeted Communities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Regulatory Constraints</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Proposed Regulatory Documents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Impact of Proposed Regulatory Changes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2 - Public Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Outreach Plan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Community and Policy Maker Support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3 – Future Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Opportunity Sites</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Next Steps</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4 – Project Implementation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Project Tasks, Schedule, and Budget</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Project Management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LACMTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
Transit Oriented Development Planning Grant Program
Award Appeal Fact Sheet
April 1, 2015

To be completed by project sponsor, based on the submitted application

Project Sponsor: City of Palmdale
Funding Line Score: 70

Project Title: Palmdale Downtown District Overlay, Palmdale Metrolink Station, Antelope Valley Line and Sierra Highway Transit-Corridor Project

Reason for Appeal – New information is not allowed (500-character limit):

Metro, CHSRA and Caltrans have institutional knowledge that in order to meet the geometric req. for connecting the future Metrolink/high speed rail station with a future High Desert Corridor high speed rail, the existing Palmdale Metrolink Station must be relocated. As indicated in the application, the station will be shifting south, approx. ¼ mile, and the new station will combine local transit, Metrolink, CHSR and HDC rail. Palmdale is being proactive and believes that it is reasonable to evaluate land uses and multi-modal connectivity, south and east of the future combined station.

Note: One-page limit
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FTA Section 5310
Draft Appeal Guidelines
Projects recommended for funding (above the line) by Metro staff will remain above the funding line unless the Metro Board decides otherwise.

All appealing project sponsors are required to complete and transmit an Appeal Fact Sheet to Metro 72 hours prior to the TAC appeals meeting, so that Metro 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, and Metro staff recommended score along with the funding line score.

Metro staff will be in attendance to answer TAC questions on the evaluation of appealed project. Please note that Metro staff cannot change the Evaluation Team’s recommended score.

TAC can only consider the Metro FTA Section 5310 Program evaluation criteria as the basis for evaluating appealed projects. Information presented as part of the appeal can only elaborate on or clarify information already presented in the submitted application. New information which should have been submitted in the application cannot be introduced. Updated technical information (e.g. revised Level of Service, updated ridership/ridership projections, expansion of service area) will be allowed as long as the same project limits and scope of work are maintained. 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.

TAC must be cognizant of the limited funding available in the FTA Section 5310 Program for Los Angeles County, Santa Clarita and Lancaster/Palmdale. Funding for the Santa Clarita and Lancaster/Palmdale UZAs is minimal. TAC can only recommend funding up to those amounts appropriated for each of the urbanized areas (UZAs). Funding from another UZA may be considered provided the proposed project has a nexus to that area (e.g., service is provided to/from the UZA funding the project, vehicle and/or other asset is used in the UZA funding the project, etc.). Any unused funds set aside for appeals will be re-allocated to projects underfunded within that UZA.

Downscoping or a request for less funding is not valid grounds for an appeal since these factors were considered during the application process.
• 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.
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First/Last Mile Wayfinding Signage
Draft Guidelines Summary
Wayfinding Signage Pilot Grant Program Guidelines - Summary

Program Goals
- Provide guidance for designing and implementing wayfinding signage and uniform, consistent messaging to and around Metro stations
- Improve the usability of the Metro system throughout Los Angeles County by increasing visibility and awareness of transit stations
- Provide helpful navigation and paths of travel to Metro fixed guideway stations
- Increase ridership and improve the visibility of the transit system

Eligible Applicants
- Cities, County of Los Angeles, Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, municipal and local transit operators, and Caltrans, with jurisdiction over wayfinding signage.

Eligible Activities
- Project must improve and implement wayfinding signage, including updates and/or replacements of signage, within one mile of the station or facility
- Project must be consistent with Metro’s Station Wayfinding Signage Guidelines and follow applicable local, state, and federal laws and guidelines or standards
- Funding is eligible for design, fabrication, and installation of static wayfinding signs to existing Metro fixed guideway stations and stations that will be opened by the end of Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-17.

Available Funding
- $250,000 each in FY 2015-16 and FY 2016-17
- All funds will be awarded in FY 2015-16

Eligible Costs
- Third party consulting costs and internal staff costs for providing services with respect to the project
- Administrative costs (e.g., overhead and project management) are limited to a maximum of ten percent (10%) of the total project budget
- Wayfinding signage that is part of a larger project will require grantees to fund a proportionate share of the project cost
- Metro will be responsible for funding fifty percent (50%) of the wayfinding signage consisting of directional signage to Metro fixed guideway stations

Evaluation Criteria
- Demonstration of Need (maximum 25 points)
- Integration with other First/Last Mile Strategies (maximum 35 points)
- Project Readiness and Cost Effectiveness (maximum 35 points)
- Local Match (maximum 15 points) – requires minimum of 5% Local Match
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Complete Streets Resolution (Sample)
Sample
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Complete Streets Resolution
for Los Angeles County Jurisdictions

Resolution No. _______________

A RESOLUTION OF THE [City Council/Board of Supervisors] OF THE [Jurisdiction]
ADOPTING
A COMPLETE STREETS POLICY

WHEREAS, the term “Complete Streets” describes a comprehensive, integrated transportation network
with infrastructure and design that allows safe and convenient travel along and across streets for all users,
including pedestrians, users and operators of public transit, bicyclists, persons with disabilities, seniors,
children, motorists, users of green modes, and movers of commercial goods [insert other significant local
users if desired, e.g. drivers of agricultural vehicles, emergency vehicles, or freight];

WHEREAS, [Jurisdiction] recognizes that the planning and coordinated development of Complete
Streets infrastructure provides benefits for local governments in the areas of infrastructure cost savings;
public health; and environmental sustainability;

WHEREAS, [Jurisdiction] acknowledges the benefits and value for the public health and welfare of
reducing vehicle miles traveled and increasing transportation by walking, bicycling, and public
transportation;

WHEREAS, the State of California has emphasized the importance of Complete Streets by enacting the
California Complete Streets Act of 2008 (also known as AB 1358), which requires that when cities or
counties make substantive revisions to the circulation elements of their general plans, they identify how
they will provide for the mobility needs of all users of the roadways, as well as through Deputy Directive
64, in which the California Department of Transportation explained that it “views all transportation
improvements as opportunities to improve safety, access, and mobility for all travelers in California and
recognizes bicycle, pedestrian, and transit modes as integral elements of the transportation
system”;

WHEREAS, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (known as AB 32) sets a mandate for
the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in California, and the Sustainable Communities and Climate
Protection Act of 2008 (known as SB 375) requires emissions reductions through coordinated regional
planning that integrates transportation, housing, and land-use policy, and achieving the goals of these
laws will require significant increases in travel by public transit, bicycling, and walking;

WHEREAS, numerous California counties, cities, and agencies have adopted Complete Streets policies
and legislation in order to further the health, safety, welfare, economic vitality, and environmental well-
being of their communities;

WHEREAS, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), through its Metro
Complete Streets Policy, requires that all jurisdictions address complete streets policies at the local level
through the adoption of a complete streets policy resolution, which should include the “Elements of an
Ideal Complete Streets Policy” developed by the National Complete Streets Coalition, or through a
general plan that complies with the California Complete Streets Act of 2008 to be eligible for Metro
Capital Grant funds;
WHEREAS, [Jurisdiction] therefore, in light of the foregoing benefits and considerations, wishes to improve its commitment to Complete Streets and desires that its streets form a comprehensive and integrated transportation network promoting safe and convenient travel for all users while preserving flexibility, recognizing community context, and using design guidelines and standards that support best practices;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the [City Council/Board of Supervisors] of [Jurisdiction], State of California, as follows:

1. That the [Jurisdiction] adopts the Complete Streets Policy attached hereto as Exhibit A, and made part of this Resolution, and that said exhibit is hereby approved and adopted.
2. That the next substantial revision of the [Jurisdiction] General Plan circulation will incorporate Complete Streets policies and principles consistent with the California Complete Streets Act of 2008 (AB 1358) and with the Complete Streets Policy adopted by this resolution.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the [City Council/Board of Supervisors] of the [Jurisdiction], State of California, on __________, 201_, by the following vote:

Attachment: Exhibit A
Exhibit A
This Complete Streets Policy was adopted by Resolution No. _________ by the [City Council/Board of Supervisors] of the [Jurisdiction] on _______________, 201_.

COMPLETE STREETS POLICY OF [JURISDICTION]

[Insert VISION statement here.]

A. Complete Streets Principles

1. Complete Streets Serving All Users and Modes. [Jurisdiction] expresses its commitment to creating and maintaining Complete Streets that provide safe, comfortable, and convenient travel along and across streets (including streets, roads, highways, bridges, and other portions of the transportation system) through a comprehensive, integrated transportation network that serves all categories of users, including pedestrians, users and operators of public transit, bicyclists, persons with disabilities, seniors, children, motorists, users of green modes, and movers of commercial goods [insert other significant local users if desired, e.g. emergency responders, drivers of agricultural vehicles, freight, etc.].

2. Context Sensitivity. In planning and implementing street projects, departments and agencies of [Jurisdiction] will maintain sensitivity to local conditions in both residential and business districts as well as urban, suburban, and rural areas, and will work with residents, merchants, and other stakeholders to ensure that a strong sense of place ensues. Improvements that will be considered include sidewalks, shared use paths, bikeways, paved shoulders, street trees and landscaping, planting strips, accessible curb ramps, crosswalks, refuge islands, pedestrian signals, signs, street furniture, bicycle parking facilities, public transportation stops and facilities, transit priority signalization, and other features assisting in the provision of safe travel for all users, such [insert other accommodations if desired] [, and those features identified in insert name of Multimodal Plan, Pedestrian Master Plan, Bicycle Master Plan, if it exists].

3. Complete Streets Routinely Addressed by All Departments. All relevant departments and agencies of [Jurisdiction] will work towards making Complete Streets practices a routine part of everyday operations, approach every relevant project, program, and practice as an opportunity to improve streets and the transportation network for all categories of users, and work in coordination with other departments, agencies, and jurisdictions to maximize opportunities for Complete Streets, connectivity, and cooperation.

4. All Projects and Phases. Complete Streets infrastructure sufficient to enable reasonably safe travel along and across the right of way for each category of users will be incorporated into all planning, funding, design, approval, and implementation processes for any construction, reconstruction, retrofit, maintenance, operations, alteration, or repair of streets (including streets, roads, highways, bridges, and other portions of the transportation system), except that specific infrastructure for a given category of users may be excluded if an exception is approved via the process set forth in section C.1 of this policy.

B. Implementation

1. Design. [Jurisdiction] will generally follow its own accepted or adopted design standards, including [list names here], and will also evaluate using the latest design standards and innovative design options, with a goal of balancing user needs.

2. Network/Connectivity. [Jurisdiction] will incorporate Complete Streets infrastructure into existing streets to improve the safety and convenience of all users, with the particular goal of creating a connected
network of facilities accommodating each category of users, and increasing connectivity across jurisdictional boundaries and for anticipated future transportation investments.

3. Implementation Next Steps. [Jurisdiction] will take the following specific next steps to implement this Complete Streets Policy:

   A. Plan Consultation and Consistency: Maintenance, planning, and design of projects affecting the transportation system will be consistent with local bicycle, pedestrian, transit, multimodal, and other relevant plans.

   B. Stakeholder Consultation: Develop and/or clearly define a process to allow for stakeholder involvement on projects and plans including, but not limited to, local bicycle and pedestrian advisory groups, transit riders and operators, accessibility advisory groups, movers of commercial goods, businesses, residents, emergency responders, and/or other stakeholders, as defined necessary to support implementation of this Complete Streets policy by [insert jurisdiction].

   C. [Add additional specific next steps here.]

4. Performance Measures. All relevant agencies or departments will perform evaluations of how well the streets and transportation network of [Jurisdiction] are serving each category of users by collecting baseline data and collecting follow-up data on a regular basis.

C. Exceptions

1. Exception Approvals. A process will be developed for approving exceptions, including who is allowed to sign off on exceptions. Written findings for exceptions must be included in a memorandum, signed off by a high level staff person, such as the Public Works Director, or senior-level designee, and made publicly available. Exceptions must explain why accommodations for all users and modes were not included in the plan or project. [Specific exceptions can be listed here. Federal guidance on exceptions can be found from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Accommodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel (http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/design_guidance/design.cfm).]
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Complete Streets Recommended Policy Elements
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Recommended Elements of a Complete Streets Policy to Comply with Metro Capital Grant Programs - DRAFT

The State of California has emphasized the importance of Complete Streets by enacting the California Complete Streets Act of 2008 (AB 1358), which requires that when cities or counties make substantive revisions to the circulation elements of their general plans, they identify how they will provide for the mobility needs of all users of the roadways. The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) sets a mandate for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the state, and the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (SB 375) requires emissions reductions through coordinated regional planning that integrates transportation, housing, and land-use policy. In order to support regional transportation goals and spur the collective action necessary to meet greenhouse gas reduction mandates and achieve a safer and more sustainable transportation system, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) requires that all local jurisdictions adopt a Complete Streets policy or an adopted General Plan consistent with the Complete Streets Act of 2008 in order to be eligible for future Metro capital grant funding programs. In addition, projects recommended for funding in the 2015 Call for Projects will be required to comply with the requirement above prior to the first programming year. The recommended policy elements below are modeled on the National Complete Streets Coalition elements of an ideal complete streets policy.

**Recommended Policy Elements:**

**Vision:** A clear and strong vision that is based on local needs and goals. The vision must include that all transportation improvements will be planned, funded, designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users, appropriate to the function and context of the facility.

**All Users and Modes:** All users (referenced above) will include public transit users and operators, pedestrians, bicyclists, children, persons with disabilities, seniors, motorists, users of green modes\(^1\), and movers of commercial goods.

**All Projects/Phases:** The policy applies to all roadway projects including those involving new construction, reconstruction, retrofits, repaving, rehabilitation, maintenance, operations, or expansion of existing roadways, as well as those that involve new privately built roads and easements intended for public use.

**Exceptions:** Jurisdictions must prepare a process for approving exceptions, including who is allowed to sign off on exceptions. Written findings for exceptions must be included in a memorandum, signed off by a high level staff person, such as the Public Works director, or senior-level designee, and made publicly available. Exceptions must explain why accommodations for all users and modes were not included in the plan or project.

**Network/Connectivity:** The transportation system should provide a comprehensive, integrated and connected network of facilities for all modes of travel. A well-connected network should include non-motorized connectivity to schools, transit, parks, commercial areas, and civic destinations.

\(^1\) Green modes refer to a growing category of clean mobility options that include active transportation, rideshare, transit, and clean fueled vehicles.
**Jurisdiction:** All departments in the jurisdiction whose work affects the roadway must incorporate a complete streets approach into the review and implementation of their projects and activities. As well, the jurisdiction will work in coordination with other agencies, transit districts and jurisdictions to maximize opportunities for Complete Streets, connectivity, and cooperation in designing and building transportation projects.

**Design:** The jurisdiction will define and generally follow its own accepted or adopted design standards, and will also evaluate using the latest design standards and innovative design options, with a goal of balancing user needs.

**Context Sensitivity:** The planning and implementation of transportation projects will reflect conditions within and surrounding the project area, whether the area is a residential or business district or urban, suburban or rural area. Project planning, design and construction of complete streets projects should include working with residents, businesses and other stakeholders to ensure that a strong sense of place is maintained.

**Performance Measures:** Jurisdiction will establish performance measures, and identify a means to collect data for the measures, to evaluate the implementation of the complete streets policy. Examples include tracking the number of miles of bicycle lanes and sidewalks, numbers of street crossings, transit ridership, etc. Specific measures should be listed.

**Implementation Next Steps:** Jurisdiction will include a list of specific next steps for implementation of the Complete Streets policy. Implementation actions will include that any proposed improvements will be evaluated for consistency with local bicycle, pedestrian, transit, multimodal, goods movement and other relevant plans that affect the right-of-way. Implementation actions will also include that public input on projects and plans will be solicited from stakeholders, including local bicycle and pedestrian advisory groups, transit riders and operators, accessibility advisory groups, movers of commercial goods, businesses, residents, emergency responders, and/or other stakeholders, as appropriate, as early in the development process as possible.

Visit Metro’s Sustainable Planning web page at [www.metro.net/sustainableplanning](http://www.metro.net/sustainableplanning) for links to complete streets resources and best practices. Metro will also be posting a Complete Streets resolution template and a sample local staff report in the future. A jurisdiction that is interested in adopting a Complete Streets Policy resolution can tailor the template to meet its local context and specific needs and bring it to city council for adoption.