Agenda
Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

William Mulholland 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
   • February Board Recap (handout) (Fanny Pan)
   • Parking Forum Announcement

4. Consent Calendar  Action
   • Approval of Minutes
   Attachment 3: Draft February 6, 2013 Minutes

5. 2013 Call for Projects  Information (Rena Lum)
   5 min

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

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

8. TOD Grant Program, Round 3  Information (Rufina Juarez)
   Attachment 4: February 2013 Board Report
   10 min

9. SR-710 Study Update  Information (Michelle Smith)
   10 min

Metro
Metropolitan Transportation Authority
10. Regional Rail Update
   Attachment 5: Draft State Rail Plan Executive Summary
   10 min
   Information
   (Jay Fuhrman)

11. CTC Update
   5 min
   Information
   (Patricia Chen)

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

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

14. High Desert Corridor Update
   10 min
   Information
   (Robert Machuca)

15. Other Business

16. Adjournment

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

Please call Matthew Abbott at (213) 922-3071 or e-mail abbottm@metro.net with questions regarding the agenda or meeting. The next meeting will be on April 3, 2013 at 9:30 a.m. in the William Mulholland Conference Room.
Attachment 1

Subcommittee Agendas – February 2013

• Bus Operations
  ➢ February 19, 2013

• Local Transit Systems
  ➢ February 28, 2013

• Streets and Freeways
  ➢ February 21, 2013

• TDM/Air Quality
  ➢ Did not meet in February
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/Charlene Lorenzo

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

6. 2013 Call for Projects Update (10 minutes) Information Rena Lum

7. FTA 5339 Funding Allocation Process Follow-up (15 minutes) Information Cossette Stark/Ashad Hamideh

8. 2014 FTA 5307 15% Discretionary Capital & 1% TE Funds Application Changes (15 minutes) Action Lois Smith
9. Fund Balances Update (10 minutes)  
   Information  
   Susan Richan

10. New Business  
    Information  
    All

11. 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
   2014 FTA 5307 Application Package

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 March 19, 2013 at 9:30 am in the Mulholland Conference Room, 15th Floor of the Gateway Building.
NOTE NEW TIME:  2:00 PM

Thursday, February 28, 2013, 2:00PM

Agenda

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS SUBCOMMITTEE

William Mulholland Conference Room – 15th Floor

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes – January 31, 2013  (Handout)

3. Brief Update on MAP-21, FTA 5317 and FTA 5310

4. Call for Projects and SRTP information

5. Legislative Update

6. 1st DRAFT of FY14 Proposition A 5% of 40% Incentive Subregional Paratransit, review of FY12 close out (audit) and status of current year, FY13 payments (Handout)

7. New Business, Date of Next LTSS Meeting (March 21 or 28) Adjournment

Action
Ryan Thompson, Chair

Information
Ashad Hamideh, Metro

Information
Rena Lum, Metro

Information
Raffi Hamparian/Marisa Yeager, Metro

Information
Susan Richan, Metro

Ryan Thompson
Agenda
Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

Mulholland Conference Room, 15th Floor

1. Call to Order
   1 min

2. Approval of Minutes
   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
   5 min

4. Metro Report
   5 min

6. State and Federal Legislative Update
   10 min

7. Caltrans Report
   10 min

8. Short Range Transportation Plan
   5 min

9. 2013 Call for Projects
   10 min

10. Metro FY 2014 Budget Update
    10 min

Action (Bahman Janka)
Action (Subcommittee)
Information (Bahman Janka)
Information (Fulgene Asuncion)
Information (Raffi Hamparian/ Marisa Yeager/Michael Turner)
Information (David Sosa)
Information (Rena Lum)
Information (Rena Lum)
Information (Frank Shapiro)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>SR-710 Study Update</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Information (Michelle Smith)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Accelerated Regional Transportation Improvements (ARTI)</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Information (Chris Margaronis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Measure R Local Return Guidelines</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Information (Terry Matsumoto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>New Business</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Discussion (Subcommittee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Adjournment</td>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Action (Subcommittee)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next meeting of the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee will be held on March 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 February 2013 Subcommittee Actions

Bus Operations Subcommittee:

- Approved minutes for December 4, 2012
- Approved a motion to have the changes to the BOS established principles, priorities and application procedures in the application packet for the 2014 FTA 5307 15% Discretionary Capital and 1% Associated Transit Improvement funds be approved via e-mail, provided a quorum number of 9 votes is received and at least 5 votes are in favor

Local Transit Systems Subcommittee:

- Approved minutes for January 31, 2013

Streets and Freeways Subcommittee:

- Approved minutes for January 17, 2013

TDM/Air Quality Subcommittee:

- Did not meet in February
Attachment 3

February 6, 2013 TAC Minutes

February 6, 2013 Sign-In Sheets

TAC Member Attendance
Wednesday, February 6, 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 9:30 a.m., took roll and declared a quorum was present.

2. Post Measure J (Martha Welborne, Executive Director of Countywide Planning)
Ms. Welborne reported that at their January 24, 2013 meeting, the MTA Board approved the direction of the January 2013 Board Report (Item 84) as amended. MTA staff recommended the Board to approve continuation of first, second, and third decade Measure R project development work while staff seek a viable financial strategy to allow acceleration of Measure R projects. Staff believes that there are options to accelerate the projects with other types of funding (such as through a new Measure or future Federal authorization). The Board generally agrees with this, but asked staff to return to the March 2013 Board meeting with a financing plan and more details on the approach staff plans to take. The Board wants to ensure consistency with the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) priorities, while also taking into consideration other needs such as the State of Good Repair. For projects that might qualify for Public-Private Partnerships (P3), the Board wants an estimate of public investment required to support the potential P3.

Marianne Kim (Automobile Club of Southern California) asked which projects staff is requesting continuation on? Ms. Welborne responded second and third decade Measure R projects, such as the South Bay Metro Green Line Extension and the Eastside Gold Line Extension Phase II for which MTA has completed the draft environmental documents. If no financing options are available and the projects are not built by the third decade, the environmental documents will need to be completed again.

Larry Stevens (League of Cities - San Gabriel Valley COG) asked if the Board is intending to discuss whether to go forward with a new ballot measure in the future? Ms. Welborne responded that a new ballot measure is a possibility, and that there is also currently an initiative in the State Legislature to reduce the requirement of a two-thirds vote to pass a Measure.
Fanny Pan (MTA) stated that the Board approved motion will be emailed to TAC members (email containing the Board motion was sent to TAC members on February 6, 2013).

3. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees

Bus Operations Subcommittee (BOS) (Joyce Rooney)
- Last meet on January 15, 2013
- Received update on mobile validators
- Approved FTA position on 5339 funding allocation process
- Held new officer elections. Joyce Rooney is the new Chair and Ian Dailey is the new Vice Chair
- Next meeting will be held on February 19, 2013

Local Transit Systems (LTSS) (Ryan Thompson)
- Last met on January 31, 2013
- Presentation on MAP-21 funding process
- Discussed wheelchair securement policies
- Presentation on 5310 grant cycle
- Next meeting is scheduled for February 28, 2013

Streets & Freeways (Nancy Villasenor)
- Last met on January 17, 2013
- New members were announced. Carlos Rios is replacing Ken Husting as the primary member representing the City of Los Angeles. The alternate City of Los Angeles representative will be Arson Mangasarian. Officer Christian Cracraft will be the new alternate representative for the California Highway Patrol (CHP).
- Fulgene Asuncion (MTA)
  - Announced that a series of open houses were held in late January for the SR-710 North Study
  - Requested participation from the Subcommittee in developing the revised Measure R Local Return Guidelines. Steve Forster, Charles Herbertson and Elaine Jeng volunteered
- The Caltrans Transportation Planning workshop was held on January 31, 2013
- It was requested that MTA staff present on Metro’s Budget Development Process at the next meeting
- Received presentations on the Sepulveda Pass System Planning Study and the City of Long Beach Bike Infrastructure and Safety
- Next meeting is scheduled for February 21, 2013

TDM/Air Quality
- Did not meet in January. Next meeting scheduled for March 20, 2013

4. Chairperson’s Report (Fanny Pan, MTA)
A handout was distributed in lieu of an oral report. Ms. Pan announced that the BOS Subcommittee elected new TAC representation. Joyce Rooney (Beach Cities Transit) is the primary representative and Susan Lipman (Santa Clarita Transit) is the alternate. Ian Dailey (Torrance Transit) is the second primary representative and Jane Leonard (Culver City Bus Lines) is the alternate. Officer Christian Cracraft will replace Officer Spencer Badal as the alternate CHP representative.
A flyer was distributed announcing the 2013 Cycle-6 Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Call for Projects. A webinar will be held on February 19th, and a workshop will be held on March 6th. The workshop is expected to be available through Caltrans District Video Conferencing Rooms throughout the State. More detail on the webinar and workshop can be found at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/HSIP/training.html.

Ms. Pan reminded the Committee that there are still outstanding Call for Project (CFP) agreements for those projects with Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 as the first year programming year and amendments for time extensions. She stated that project sponsors should work with MTA project managers to finalize execution of the agreements/amendments as soon as possible. If projects agreements/amendments are not executed, they will be considered for potential deobligation during the TAC appeals process in June. Project sponsors can contact Fanny Pan with any questions regarding their outstanding projects.

Ms. Pan reported that MTA staff took the initial CFP deobligation recommendations to the Planning and Programming Committee in November 2012. The Board deferred the deobligation to February 2013. Staff has since removed the City of Los Angeles’ Vermont Bridge project from the current list due to contract closeout not being finalized and added three transit capital projects to the list of projects recommended for deobligation. Of the three Transit Capital projects, two are projects that the sponsor requested to be canceled. The other project was a down scope approved by MTA. The total amount recommended for deobligation is $12.9 million, which will be reprogrammed to the 2013 CFP.

Ms. Pan provided information about the Congestion Management Program (CMP) annual local growth performance finding. MTA staff is seeking approval from the Board in February for the finding that all 88 cities and the County of Los Angeles conformed to the requirements of the CMP. To conform, cities must annually report development or growth data, biennially monitor the highway arterial and transit network, and continue implementation with the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and Land Use Element of the CMP. A public hearing is scheduled prior to the Planning and Programming Committee meeting on February 20, 2013 at 2:30 pm. A finding of conformance by the Board would ensure the continued flow of more than $85 million in State gas tax revenue to local jurisdictions.

4. Consent Calendar
A motion to approve the January 2, 2013 minutes was made by Ken Husting (City of Los Angeles) and seconded by Mohammad Mostahkami (League of California Cities - Gateway Cities COG). Robert Newman (League of California Cities - San Fernando Valley COG) abstained. The minutes were approved with no objections.

5. Measure R Local Return Guidelines (Terry Matsumoto, MTA)
Mr. Matsumoto reported that the information presented at the January 2nd TAC meeting was circulated to a Working Group and BOS at its request. The Working Group meeting was held on Monday, January 28, 2013 and the proposed revised guidelines were discussed and approved.
Nicole Rizzo (League of California Cities - North County) asked who were the members of the Working Group? Mr. Abbott reported that the Working Group was comprised of TAC Subcommittees members David Kriske (City of Burbank), Joyce Rooney (Beach Cities Transit), Elaine Jeng (Culver City), Alex Gonzales (City of Covina), Charles Herbertson (Culver City), Ken Husting (City of Los Angeles), Susan Lipman (Santa Clarita Transit), and Ryan Thompson (City of Calabasas). Mr. Husting explained that the Working Group offered constructive comments for revisions. He stated that he feels that the document presented to the Committee is fair.

Mr. Mostahkami requested that TAC find out if the Measure R Local Return Guidelines would be revised every five years like the Prop A and Prop C guidelines. Susan Richan (MTA) will check and get back to Mr. Mostahkami.

A motion to support the Measure R Local Return Guidelines was made by Mr. Husting and seconded by Mr. Thompson. The motion was approved with no objections. Mr. Matsumoto stated that the item will be on the February Committee and Board meeting agendas.

6. East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor (Walt Davis, MTA)
Mr. Davis reported that the Alternatives Analysis (AA) has been completed and received and filed with the Board in January 2013. In addition, the Board approved the contract modification to cover the expanded study area during the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (DEIS/DEIR) and that the project name be changed from the East San Fernando Valley Rapidway to the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor. The project is currently moving forward with the DEIS/DEIR.

Mr. Davis reported that the LRTP committed $170.1 million to the project with a revenue operation date of 2018. The project has a very aggressive schedule in order to accommodate the 2018 revenue operation date. MTA is working jointly with the City of Los Angeles as well as the City of San Fernando. The project has been well received by the public and will improve north-south mobility in the East San Fernando Valley by providing additional transit options in a largely transit dependent area. The thirty build alternatives that were initially considered have since been narrowed down to two. A Light Rail Transit (LRT) option would begin at the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station and proceed southeast and transition south onto Van Nuys Bl. to Ventura Bl. The LRT alternative is 11.2 miles in length and will include approximately 13 stations. It is estimated to cost $1.8 - $2.3 billion. A Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) option is also moving forward. Similar to the LRT alternative, the BRT will start at the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station and proceed to Van Nuys Bl. in mixed-flow lanes, then transition into a median-running bus only lane and travel south to the Metro Orange Line (MOL). From the MOL, there are three options: 1) continue south on Van Nuys Bl. in a mixed flow or dedicated lane, 2) turn west and travel to the Sepulveda MOL station, or 3) turn south in a dedicated lane on Sepulveda Bl. and travel to Ventura Bl. The BRT option is approximately 12 miles in length and will include 13-14 stations. The estimated cost for the BRT option is $250 - $570 million.

Mr. Davis stated that the community prefers the LRT, but there is support for a BRT option. The community also voiced a preference for a connection to the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station, and a future connection to the Sepulveda Pass Project. The next step is to
continue with the environmental process. Scoping meetings are scheduled to begin in March 2013.

Mr. Stevens asked for clarification on the type of stations for the BRT alternative. Mr. Davis responded that for the median-running portion, the BRT will have stations similar to the MOL.

Mr. Stevens asked how the LRT can be considered a feasible alternative since it is only 10% funded from the LRTP? Mr. Davis responded that the difference in cost as well as other concerns will be addressed in the environmental documents.

7. 2013 Call for Projects (CFP) (Rena Lum, MTA)
Ms. Lum reported that on January 18th, MTA received a total of 208 CFP applications. Several applications have been reassigned to different modes. Staff recently sent a Reconciliation Report to individuals designed as contact persons by project sponsors. Changes included in the Reconciliation Report are due to Ms. Lum by Tuesday, February 19th. Currently, $186 million is available for the 2013 CFP and additional funds may become available by Board action on the additional deobligation later this month. A majority of the funds are available for FY 2018 and FY 2019. MTA staff will be evaluating the applications from February to June. In April, staff will take the preliminary modal funding marks to the Board. In June, the preliminary recommendations will be presented to the Board and the Rainbow Report will be released in July. The TAC appeal process is scheduled for July 30-31, 2013. Staff will seek final Board adoption of the 2013 CFP in September.

8. Short Range Transportation Plan (SRTP) (Rena Lum, MTA)
Ms. Lum reported that MTA is continuing with the technical process. The State of Good Repair Report, which is in the process of being completed, is taking longer than originally expected. A draft SRTP is anticipated to be available in the Fall, and MTA will be conducting outreach after the draft SRTP is released.

9. CTC Update (Patricia Chen, MTA)
Ms. Chen reported that at the January 8th California Transportation Commission (CTC) meeting, Commissioner James Ghielmetti was elected Chair and Carl Guardino was elected Vice-Chair. It was announced that the CTC is beginning the 2014 fund estimate. The draft fund estimate assumptions will be completed by March 5th and the Commission will consider adopting the assumptions on May 7th. A draft fund estimate will be presented on June 11th and will be up for adoption August 6th. Funding targets in the fund assumption will be used to create the 2014 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Also at the meeting, the CTC received the Letter of No Prejudice for the Crenshaw project, which was on the agenda for notice in January and will be on the agenda for action in March. In a financial action for the East San Gabriel Grade Separation Project, $68 - $69 million in project savings was deallocated from the project. This reduces the Trade Corridor Improvement Funding (TCIF) for the project from $333 million to $264 million. The next CTC meeting will be on March 5th.
10. MAP-21 5339 Formula Grants (Ashad Hamideh, MTA)

Mr. Hamideh reported that Section 5339 program in Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) is a formula based program that replaces the 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities discretionary grant program. The BOS Subcommittee passed two motions regarding the program in January. The first action was to adopt a position that Section 5339 be allocated 100% to the Capital Allocation Procedure (CAP) by formula (no set-aside for 15% discretionary). Changes in MAP-21 repealed the Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) program, but made funds under Section 5307 available for JARC eligible activities. Although some of the Section 5307 funds apportioned to urbanized areas are based on their share of low-income population (the target population of JARC activities), MAP-21 does not require a set-aside for JARC eligible activities from Section 5307 funds. Input was received from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) through SCAG that Not-For-Profit organizations are not eligible for this source of funding (only direct recipients). Therefore, the second action that was taken by BOS was to continue the allocation of the 5307 funds through the CAP without an off-the-top set aside for JARC activities, and that MTA and bus municipal operators can implement JARC programs at their discretion with other agencies. Mr. Hamideh added that Metro has requested a meeting with SCAG (per FTA guidance, SCAG is the “designated recipient” of Section 5339 funds) to discuss the Section 5339 Program (including the two actions taken by BOS). He concluded by saying that TAC will be informed about the outcome of this meeting, as well as options and next steps.

Mr. Hamideh reported that under the FTA guidance for MAP-21, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is the designated recipient of Section 5339 funds. Therefore, the actions taken at the BOS Subcommittee are contingent on SCAG approval. However, MTA could be the designated recipient of Section 5339 funds. At this point, no decision has been made as to whether or not MTA will propose to be the designated recipient of the 5339 funds. Due to the need of additional discussion with SCAG, MTA will provide an update on the actions taken at the January BOS meeting at a later date.

11. Regional Airport Connectivity Plan (Chris Haskell, MTA)

Mr. Haskell reported that the Regional Airport Connectivity Plan was prepared in response to the July 2012 motion made by Board Chairman Antonovich, asking MTA to conduct a detailed analysis on five airports in the region (Palmdale, Ontario, Long Beach, LAX, and Burbank) and develop a regional connectivity plan connecting each of the airports to Metro’s regional rail network. In addition to the MTA plan, SCAG is working on the Airport Ground Access Element for their 2016 Regional Transportation Plan.

Mr. Haskell reported that Airport Authorities are the only entities that can initiate projects on airport property or in the vicinity of an airport that might affect runway protection zones. Airport Authorities are overseen by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) who has final approval of projects that are on, or around, airport property. Partnerships with these organizations are vital to ensuring that projects continue to advance. The next step is to work closely with SCAG as they develop their 2016 Regional Transportation Plan.

Mr. Stevens asks why the John Wayne Airport in Orange County was not included in the study when Ontario Airport is included and it is not located in Los Angeles County? Mr. Haskell
replied that Orange County was not included in the motion made by Board Chairman Antonovich and that the motion specifically called for these five particular airports.

Ms. Rizzo asked if the Regional Airport Connectivity Plan is interfacing with the Metrolink Rail Plan? Mr. Haskell responded that the plan does make reference to various Metrolink Rail Plans such as the Antelope Valley Line Infrastructure Improvement Strategy and the San Bernardino Line Strategic Study.

12. Congestion Mitigation Fee (Robert Calix, MTA)

Mr. Calix reported that he is conducting the final round of updates to the various Councils of Governments (COGs) and subregion Committees as well as to their Boards. He was asked to return to the COGs and subregions to share the results of the pilot nexus studies. He hopes to share the results of the pilot nexus studies to TAC by April, provided he is finished with the subregional COG outreach. The results include congestion reduction, fee per trip ranges, economic output and job creation, and some of the comments and issues that came out of this process. Staff hopes to go to the Board with a recommendation in late Spring (May/June 2013).

Mr. Stevens asked if all of the pilot nexus study results are public? Mr. Calix responded that at this time, he has only distributed the pilot nexus study reports to the respective subregions. The subregions have requested some time to review before it is shared with the other subregions. Sometime in the next month, the reports will be shared between subregions so that all the subregions can see the complete results of the report.

Mr. Stevens asked if staff will be recommending a countywide minimum per-trip fee and, if so, what it would be? Mr. Calix responded that the response to this question has not been formulated yet as the COGs and the subregions have not been able to review all of the study results.

Jane Leonard (BOS) asked what the timeframe for implementation is? Mr. Calix responded that it can be implemented countywide within 24 months after Board approval.

13. I-605 Hot Spots Feasibility Study (Ernesto Chaves, MTA)

Mr. Chaves reported that Measure R dedicated $590 million to the I-605 Hot Spots Feasibility Study. MTA completed the feasibility study in December and identified ‘hot spots’ locations as well as defined some preliminary improvement concepts. The study area covers the entire I-605 Freeway within the Gateway Cities Subregion as well as over 100 different arterial intersections in the area. The project team developed conceptual plans for the freeways and intersections including freeway widening, auxiliary lane concepts, interchange reconfigurations, ramp closures, and other operational improvements. The I-605 program has a separate TAC and Policy Committee that reviewed these concepts. An effectiveness analysis was conducted to identify which concepts would be most effective at reducing congestion in the identified hot spots. Estimated cost of all improvements contained within the packages is approximately $2 billion. MTA, as well as the project TAC, is recommending moving forward with the individual congestion area packages by completing Project Study Reports (PSRs). In March, MTA will prepare PSRs for the SR-91/I-605 interchange and the I-
605 from the SR-91 to the SR-60. The PSRs will be completed in approximately one year and the projects can then be defined individually with the funding that is currently available.

Mr. Stevens asked if there has been any coordination between this study and the CMF nexus study? Mr. Chaves responded not at this time, but there will be in the future. The projects in the I-605 Hot Spots Feasibility Study are still conceptual. Once the PSRs are completed, the projects will be more defined and will be able to coordinate with other projects.

14. Legislative Update (Raffi Hamparian and Michael Turner, MTA)

Federal
Mr. Hamparian reported that Congress did not pass the annual appropriations bill last year. Instead, they passed the six-month Continuing Resolution, which is essentially a cut-and-paste of the previous six months of Federal FY 2012. This means that funding levels identified in MAP-21 are not going to come to fruition because they did not abide by the MAP-21 funding levels in FY-2013. Rather, they abided by the old Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) levels.

Mr. Hamparian reported that sequestration is the result of the Budget Control Act of 2011. As a result of this Act, the US Department of Transportation (USDOT) will cut 7 - 8% of funding across the board on a number of transportation programs with a focus on those that are discretionary in nature, such as the Federal New Starts Program.

Mr. Hamparian reported that the Federal and State Legislative Program is focusing on the core Federal Transportation Program, the New Starts Projects, the Non-New Starts Projects that are in construction or nearing construction (such as the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor and Gold Line Foothill Extension) and goods movement issues. SAFETEA-LU and MAP-21 were not robust documents in regards to goods movement. Both documents called for a national freight highway network, but provided no funding.

James Lefton (City of Los Angeles) asked that since the New Starts and Small Starts programs have been merged under MAP-21, what other projects could be competing with the Downtown Los Angeles Street Car Project? Mr. Hamparian responded that since the Street Car Project has not been submitted to the USDOT, it has not been affected at the moment. However, when the time comes to submit the Street Car Project application, discussion will need to occur in order to ensure cooperation.

John Walker (County of Los Angeles) asked that if sequestration occurs, will budget cuts to highway trust fund revenues occur or just the general fund? Mr. Hamparian clarified that the cuts will occur to programs that are discretionary in nature such as New Starts.

State
Mr. Turner reported that there is an initiative in the Legislative Program examining the succession planning policy at the MTA. Over the next five to ten years, much of the MTA workforce will reach retirement age and strategies to replace those workers will need to be implemented. Mr. Turner reported that Legislature passed a bill last year that reformed the procurement laws and staff is working on fixing issues with the pre-qualification process this
year. The Governor recently released the budget and there is very little money left for transit funding. At the moment, there is not much revenue for transportation on the State level.

Mr. Turner reported that implementation of MAP-21 in California generally affects three areas of funding: 1) the Surface Transportation Program (STP), 2) Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), and 3) Transportation Alternative Programs (TAP). Under MAP-21, the funding allocation formula for STP switched to 50% Local and 50% State. State legislation is looking to reconfigure the fund allocation closer to the previous 62% Local and 38% State distribution. For CMAQ, the need is to reestablish the formula in California that existed at the Federal level for the allocation of CMAQ funds. For TAP, small pots of funds that had very different allocation formulas were consolidated. MTA is trying to reach consensus with all of the Southern California agencies on a recommended TAP fund allocation.

Ms. Leonard asked if there has been any discussion about protecting AB 2766 (the current vehicle licensing fee percentage) funding that is already in existence? Mr. Turner replied that AB 2766 was not included in the MAP-21 discussions, but he would gather more information on the subject and reply to Ms. Leonard at a later date.

Mr. Stevens asked if MTA has looked to secure funding from Cap and Trade funds? Mr. Turner responded that MTA has worked with a coalition through the California Transit Association that is working with the League of Cities and Transportation California to get a portion of Cap and Trade funds for transportation. At the moment, it is unclear what amount will be available through Cap and Trade funds.

Jessica Meaney (Safe Routes to School National Partnership) suggested that TAC form a list of Walk and Bike projects that would be ready to start if potential funds become available.

15. LACMTA Green Construction Policy (Cris Liban, MTA)
Mr. Liban reported that MTA continues to meet with several groups across the County to talk about Green Construction Policy (GCP) implementation. MTA is nearing the 18 month of the implementation of GCP and is scheduled to report back to the Board in early March to summarize the implementation process. The GCP webpage can be accessed at http://www.metro.net/projects/gcp.

16. Adjournment
Ms. Pan reported that the next regularly scheduled TAC meeting is March 6, 2013 in the William Mulholland Conference Room, on the 15th floor. If you have questions regarding the next meeting, please contact Matthew Abbott at (213)922-3071 or email abottmm@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. Joyce Rooney/Susan Lipman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Jan Dailey/Jane Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>1. Alberto Angelini/Jimmy Shih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. David Sosa/Vijay Kopparra</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 Leighton/Corinne Ralph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Zaki Mustafa/Ken Hustung</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>1. David Kriske/Dennis Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Cities</td>
<td>2. Mohammad Mostahkami/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. Nicole Rizzo/Mike Behen</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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 (SCRRA - Ex-Officio)</td>
<td>1. Anne Louise Rice/Karen Sakoda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA 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 Yamaron/Phil Aker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Mark Hunter/Brooke Geer Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kevin Minne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Joan Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gina Andhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Joe Hume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jessica Meary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Glenn Wekes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bronwen Trike</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The last name in row 7 has been redacted for privacy.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Kim/Stephen Finnegan (A)</td>
<td>AUTO CLUB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Rooney/Susan Lipman (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Daly/Jane Leonard (A)</td>
<td>BOS SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgt. Cindy Porter/OIC Christian Cracraft (A)</td>
<td>CHP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto Angelini/Jimmy Shih (A)</td>
<td>CAL TRANS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Sosa/Vijay Koparam (A)</td>
<td>CAL TRANS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Blackman/John Whithead (A)</td>
<td>CITIZEN REP ON ADA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Villasenor/Mark Christoffels (A)</td>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Littleton/Corrine Ralph (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaki Mustafa/Ken Hustling (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferdy Chali/Shirley Luard (A)</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon Freeman/Frank Evangelista (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Walker/Allan Abramson (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick DeChellis/Paul Masetas (A)</td>
<td>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Koski/Dennis Woods (A)</td>
<td>ARROYO VERDEGO CITIES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Mostakami/Lisa Rapp (A)</td>
<td>GATEWAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Brager/Ramiro Adeva (A)</td>
<td>LAS VIRGENES MALibu COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Behen/Nicole Rizzo (A)</td>
<td>NORTHL A COUNTY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Stevens/ Craig Bradshaw (A)</td>
<td>SAN GABRIEL VALLEY COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Newman/Vacant (A)</td>
<td>SAN FERNANDO VALLEY COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Basile/Ted Sarnain (A)</td>
<td>SOUTH BAY CITIES COG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Fernbach/Sharon Perlstein (A)</td>
<td>WESTSIDE CITIES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Thompson/Kathryn Engelt (A)</td>
<td>LTISS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Gonzalez/Abe Barros (A)</td>
<td>LTISS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Pani/Matthew Abbott (A)</td>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Drayton/Christopher Gallane (A)</td>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Louise Rice/Karen Sakoda (A)</td>
<td>SORRA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evonne Drummonds/Kathryn Higgenes (A)</td>
<td>SCAGMD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Whitney/Annier Nami (A)</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupe Valdez/La Donna DiCamillo (A)</td>
<td>GOODS MOVEMENT REP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Yamamoto/Phil Aker (A)</td>
<td>TOMAQ SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hunter/Brooke Geer/Pasman (A)</td>
<td>TOMAQ SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 4

February 2013 Board Report
SUBJECT: FY 2012 TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT GRANT PROGRAM

ACTION: APPROVE FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS AND REVISE THE PROGRAM GUIDELINES

RECOMMENDATION

A. Award $9,443,997 in Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Grants to the 13 recommended project sponsors, as shown in Attachment A;

B. Authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute Grant Agreements for the funds; and

C. Amend the TOD Round 3 Grant Program Guidelines to allow 36 months for project completion.

ISSUE

In June 2012, at the Board’s direction, a request for applications was issued for Round 3 of the TOD Planning Grant Program dollars with a maximum funding of $10 million. We received 15 applications totaling $17,719,222 in funds. All applications have been evaluated by an internal panel and we have made recommendations for funding for 13 projects totaling $9,443,997. We are requesting Board approval of the funding and authorization for the CEO to execute Grant Agreements with successful applicants. Further, we are asking the Board to revise the TOD Planning Grant Program Guidelines, from 24 months to 36 months as shown on page 13 in Attachment B.

DISCUSSION

The Program provides funds to encourage cities along transit corridors to make the regulatory changes necessary to foster infill and TOD. TODs increase accessibility and utilization of public transportation, which leads to transit system improvement. In addition, the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) recently proposed guidelines for New Starts and Small Starts projects provides competitive advantage to applicants which encourage transit supportive land use plans, policies and other economic development indicators along transit corridors.
Eligible activities for funding include, but are not limited to, amendments to local general plans and adoption or amendments of specific plans, Transit Village Districts, overlay zones, parking, height, zoning ordinances and similar measures.

Rounds 2 and 3 expanded eligible activities to include developing specific planning tools to consider in adopting regulatory changes that promote TOD, assisting cities to collaborate on planning for new stations and/or to promote TOD-friendly regulatory change around existing or proposed stations, and developing model ordinances or other regulatory frameworks. Any California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) actions necessary for these regulatory changes are also eligible activities under the Program.

Round 3

At its February 23, 2012 meeting, the Board approved Item 31 (Villaraigosa, O'Connor, Wilson and Huizar) making Round 3 available to Metro's systemwide rail and transit corridors, and Los Angeles County Metrolink Stations, in place of six specific transit corridors and rail lines that had previously been directed by the Board.

The Round 3 funding is available to all Los Angeles County local jurisdictions with regulatory land use oversight and COGs and JPAs that represent those Los Angeles County local jurisdictions with regulatory land use oversight, within ¼ mile of Metro's rail and transitway stations and within ½ mile of Metrolink stations. Any COG or JPA applying for funds is required to demonstrate support from the municipality (ies) it is representing with the grant-funded activities. Also at the February 2012 meeting, the Board directed (Ridley-Thomas) prioritization of funding awards with first priority given to applicants proposing regulatory land use changes and second priority to applicants proposing pre-regulatory studies.

We conducted outreach to eligible jurisdictions, COGs and JPAs through letters, phone calls and direct meetings. During this outreach, we heard from eligible municipalities that the proximity in funding rounds creates capacity issues, and that a longer timeframe for project completion would make the grant funding feasible to the broadest number of participants. In addition, some recommended applicants for this round have requested extra time to identify staffing needs in order to complete grant-funded activities within their budgetary constraints. TOD Rounds 1 and 2 have the option of an administrative extension, if time extensions are needed. For this reason, we recommend modifying the Round 3 program guidelines to provide 36 rather than 24 months for project completion.

Evaluation

The Round 3 applications were evaluated by an internal panel. The panel divided the applications into first and second priority categories and set a funding threshold of 70 out of 100 possible points. The applications evaluation included reductions in funding awards and/or eliminations of tasks that fell outside the purview of the grant program. Eliminated tasks included studies of funding mechanisms that support both TOD
economic development as well as infrastructure capacity studies. In response to the number of applicants seeking funds to prepare summaries of TOD funding mechanisms, we are preparing a brief on these funding mechanisms based on a review of several current studies on the topic, and will provide this brief to all TOD Program participants and other interested municipalities. We believe substantial research has been conducted on this topic, and such summaries need not be replicated.

In the first priority category of regulatory land use documents, the panel is recommending funding for the 12 projects submitted in this category. In the second priority category of pre-regulatory studies, the panel is recommending funding for one of the three applications submitted in this category. The panel determined that the three applications for which funding is not recommended did not provide a significant nexus between the proposed work and the subsequent regulatory changes that could lead to increased ridership.

The total recommended funding is $9,443,997. This is less than the $10,000,000 available. The evaluation panel determined that this funding amount is the most appropriate to achieve the Program goals, which is to support land use changes that promote TOD and therefore increase ridership and access to transit.

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

There is no negative impact to the safety of our employees and/or patrons. The TOD policies supported by the Program could improve safety around stations. The principles of TOD include better pedestrian and bicycle access to stations as well as clearer access to stations which can reduce accidents. Further, TOD tends to encourage walking and bicycling, both of which improve the health of patrons.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The FY13 budget includes $1,500,000 in the Subsidies to Others Budget, Cost Center 0441 Project 465550, Transit Oriented Development Grant Program Round 3. Since this is a multi-year project, it will be the responsibility of the Cost Center Manager and the Executive Director, Countywide Planning to budget expenditures in future years.

Impact to Budget

The source of funds for these activities is Measure R 2% System Improvement Funds. These funds are eligible for rail capital improvement costs.

Other sources of funds were considered. However, these funds meet the criteria for these types of projects and sufficient dollars exist to cover these expenditures. Should other eligible funding sources become available, they may be used in place of the identified funds.
ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board may choose not to approve the funding awards and related actions as recommended. We do not recommend this alternative. The Program as designed furthers the Board objectives with regard to land use policy, increased ridership and systemwide improvements. Further, many local planning agencies do not have the resources to accelerate the regulatory changes necessary to promote infill and TOD projects along transit corridors and thus take full advantage of the transit access being made available. Finally, the recommended grant awards meet the program’s objectives and have been carefully evaluated to ensure the end result would achieve the programmatic goals of increased ridership.

The Board may choose not to extend the timing for completion of grant-funded activities, in which case the applicants will be required to demonstrate the ability to complete the grant-funded activities within 24 months. We do not recommend this alternative as providing for realistic timelines creates higher quality results and a better opportunity for successful completion of grant-funded projects. Additionally, this recommended change is in response to feedback received during Round 3 outreach.

NEXT STEPS

With Board approval, we will initiate and execute Grant Agreements with the Round 3 awardees and will also provide the program applicants with a summary of TOD funding mechanisms. We will initiate a study of similar grant funding programs to determine the most effective approach for future rounds. Now that three rounds of the TOD Grant Program have been considered, we believe it would be valuable to evaluate the body of applications received and the program component likely to best achieve the program goals. We will report back to the Board on any recommended changes to the program guidelines should the Board authorize subsequent rounds.

ATTACHMENTS

A. TOD Planning Grant Round 3 Summary and Funding Recommendations
B. Revised Round 3 Program Guidelines

Prepared by: Calvin Hollis, Executive Officer, (213) 922-7319
Jenna Hornstock, Deputy Executive Officer, (213) 922-7437
Rufina Juárez, Transportation Planning Manager, (213) 922-7405
Martha Welborne, FAIA  
Executive Director Countywide Planning

Arthur T. Leahy  
Chief Executive Officer
## 2012 TOD Planning Grant Round 3
### Summary and Funding Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Requested Funding</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Ave Score</th>
<th>Recommended Funding</th>
<th>Stations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of San Fernando</td>
<td>$282,392</td>
<td>TOD Overlay Zone for area immediately south of Metrolink station.</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>$282,392</td>
<td>Metrolink: Sylmar/San Fernando Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Baldwin Park</td>
<td>$289,670</td>
<td>TOD Specific Plan for Downtown Baldwin Park.</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>$289,670</td>
<td>Metrolink Station: Baldwin Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Monte</td>
<td>$400,400</td>
<td>Transit District Specific Plan for El Monte's Main Street area just south of Metrolink Station.</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>$400,400</td>
<td>Metrolink Station: El Monte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Huntington Park</td>
<td>$319,000</td>
<td>Focused General Plan Update for the City of Huntington Park.</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>$319,000</td>
<td>Two possible stations as part of the West Santa Ana Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lynwood</td>
<td>$875,175</td>
<td>Transit Oriented District Plan for area around Long Beach Station and Alameda St/Imperial Highway Bus Corridor.</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>Metro Green Line Station: Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Long Beach</td>
<td>$183,500</td>
<td>TOD Pedestrian Master Plan along the Metro Blue Line corridor in Long Beach.</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>$183,500</td>
<td>Eight Metro Blue Line Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Department of City Planning (DCP)</td>
<td>$6,449,359</td>
<td>Amend community plans and ordinances. Modify, expand, and/or create parking districts and overlay zones. Create streetscape and specific plans.</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>$4,480,000</td>
<td>Three Westside Subway Stations, four Metro Regional Connector Stations and five Orange Line Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning</td>
<td>$675,876</td>
<td>TOD Specific Plan around Metro Blue/Green Line Willowbrook Station.</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>$546,035</td>
<td>Metro Blue/Green Line Station: Willowbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Azusa</td>
<td>$653,000</td>
<td>TOD Master Plan and General Plan/Development Code update for areas around Alameda Avenue and Citrus Avenue Stations.</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>$653,000</td>
<td>Metro Gold Line Phase II extension: Alameda Avenue and Citrus Avenue Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Monterey Park</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Transit Village Specific Plan for area around Garfield Avenue Station.</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Metro Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Gold Line Extension Station: Garfield Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Palmdale</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>TOD Overlay Zone for area around the Palmdale Transportation Center and the Palmdale Regional Airport.</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Metrolink Station: Palmdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Glendale</td>
<td>$641,000</td>
<td>South Glendale Community Plan EIR and a Multi-Modal Transportation Model.</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Metrolink Station: Glendale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) and Los Angeles Department of City Planning (DCP)</td>
<td>$1,063,600</td>
<td>Streetscape Plan for the Century Corridor TOD.</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>$590,000</td>
<td>Metro Crenshaw/LAX Line Station: Aviation/Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orangeline Development Authority (OLDA)</td>
<td>$2,945,000</td>
<td>Preparation of an adoption ready, comprehensive and coordinated strategy for TOD for the OLDA transit corridor.</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Three Metrolink Stations and eight West Santa Ana Branch Corridor Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley Council of Government (SFVCOG)</td>
<td>$2,041,250</td>
<td>TOD data, policy, and regulatory guidelines that can be adopted by municipalities in the San Fernando and Santa Clarita Valleys. TOD Station Area Plans for five Metrolink stations in the San Fernando Valley.</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Seventeen Metro Orange Line Stations, eight Metrolink Stations, and one Shared Orange Line and Metrolink Station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,719,222</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$9,443,997</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The Transit Oriented Development ("TOD") Planning Grant Program ("Program") provides Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority ("Metro") funds to encourage local governments to develop and adopt land use regulations that promote sustainable, transit-oriented design principles. 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, Joint Powers Authorities ("JPAs") that represent local governments, and/or Councils Of Governments ("COGs") to adapt their existing general plans, specific plans, zoning, and other ordinances to encourage such sustainable development forms or to develop model ordinances, planning tools, and/or recommendations that will lead to local regulatory changes in support of TOD. Grant funding for Round 3 of the Program is available to cities, the County of Los Angeles, JPAs, and/or COGs that: (1) have, or represent cities that have, Metrolink stations in Los Angeles County; (2) are along any of Metro’s existing or proposed rail lines or bus transitways. As in the first and second rounds, eligible cities, JPAs, and COGs may use grant funding to develop specific regulatory documents that can be adopted by the member 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;
- Environmental studies required to support the new or amended regulatory documents.

Round 3 of the TOD Planning grant may be used by applicants to complete planning efforts that:

- Identify opportunities for regulatory changes that promote TOD;
- Develop specific planning tools for member cities to consider in adopting regulatory changes that promote TOD;
- Assist member cities to collaborate on planning for the new stations and/or to promote TOD friendly regulatory change around existing or proposed stations;
- Develop model ordinances or other regulatory frameworks.

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;
• Support and implement sustainable development principles.

III. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Local Governments, Los Angeles County, JPAs, and/or COGs representing communities with land use regulatory jurisdiction:

• Within ½ mile of Metrolink Stations in Los Angeles County
• Within ¼ mile of the existing, planned, or proposed Metro rail transit stations or bus transitway stations.

JPAs or COGs that apply MUST demonstrate support of the proposed grant activities from all targeted local governments. Support can be demonstrated by a letter or resolution from the local government.

IV. FUNDING PRIORITIES

a. First priority will be for funding proposals that will result in eliminating regulatory constraints to TOD projects and developing the regulatory documents described in Section I above. Such regulatory changes will result in conditions that 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. While adoption of a Transit Village Development District [Government Code 65460] is only one method of achieving the regulatory changes desired under this grant program, proposals may seek to emulate major portions of the objectives stated in Government Code 65460.

b. Second priority will be given to funding proposals that include planning at or near station locations that may be a precursor to regulatory change, including but not limited to, traffic modeling, density studies and financial feasibility of various development forms. Funding of such projects will only be considered if available funds remain after qualified first priority projects are funded.

V. SCORING: The following provides guidance in the scoring of the applications. Each section of the application contains an indication of the maximum points that may be awarded.
Section 1A - Proposed Regulatory Documents and/or Planning Study:
(a) If the applicant is proposing to adopt or amend a regulatory document, this section should list each of the regulatory documents that will require revision to allow TOD projects to go forward and describe the new regulatory documents, if appropriate. This may include a community’s general plan, zoning ordinances, parking codes, specific plans, Transit Village District documents, etc.
(b) If the applicant is proposing development of a model ordinance or other pre-regulatory documents, this section should discuss the objective(s) of the effort, the targeted community(ies), and some of the anticipated outcomes, for example: description of appropriate TOD guidelines for the targeted communities; identification of specific opportunities for TOD; recommendation of regulatory documents to adopt and/or amend; development of general planning principles for communities to consider in moving forward with TOD-friendly regulatory changes, etc. (Up to 25 points)

Section 1B - Community and Policy Maker Support: This section should identify all of the impacted communities and provide evidence that there exists community stakeholder and policy maker support for the types of regulatory changes and/or studies being proposed. This could be evidenced by prior actions implementing similar changes elsewhere in the community, specific direction by the impacted city councils and mayors, letters of support, etc. This section applies to all applicants, though COGs and JPAs are required to demonstrate support from the targeted communities. (Up to 5 points)

Section 2A - Regulatory Constraints: This section should identify those specific regulatory constraints and/or general land use challenges that the program is meant to address. This could include: outdated parking requirements, height or density restrictions, lack of bicycle and pedestrian access and utilization incentives, etc.; a lack of cohesive vision as to how to plan collaboratively for TOD around new and/or proposed stations; and a lack of clarity as to appropriate TOD principles given the nature of the impacted communities. The description should be comprehensive and subject to regulatory relief. (Up to 15 points)

Section 2B - Impact of Proposed Regulatory Changes: A strong application will carefully describe how the regulatory changes will directly mitigate the constraints previously identified or offer a clear description of how the proposed planning efforts will lead to development, and likely adoption, of regulatory changes that support appropriate TOD. (Up to 15 points)

Section 3 - Public Participation: This section should demonstrate that the applicant has thought through the public participation and outreach program necessary to bring the planning studies and/or regulatory changes forward, has the support of the targeted local government and/or communities, and has considered the impact of the outreach/participation program on the project delivery schedule. (Up to 5 points)

Section 4 - Opportunity Sites: The strongest applications will be able to link the changes to the regulatory environment and/or the proposed planning
recommendations with the near term potential for implementing neighborhood-appropriate TOD development principles. The availability of suitable sites, particularly if controlled by the applicant, will be one measure of near term implementation. (Up to 5 points)

**Section 5A - Project Management Scope of Work:** This section should clearly describe all the work to be undertaken to effect the studies and/or changes proposed leading to and including any required action of the legislative body. The work program should be comprehensive, with clearly stated realistic milestones and deliverables by which progress can be gauged. Responsibilities between staff and consultants, if any, should be identified. (Up to 20 points)

**Section 5B - Project Schedule and Budget:** In this section of the application, a narrative description of the schedule should be provided, and the schedule should demonstrate that the model ordinances or other planning tools can be completed, and/or that the regulatory changes can be completed and brought forward for legislative policymaker action, within the 24 month grant period. Any innovative approaches to the schedule that will expedite the program should also be described in this section. Any local match should be described, including its availability. Strong applications will have presented a realistic and highly cost efficient schedule that maximizes the impact of the grant funds requested. (Up to 10 points)

**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, 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 24-36 months of award.

b. Governing Body Authorization. Completed TOD Planning Grant 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, and a schedule of milestones and deliverables. The schedule and milestones must reflect that the project will be completed within 24 months from the date of award.

d. Funding Disbursements. Funding will be disbursed on a quarterly basis subject to satisfactory compliance with the expenditure plan and milestone schedule as demonstrated in a quarterly report supported by a detailed invoice showing the staff and hours billed 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 February, May, August, and November.

e. Audits. All grant program funding is subject to Metro audit. The findings of the audit are final.
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Draft State Rail Plan Executive Summary
Executive Summary

In 2008, the United States Congress enacted the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (PRIIA), which aimed to strengthen the national rail network by developing a long-term vision of the rail system. PRIIA underscored the benefits of integrating rail into the statewide transportation planning process. The federal law required states to develop state rail plans, no less frequently than every five years, that meet federal requirements, in order to be eligible for federal funding for high-speed rail (HSR) and intercity passenger rail programs. The law also encourages states to develop strategies and policies for enhanced passenger and freight rail services that benefit the public. State Government Code 14036 requires the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to produce a State Rail Plan every two years that includes a passenger and freight rail component.

The 2013 California State Rail Plan (CSRP) meets both federal and state requirements. CSRP completion will make the State compliant with 49 United States Code Section 22102 concerning state rail plans and state rail administration. The CSRP establishes a statewide vision and objectives, sets priorities, and develops policies and implementation strategies to enhance passenger and freight rail service in the public interest. The CSRP details a long-range investment program for California’s passenger and freight infrastructure. It supports the State’s goal to develop an integrated, multimodal transportation network. Finally, the CSRP will guide federal and state rail investments that will improve the movement of people and goods while enhancing economic growth and quality of life.

The CSRP has 10 chapters, as follows:

1. Introduction.
2. California Rail Transportation Context and Challenges.
5. Existing Passenger Rail System.
6. Existing Freight Rail System.
7. Passenger and Freight Rail Integration.
8. Passenger Rail Improvements.
10. Rail Benefits and Next Steps.

Introduction

California’s rail system performance over the past decade underscores the system’s importance to the State. Intercity and commuter passenger rail ridership has been robust and increased during that period. At the same time, the freight rail network has become increasingly important for international, domestic, and intrastate trade.

Passenger and freight rail are positioned to help address environmental, economic development, and population growth challenges such as increased travel demand, traffic congestion, and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The advent of a statewide HSR system that will be integrated into the existing passenger rail network provides opportunities to address these challenges.

Meeting these challenges will be complex. Additional funding for capital investments, ongoing operations, and maintenance is needed. Plans for HSR development and integration with intercity and commuter rail
systems—which leverage state and federal HSR investments—will require well-coordinated and integrated planning, programming, and execution by multiple agencies. Rail networks face increasing freight and passenger demand, often on freight-owned rail infrastructure. Additionally, multiple passenger rail operators (HSR, intercity, and commuter) must respond to traveler expectations of coordinated rail service operations, safety, ticketing, and traveler information.

The 2013 CSRP provides a planning framework for improving California’s rail system. It notes improvements made over the past decade, addresses future needs, and details plans for expansion and integration of rail services.

**CSRP Highlights**

The major findings and results of the CSRP are as follows:

- The 2013 CSRP is more comprehensive and wide-reaching than previous state rail plans because of new federal rail law, and includes changes to rail policy and funding programs.

- The CSRP establishes the following rail vision statement for the future:
  
  *California has a premier, customer-focused rail system that successfully moves people and products while enhancing economic growth and quality of life.*

- The CSRP plans for an integrated HSR, intercity and commuter rail network that is consistent with the California High-Speed Rail Authority’s (Authority) California High-Speed Rail Program Revised 2012 Business Plan (2012 Business Plan). The plans for this network anticipate the travel needs of future population and employment growth.

- For years, California has invested in expanding high-capacity and high-performance intercity and commuter passenger rail services. These services attract high passenger volumes; the three state-supported services are the second, third, and fifth busiest routes in the country.

- Intercity passenger rail institutional roles may change in the future as the result of 2012 legislation that authorized the creation of two new joint powers authorities (JPA) to administer the Pacific Surfliner and San Joaquin routes.

- In 2013, Caltrans and the Authority will become part of a new State Transportation Agency. This agency’s actions may have a major impact on rail planning and service delivery.

- The CSRP summarizes plans for expanding state-supported intercity passenger rail routes by 2020 to support blended service on the first construction section of the Initial Operating Section (IOS) planned for 2018. The proposed expansion of services listed below and the anticipated associated passenger rail improvements described in the CSRP are the subject of on-going Class I railroad operations analysis and related studies. Project scope and costs will be refined as the result of this analysis.
  
  - **Pacific Surfliner**: One more daily roundtrip from San Diego to Los Angeles for a total of twelve; one more daily roundtrip from Los Angeles to Goleta for a total of six, with two of those trips continuing from Goleta to San Luis Obispo.
  
  - **San Joaquin**: As many as seven to eleven daily roundtrips on the first construction section of the IOS and as many as three to six daily roundtrips on the BNSF Railway line.
  
  - **Capitol Corridor**: One additional weekday roundtrip from Sacramento to Oakland for a total of sixteen, and four additional weekday roundtrips from San Jose to Oakland for a total of eleven.
The CSRP describes the planned passenger rail system in 2025 when initial HSR operations are anticipated to be in effect. At that time, 34 round trips on the initial HSR segment from Merced to the San Fernando Valley are planned. Additional expansions to intercity and commuter routes are planned to integrate with the HSR operations and meet demand from population growth; they are subject to additional service planning and operations modeling.

The CSRP describes plans for expansion of existing commuter rail services and new commuter and intercity rail services. Execution of these plans is contingent upon funding and agreement of the railroad that owns the right-of-way.

California is a major origin and destination for freight rail traffic, given its market size and position in international trade flows. The expansion of the Panama Canal and other Pacific Coast port expansions are unlikely to change Pacific Rim trade that moves on California freight railroads. Regional planning studies have identified a series of projects that can resolve freight chokepoints and bottlenecks.

The CSRP emphasizes the critical role Class I freight railroads play in international trade to California shippers and to the national rail network.

The CSRP stresses the importance of large annual expenditures by Class I freight railroads in maintenance, capacity expansion, locomotives, and rolling stock. The plan identifies currently planned projects among 4 types of freight improvements totaling $15 billion.

Many of the intercity and commuter rail services run on private Class I freight railroad right-of-way, which provides challenges and opportunities for both systems.

Major conflicts in rail corridors will require careful coordination between multiple passenger and freight users. Some of these corridors include Oakland to Sacramento, Los Angeles to Colton, Los Angeles to Riverside, and Los Angeles to Burbank.

The CSRP describes the following public benefits of the HSR and intercity passenger rail improvements:

- Statewide carbon dioxide emission reduction of 37,000 tons per year in 2020, 573,000 tons per year in 2025, and almost 1.9 million tons per year by 2040 from the expanded HSR and intercity passenger rail system.

- Annual user and non-user economic benefits increasing from $164 million in 2020 to $2.5 billion in 2025 to nearly $7.4 billion in 2040.

Outreach was conducted to state, regional and local agencies to receive their input and feedback. A variety of methods and channels will be employed to receive public input. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) and the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) are offering comments and suggestions in an ongoing process aimed to lead to approval of the CSRP by both entities.

Dynamic changes have caused funding and planning for California’s passenger and freight rail system to evolve quickly. Class I Railroads are conducting operations analysis; Caltrans and the Authority will be updating planning documents; and environmental work at the program and project level is proceeding. This work will be reflected in future documents, including the 2014 CSRP and the 2014 High-Speed Rail Program Business Plan.
**CSRP Chapter Summaries**

**Chapter 1: Introduction.** Chapter 1 explains what the 2013 CSRP will accomplish and why the plan is more comprehensive and wide reaching than previous state rail plans. It details how the CSRP meets federal and state legal requirements for state rail plans, and describes the contents of each chapter in the CSRP. The chapter also explains how the 2013 CSRP responds to changes in federal rail policy, funding, and requirements, new California climate change legislation that ties transportation to emission reduction goals, and integration with the Authority’s 2012 Business Plan.

**Chapter 2: California Rail Transportation Context and Challenges.** Chapter 2 describes the policy, planning and legislative context for the CSRP as well as the socioeconomic and environmental background and rail transportation system challenges. The CSRP supports and is an element of the multimodal California Interregional Blueprint (CIB) and California Transportation Plan (CTP). Additionally, it supports and is consistent with the Authority’s 2012 Business Plan. This chapter describes rail transportation’s environmental benefits and notes environmental review processes for rail projects. The chapter also details the following rail system issues: demand factors for growth in passenger and freight traffic, needs for seamless passenger transportation connections, necessity of integrated planning for HSR, and intercity and commuter rail operations. Chapter 2 also reiterates the importance of integrated planning between HSR, intercity and commuter rail operations, both from a legal standpoint and out of necessity for operations and customer satisfaction.

**Chapter 3: State Rail Plan Vision Statement.** Chapter 3 presents California’s unified rail vision: *California has a premier, customer-focused rail system that successfully moves people and products while enhancing economic growth and quality of life.* The passenger rail system creates an integrated network with state-of-the-art, customer-focused services that enhance quality of life. The freight rail system connects industries and shippers to national and international markets, co-exists with growing passenger rail services, and also improves quality of life. Chapter 3 also describes how the CSRP vision fits into the CTP vision, goals and objectives, the CIB, and other modal plans.

**Chapter 4: Public Outreach and Approval Process.** This chapter details the public outreach goals and objectives, and support tasks such as stakeholder databases, website development, branding, and creation of collateral materials. The public outreach plan establishes a series of meetings and coordination with the CSRP Advisory Committee, other state agencies, and public meetings associated with the February 2013 Draft CSRP release. The chapter outlines this activity, summarizes comments received and their incorporation into the CSRP, and explains the approval process by the CTC and FRA. It details how state, regional, and local agencies are providing their input and feedback on the CSRP. Finally, it explains the review and approval process for the CSRP by the CTC and FRA.

**Chapter 5: Existing Passenger Rail System.** Chapter 5 includes a detailed description of California’s state-supported intercity routes: *Pacific Surfliner, San Joaquin* and *Capitol Corridor*, including the connecting Amtrak Thruway bus service. It also describes the Amtrak long-distance trains that operate in California. The chapter discusses commuter rail services in the State, and explains the State’s urban rail systems and their connectivity to intercity and commuter rail. Exhibit ES.1 shows the state-supported and Amtrak long distance intercity passenger rail routes in California. The chapter discusses passenger rail connectivity, rail station configurations, and operational aspects, and includes performance data for the state-supported and long-distance routes. Additionally, Chapter 5 explains current and emerging institutional roles and relationships among owners/operators of passenger rail and other regulatory agencies, and details safety and security agencies, programs and issues.
Exhibit ES.1: California Existing Intercity Passenger Rail Routes

Source: Caltrans, 2013.
Chapter 6: Existing Freight Rail System. This chapter describes and inventories California’s freight railroad system, which is shown in Exhibit ES.2. For Class I and short lines, this information includes system characteristics, capabilities, and functions. The chapter offers details on types of commodities moved along the current and future freight rail network. The chapter describes freight rail trends emphasizing the unique function of California’s freight rail network, international trade flows, logistics change, and upcoming Positive Train Control requirements. The chapter also discusses freight rail system bottlenecks and capacity issues, institutional structure of freight rail programs, statutes affecting freight rail, public initiatives for rail freight, and freight rail safety and security.

Chapter 7: Passenger and Freight Rail Integration. This chapter discusses current and future issues in California regarding passenger and freight trains sharing the same tracks. The chapter identifies corridors with high train volumes, challenges for ongoing shared conditions, and strategies and mitigation measures for corridors experiencing increased demand by multiple users. Major conflicts in several rail corridors will require careful coordination among multiple passenger and freight users. The chapter also discusses passenger and freight rail connectivity.

Chapter 8: Passenger Rail Improvements. This chapter discusses HSR phased implementation and modernization; the process for developing and prioritizing improvements to the three existing state-supported intercity rail routes and a list of potential improvements (subject to additional studies currently underway); proposed extensions to intercity rail routes and proposed new routes; a program of improvements for existing commuter rail services and proposed new commuter rail services; and the proposed X Train and XpressWest HSR services. Exhibit ES.3 shows a map of the planned California HSR system, and Exhibit ES.4 shows the integrated statewide passenger system map with conventional intercity and high-speed rail networks along with related blended systems and long-distance Amtrak routes. Finally, the chapter addresses station planning to enhance connectivity to transportation systems.

Chapter 9: Freight Rail Improvements. Chapter 9 outlines 4 kinds of freight rail issues and improvements: trade corridors, local rail, community impact mitigation, and economic development. The chapter describes new projects and programs for freight investments, policy issues, and best practices for consideration, and lists freight rail-related highway-rail grade separations. It also stresses the importance of large annual expenditures by Class I freight railroads in maintenance, capacity expansion, locomotives, and rolling stock. Chapter 9 identifies currently planned projects totaling $15 billion.

Chapter 10: Rail Benefits and Next Steps. Chapter 10 summarizes the rail service planning assumptions for 2020, 2025, and 2040 for frequencies on the integrated HSR, intercity and commuter rail networks. Ridership and revenue projections for these planning scenarios are then presented. Projected GHG and air quality emission reductions and economic effects resulting from HSR and intercity rail improvements are quantified. Other environmental and land use and community benefits of planned rail are discussed. The chapter explains past and current rail funding programs at the federal and state level. Finally, the chapter suggests important next steps presented in the following categories: institutional changes, planning activities, and project execution. The next steps are:

- **Institutional Changes:** Relationships among organizations engaged in passenger rail planning and service delivery could change in the near future. In order to deliver the HSR Blended System, new institutional structures may evolve.
  - Effective July 1, 2013, a new State Transportation Agency will be created in California state government that will have jurisdiction over the Authority, Caltrans, the CTC and other transportation related state departments. The proposed 2013-14 Governor’s Budget states: “The Transportation Agency develops and coordinates the policies and programs of the state’s transportation entities to achieve the state’s mobility, safety, and air quality objectives from its transportation system.” This agency’s actions may have a major impact on rail planning and delivery.
Exhibit ES.2: California Class I Rail System, 2012

Source: Caltrans, 2013.
Exhibit ES.3: California High-Speed Rail Initial Operating Section and Phased Implementation

Source: California High-Speed Rail Authority, 2013.
Exhibit ES.4: California Intercity and High-Speed Rail Network

Source: Caltrans, 2013.
In 2012, the California State Legislature authorized the creation of two new JPAs to administer the Pacific Surfliner and San Joaquin routes (described in more detail in Section 5.3.1 in Chapter 5). If JPAs are created under the requirements of state law, the JPAs can enter into interagency transfer agreements with Caltrans between June 30, 2014 and June 30, 2015. The legislation specifies several requirements that must be reached before the internal transfer agreements can be executed. Under the terms of the legislation, Caltrans would continue to administer the two routes through Fiscal Year 2013-14. The process of establishing JPAs has started. This process provides a forum for re-examination of the appropriate institutional structures to administer intercity rail in California.

With the release of the 2012 Business Plan, the Authority, Caltrans, Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority, commuter rail agencies and other regional transportation and urban transit agencies realized new cooperative structures would need to be formed to plan and deliver the HSR Blended System. As discussed in Section 2.1.3 of Chapter 2 the Northern and Southern California Rail Partners Working Groups were formed to plan and deliver the HSR Blended System. These planning and delivery structures are still evolving.

The Authority expects to enter into partnerships with private firms and/or consortia for funding, construction and/or operations of HSR services.

Congressional deliberations on reauthorization of PRIIA and of MAP-21 may expand or alter federal programs for passenger and freight rail that could change responsibilities of federal and state agencies.

Planning Activities: Entities engaged in rail planning and delivery will continue to plan a wide range of passenger and freight rail projects and services in California. These activities include developing plans for the HSR Blended System, planning for existing system expansion, and planning and delivering new rail systems: As noted above, the institutional structure to plan and operate the HSR Blended System is evolving, and it has not been fully determined what entities will be involved in the following planning activities:

- Plans for integrating HSR and conventional passenger rail into a blended system will need to be developed, including: prioritization and delivery of capital projects for the 2018 and 2022 Blended System; administration and funding of operations and maintenance, including revenue and cost sharing; fleet delivery, utilization and maintenance; schedule integration and fare policy and systems; transit and other transportation connectivity; and integrated marketing and branding.

- Detailed capital and service planning is necessary for some specific locations where the existing rail systems will need to be expanded to meet the needs of the statewide blended system, including: Stockton, the HSR San Fernando Valley terminus, and Los Angeles Union Station.

- Railroads will be conducting ongoing and new rail operations simulation modeling to determine the effects of planned HSR, intercity, and commuter passenger rail operations in freight and publicly-owned rail corridors, and the necessary capital projects to allow delivery of the planned service.

- Environmental clearance for HSR projects in the 2012 Business Plan and for necessary intercity and commuter rail projects on existing and the planned HSR Blended System will continue through the completion of program and project environmental documents.
Service Development plans, which are the rail corridor-level companion documents to environmental documents, will be completed and possibly updated, particularly in relationship to planning the HSR Blended System.

Station area planning activities for stations on the HSR network will be conducted.

Detailed plans, including engineering and environmental, will be prepared for passenger and freight rail projects listed in Chapters 8 and 9.

The CSRP and the Authority’s 2012 Business Plan will be updated in 2014 in accordance with state law. These updates will include the latest information on future passenger rail operations and ongoing planning activities.

Future passenger rail services or extensions of services described in Sections 8.3 and 8.4 of Chapter 8 will require future operational modeling and operational agreements with the applicable freight railroads.

Planning for freight rail projects in the upcoming California Freight Mobility Plan will proceed.

**Project Execution:** Even as public agencies complete detailed passenger and freight rail plans, many funded freight and passenger rail projects will move into procurement, construction, and/or manufacturing. These steps include the following:

- Passenger rail locomotives and coaches for intercity service meeting new national equipment specifications will be manufactured domestically and will be tested and put into operating service.

- New mainline track, sidings, switches and turnouts, and train signal and control systems will be constructed on rail lines throughout the State for freight rail operations and for passenger rail services.

- New maintenance and layover facilities will be constructed to accommodate blended HSR service.