



DRAFT MINUTES

MTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
May 7, 2003

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Renee Berlin (Chair) called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m. Randy Lamm (MTA) took roll and declared a quorum was present.

2. Approval of Minutes

Richard Burt (South Bay Cities COG) requested that the minutes be revised to reflect TAC's approval of the waiver for MTA to act as a pass through for the City of Redondo Beach's federal formula funds (page 10).

The minutes from the April 9th meeting were approved, as revised, on a motion by Pat DeChellis (County of Los Angeles) and seconded by Steve Finnegan (Automobile Club).

3. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees

BOS (Brynn Kernaghan) Handout

- Met on April 29th;
- Discussed ASI's implementation of its new business plan and the potential impacts of MTA becoming a voting member on the ASI Board;
- Discussed MTA agenda item on the Metro Vanpool Program and potential impacts to the Capital Allocation Procedure (CAP);
- Heard updates on the Call for Projects, Short Range Transportation Plan schedule, Regional Integration ITS Project, 1-800-COMMUTE, legislation and the State's deficit.
- There will be a meeting on Monday, May 12 to finalize comments on the budget and to adopt funding marks.
- Senator Murray has submitted a bill, SB 314, which provides for Los Angeles County to impose another sales tax for specified transportation projects. Ms. Kernaghan recommended that a process be established so that all entities have input into the content of the bill.

- Action items included:
 - Allocated discretionary portion of Federal Section 5307 15%/1% funds for FY '04.
 - Set Special BOS meeting for May 12 to approve FAP/CAP funding marks for FY '04.
 - Adopted a motion stating that if MTA decides to not allocate discretionary funds that have been allocated in the past (e.g. Prop A/C interest), then operators be noticed six months in advance so that they have time for contingency planning.
 - Named BOS representatives to the Prop A/C Local Return Guidelines review committee: Michael Busch and Marianne Kim (alternate).
- Next meeting May 8 -- a briefing for TAC and the Subcommittees on the MTA Budget at 2 p.m.
- Steve Lantz (Metrolink) asked if TAC could agendaize the van pool item that went to BOS.

LTSS (Joyce Rooney)

- Met on April 24th;
- Action items included:
 - Appointed Local Return Working Group Representative Manuel Palmarin from the City of Glendora.
 - Approved supporting Metrolink's participation in the EZ-Pass program;

Received reports on:

- Call for Projects updates, Short Range Transportation Plan schedule, Regional ITS Project, UFS-Voluntary NTD reporting
- MOU's are in process;
- Next meeting May 29.

Streets and Freeway (Haripal Vir)

- Met on April 17th.
- Action items included:
 - Named Ken Johnson to the Proposition A and C Local Return Working Group;
 - Approved the staff recommendation to reallocate lapsed TDA Article 3 funds and to establish a minimum allocation of five thousand dollars for all recipients that receive small annual allocations. Eleven cities would benefit from this action.
- Next meeting is on May 15.

TDM/Air Quality (Mark Yamarone)

- Did not meet in April.
- Next meeting May 13th.

4. I-710 Gap Closure Tunnel Concept (Roger Snoble)

Roger Snoble (MTA CEO) noted that closing the gap on the I-710 Freeway is one of the most significant improvements that can be made to alleviate congestion, and improve air quality in the region. The current plans for the I-710 were engineered over ten years ago. In Europe, new tunneling technologies have been developed for highway tunnels. Mr. Snoble noted one example of the new engineering technologies is in Prague, Czechoslovakia, where a 4-lane highway tunnel is being constructed (one of a series of tunnels in Prague) underneath areas where many historic structures exist. This new tunneling technology is safer and less expensive than what has been used in the past.

MTA is currently meeting with various neighborhood groups and working with the affected cities to develop an MOU, which will specify the critical steps and milestones necessary to develop the tunnel alternative. Mr. Lantz asked if the \$1.3 billion tunnel would be dedicated to cars only and would the other tunnel be an additional cost to be funded from a yet determined source. Mr. Snoble responded that so far the concept being considered is for twin automobile tunnels, three lanes each, one of which would be an HOV lane in each direction and the cost would be \$1.3 billion. If a truck tunnel is added there would be additional cost, but incrementally it would not be that much more. Currently, the project does not allow trucks, however, it is important to acknowledge that this is an important thoroughfare for both types of vehicles.

Mr. Finnegan lauded the MTA's leadership in pursuing a I-710 solution, and asked whether there was an initiative to seek Federal funding for a more comprehensive study on the tunnel alternative and if not, is there a plan for another source of funding to perform the study. Mr. Snoble replied that funding sources were extremely limited because of the current State budget shortfalls, but that initial funding needed for the feasibility study would not be prohibitively expensive. However, if progress is made to a point where Caltrans is ready to do some engineering then there will be a need for some state and local funds.

Mr. DeChellis asked if the tunnel alternative is adopted would the environmental review process have to be repeated. Mr. Snoble replied that it probably would need to be repeated. If the MOU was executed in the next year, then the environmental process could probably be completed in another two years because there would likely be community support and there would be much less environmental impact. The construction period would be 3-4 years and the project could be completed in 10 years. There is still the obstacle of funding. Mr. DeChellis asked if litigation for the existing project was on-going and when that would be decided. Mr. Snoble said there was no estimated time when the litigation would be completed. Mr. Finnegan pointed out there are a couple of trade off's -- what is going to happen first, a resolution to the 30 - 40 year fight over the current project, or the new project that Mr. Snoble is describing. Mr. Finnegan speculated that even if the current lawsuit is resolved, there would most likely be follow-on lawsuits by either South Pasadena or Alhambra. The Auto Club has not taken a position on whether or not to support the tunnel concept, but will be looking at it. Mr. DeChellis postulated the idea that if there was resolution soon on the current project, it may have the effect of accelerating the new MOU and the new environmental impact report.

Mr. DeChellis asked about the actual tunnel parameters, if the tunnel alternative were to be built. Mr. Snoble replied that three lanes of traffic conforming to Interstate standards would necessitate at least a 55 ft. wide tunnel, which is the limit of current tunneling technology, and that emerging technologies may eventually allow for more lanes. Perhaps double decking the tunnels could allow more capacity. Jim Lefton (City of Los Angeles) asked how the funding for the tunnel alternative compared to that of surface construction. Mr. Snoble replied that tunneling is generally more expensive than surface construction, however, because of the topography and the urban landscape that exists in the area, the costs of tunneling becomes more economically viable, when compared to the “cut and cover” method.

5. Chairperson’s Report (Renee Berlin/Randy Lamm) *Handout*

Ms. Berlin relayed Robin Blair’s (MTA) request to distribute the draft MTA Parking policy. Mr. Blair will be present at the June 4th TAC meeting for discussion and possible action on this item. Mr. Blair requested that if there are any comments, to please forward them to him prior to the June 4th TAC meeting.

Ms. Berlin also discussed the TAC Subcommittee Chairperson’s meeting that was convened just prior to the TAC meeting. She stated that two items were discussed: TAC and the Subcommittees’ role in developing the priority status of the projects in the Call for Projects data base and the time frame for processing Call for Projects MOUs/LOAs. Ms. Berlin also stated that each sponsor should have received notification from the MTA of their project’s priority status. If sponsors have not received their notification, they should contact Ms. Berlin.

Ms. Berlin commented that there may be some confusion regarding the Special May 21st TAC meeting. TAC members should ‘hold’ the May 21st date for potential sponsor appeals of MTA priority rankings. If the MTA has made a mistake in applying the priority criteria, and sponsors can show appropriate documentation justifying a change in priority ranking, then MTA staff will make the change administratively. The Special TAC meeting will only be held if:

1. MTA staff cannot come to a decision; or
2. The change in priority request is turned down by staff.

The June 4th meeting will be for the annual Call for Projects deobligations appeals.

Ms. Berlin discussed a concern regarding the FY 03 LOA-MOU processing. She stated that the MTA is processing all LOAs and MOUs that have been received by MTA and which have project priorities 1 through 3.

- Randy Lamm (MTA) presented the Chairperson report and reminded TAC members to sign the attendance sheet and to review the Union Station Evacuation plan.
- Mr. Lamm reminded members there is one and possibly two special TAC meetings in May. The first on May 8, from 2-4 p.m. in the Gateway room is a workshop presentation on the FY ’04 MTA budget for TAC and its Subcommittees - BOS, Streets and Freeways, TDM/AQ and

LTSS. A special TAC meeting has been tentatively scheduled for May 21st in the Union Station room at 9:30 a.m., to accommodate any appeals of priority rankings for existing Call projects. Mr. Lamm expressed it is MTA staff's intention to try and handle any appeals administratively, and that sponsors have until May 12th to submit any supporting documentation and/or correct any incomplete or erroneous information used to establish the rankings. If the appeals can not be handled administratively, then staff will contact the sponsor to invite them to appeal to TAC on May 21st.

- At the June 4th meeting, TAC will review and take action on the annual Call for Projects Recertification and Deobligations.
- The former head of the RTD, John Dyer has passed and a funeral is planned in his hometown of Hickson, Tennessee. A memorial service is planned for June 9 in Los Angeles.
- The FY 04 draft budget is available on the MTA website at www.mta.net.
- The MTA's Board of Directors has approved a number of changes aimed at enhancing bus service in the Westside/Central Service Sector. These changes will provide more service to area riders during peak demand, adding more late-evening service and improve the night-time to day-time service. Those who want more detail should contact Mr. Lamm.
- MTA will mark 'Southern California Bike-To-Work' day on Thursday, May 15th by offering bicyclists free rides on Metro buses and rail.
- A new group of uniformed officers, whose duties will include fare enforcement and passenger assistance, will be deployed on the Metro Red Line, beginning in early May. The Sheriff's Security Assistants, outfitted in white shirts and navy blue trousers, also will work as fare inspectors on the Metro Gold Line when it opens this summer. Security Assistants currently work in the courts, screening for weapons and providing building security.
- The third installment of Metro Motion, MTA's 30-minute cable TV show aired Sunday, April 13 on CityTV in Santa Monica and spotlighted the Gateway Cities. It included stories on the Alameda Corridor, the Harbor Transitway and how Sheriff's deputies use the Segway Human Transporter to patrol the Metro Blue Line. Other air times were Sunday, April 13, 2 p.m.; Monday, April 14, 7:30 p.m.; Wednesday, April 16, 8 a.m.; Saturday, April 19, 10 a.m.; Sunday, April 20, 6:30 p.m.; and Tuesday, April 22, 5 p.m.
- MTA took over segments of the Metro Gold Line from the Los Angeles to Pasadena Construction Authority on April 18th. Increased testing of the line began in preparation for the public opening. In mid-May, the Construction Authority is expected to turn over the entire Metro Gold Line including stations to MTA. An opening date will not be announced until more testing is completed.
- Starting this fall, technicians will begin equipping MTA's Bus Operations Control Center and every bus in the active fleet with ATMS – the Advanced Transportation Management System – which promises to increase safety for employees and customers while improving operations

efficiency and vehicle maintenance. ATMS includes a state-of-the-art radio network capable of transmitting both voice and digital data messages, Computer-Aided dispatcher consoles that feature vehicle tracking, a communications switching system and administrative software. An Automatic Vehicle Location system that uses Global Positioning System satellites to monitor the location of every bus on the road, an automatic passenger counter that will keep track of how many patrons board and get off a bus, an automatic voice enunciator that will make both voice and visual announcements of upcoming bus stops, wiring for the installation of Universal Fare System equipment when that system is ready to come on line, and electronic sensors that monitor the “health” of a bus.

Board Recap

Approved

- Authorize the Chief Executive Officer to extend the term of the MTA’s Exclusive Negotiation Agreement (ENA) with Urban Partners, LLC for the proposed joint development of the Wilshire/Vermont Metro Red Line Station site for an additional 60 days to July 4, 2003.
- Amend the FY 03 budget to appropriate an additional \$27.9 million to the Enterprise Fund budget
- Consider the following actions to address State Budget impact on Los Angeles County transportation funding:
 - A. Adopted working priorities indicating those projects that can be funded based on current fund estimates. For those Freeway and Call for Projects projects that are deferred, make them the first priority for the next available funding, i.e., federal reauthorization, 2004 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), etc.;
 - B. Adopted the refined project priority setting criteria;
 - C. Requested MTA’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to hold a meeting to allow Call for Project sponsors an opportunity to comment on their project(s) prioritization;
 - D. Approved the State Transportation Improvement program (STIP) amendment request;
 - E. Advanced MTA’s 17% commitment to the Alameda Corridor East (ACE) for Phase 1 and pursuing existing Transportation Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) commitments through the legislative process; and
 - F. Directed the Chief Executive Officer to continue to develop ways to advance high priority, immediately “ready-to-go” projects using funds from both deobligated and “not ready-to-go” low priority projects.
- A motion by Supervisor Yaroslavsky to rename the MTA Metro Rapid Transitway the San Fernando Valley Metro Rapidway

- Adopt oppose position on:
AB 1720 (NUNEZ) – would make legislative findings regarding the condition of the Maintenance Employees Health and Welfare fund and require the MTA to transfer State Transit Assistance (STA) funds to the fund.

Approve As Amended

- **By Director Antonovich:**

A. To negotiate and execute twenty contract amendments for the Metro Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) for a total amount not-to-exceed \$4,438,300.

- **The following positions on state legislation:**

A. AB 684 (DUTRA) – would require that all smart card systems placed into contract after 2004 be equipped with a specified device to create interoperability of differing smart card technology and that these systems be equipped with this device as the equipment is upgraded or repaired. Require the establishment of a statewide task force to oversee the development of specifications and software to establish the technological requirements to establish interoperability of varying smart card technologies. Oppose, work with author.

B. AB 875 (WYLAND) – Would require, beginning in 2008, all funds generated by the state gas tax and sales tax on gas be apportioned by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to the county in which those funds were generated and, also require the CTC to program these funds for freeway purposes. Oppose

C. SB 157 (BOWEN) would create the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement Act in the State of California, create a Board of Governors to represent California at the agreement meetings and require that implementation of agreements reached by the project shall be done by separate legislation. Support

D. SCA 7 (MURRAY) – would require that the loan repayment conditions for the State Transportation Fund and Public Transportation Account be applied to any loan that is made from Motor Vehicle Fuel and Vehicle-related revenues to any other fund or account in the state. Support

Approved as Revised

Direct staff to report back with a comprehensive Transitional Duty Safety Patrol program and implementation plan in 60 days. This is in response to Director Bernson's motion regarding Workers Compensation

Approved on Consent Calendar

- The local scores for the Federal Transit Administration Section 5310 projects
- Approve a one-time waiver for the City of Redondo Beach of the MTA Pass-Through Grant Program policy's restriction on assisting local agencies in obtaining Federal Section 5307 Formula funds;

- Authorize the Chief Executive Officer to enter into a Joint Development Agreement (JDA) and, subject to developer meeting contingencies of the JDA, to enter into ground lease, easement agreement, and such other agreements necessary to implement the ground lease with Wilshire Entertainment Center, LLC (WEC) for the development of approximately 72,700 square feet of MTA-owned property located at the Metro Red Line Wilshire/Western Station.

6. Legislative Update (Rafi Hamparian)

No report -- the updated Legislative Matrix was distributed.

7. FY 04 Prop A/C Local Return/TDA Article 3 and Article 8 Funding Marks (M. J. West)

Ms. West reported that the funding marks were transmitted in early April to the finance officers of the 88 cities and the County of Los Angeles. For FY 04, the Local Return Program (for both Propositions A and C) is increasing by 4.4% over the FY 03 budget. TDA Articles 3 and 8 are projected to decrease by 5.5% in FY 04, over the FY 03 budget due to a reduction in carryover amounts. Population figures from 2002 data were used to generate the funding marks.

Mr. DeChellis asked if TDA Article 3 is a state sales tax. Ms. West replied that it is a State-funding program that is derived from state sales taxes. Mr. DeChellis asked why the Propositions A & C Local Return funding is increasing by 4.4%, while the TDA funding is decreasing by 5.5%. Ms. West responded that she would provide Mr. DeChellis with information on how the data for the forecast was derived. Ms. Berlin added that this would be discussed at the Special Budget Workshop the next day. Mr. DeChellis conveyed his concern that the County's budget is predicated on the forecasted revenues, and this would cause difficulties if actual receipts did not meet the forecast. Ms. West replied that she believes the forecast was derived using very conservative estimates. *[The figures in the proposed budget on page IV-13 show an increase of 4.4% in the Proposition A & C Local Return Program -- \$234.3m to \$244.7m and TDA Bikeways/Transit/Streets & Highways shows a decrease of 5.5% from \$21.8m to \$20.6m due to carryover revenues included in the FY03 budget that were distributed in the TDA program.]* Mark Bozigian (North Los Angeles County) commented that for cities that receive TDA Article 8 the impact of negative funding marks are greater because they have to cut their budgets, and economic forecasts indicate that FY 04 is not supposed to be as bad as FY 03.

Mr. Bozigian stated that he could not attend the Special Budget workshop, and requested that the information provided by M.J. West on how the numbers were derived be e-mailed to TAC members. Ms. Berlin agreed to do so.

8. TDA Article 3 Fund Lapse Recommendations. (Haripal Vir)

At the April 17th Streets and Freeways meeting, Susan Richan (MTA) reported on the TDA Article 3 Lapsing procedures. Ms. Richan explained that when the funds are lapsed, they are returned to the account for reallocation. There are two ways funds are lapsed. The first is when allocations are older than 4 years without being expended, and the second, is that cities must submit a claim form every year by June 30th. The MTA wants local jurisdictions to spend its funds, but the MTA also must provide during the Triennial Audit documentation that as the Regional Planning agency, the MTA has taken steps to ensure the timely use of funds, therefore the need for lapsing. Presently, there is approximately \$33,000 in lapsed funds that staff is recommending to be reallocated to the smaller cities to provide them with a base amount that can be used for projects. Ms. Richan stated that many small cities do not receive sufficient allocations to complete their projects. Therefore, staff proposed using Lapsing funds to provide each jurisdiction with a minimum allocation.

Ms. Richan stated that staff considered minimum guarantee options ranging from \$2,000 to \$5,000, and is recommending a minimum guarantee of \$5,000 per jurisdiction. She gave an example of why a minimum allocation is needed. The problem is that there are cities like Vernon that only receive \$49/per year of TDA Article 3 funding, and in situations like this it is not worth the City's time to submit a claim form. Ms. Richan stated that there are 11 cities that fall below the \$5,000 mark, and 10 of them said they could use funding at the \$5,000 level. One city indicated that it wanted to opt out of the program unless it could receive significantly higher funding amounts. Since jurisdictions are given a total of four years to accumulate and spend their allocations, these cities would be able to spend up to \$20,000 to do some small projects (typically bike and pedestrian types of projects).

Haripal Vir reported that the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee approved staff's recommendation and now is requesting TAC's concurrence with the Streets and Freeways action. Ms. Richan commented that a question was asked at the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee -- what happens next year if no funds are lapsed. Staff would recommend using the interest on the TDA account (limited to 2% of the TDA fund balance held in reserve) to provide the minimum allocations. David Feinberg (Westside Cities) asked if staff had contacted all the cities whose funds lapsed. Ms. Richan replied that all the cities were contacted. Mr. DeChellis asked which city did not want the TDA Article 3 money. Ms. Richan responded that the City of Industry would be sending a signed letter declining the funding because it is not enough to make it worth their time. Ms. Richan also commented that there are 54 cities that have not submitted TDA Article 3 Claim Forms, representing \$3.8 million. A letter was sent out on May 2nd. Mr. DeChellis asked that he receive the list of cities that have not submitted claim forms. Ms. Berlin agreed to send him the list.

Ms. Berlin asked if there was a motion to concur with the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee recommendation to approve the staff recommendation on TDA Article 3 Lapsing and to create a minimum guarantee program. Mr. Vir made the motion, with Mr. Finnegan seconding. The motion passed.

9. FY '04 Formula/Capital Allocation Program Funding Marks (Brynn Kernaghan)

Ms. Kernaghan explained that according to MTA Board policy and State law that certain funds that pass through the MTA be allocated to the MTA and the 16 Municipal Operators on a formula basis. Each year each operator's service data is inputted into the funding formula to produce the funding marks. The BOS will conduct a final review and approval of the funding marks on May 12th, and the MTA Board is scheduled to adopt the funding marks in June. Andre Colaiace (BOS) informed TAC that BOS passed a motion at their last meeting that would require MTA to provide six months advance notice if MTA decides not to allocate discretionary funds which have been allocated in the past (e.g. Proposition A/C interest). Mr. Colaiace asked if TAC would need to concur with the BOS motion since it would require a change in MTA Board policy concerning the funding marks. Ms. Berlin replied yes, but indicated that TAC may not be prepared to take an action today as TAC members have not had an opportunity to review the motion.

Alex Clifford (MTA Operations) commented that he was in opposition to the motion at the last BOS meeting, and that there is no urgency in rushing this policy change to the MTA Board. Mr. Clifford stated that he was not necessarily opposed to the concept of determining the status of the revenues six months in advance, however, he was concerned about the process and implications for MTA to make a decision so far in advance of the current schedule for determining fund marks. Mr. Clifford recommended that TAC ask BOS to revisit the question, and to have MTA Budget staff present at the BOS meeting to discuss how this could be implemented. Once the information is made available to answer some of these questions, then a more workable motion could be made and acted upon. Mr. Colaiace responded that since the motion was made at BOS, he questioned why it should automatically go through TAC for consideration. Ms. Berlin responded that based upon the amended TAC protocol, TAC is to be provided an opportunity to review and concur with Subcommittee motions. Further, TAC staff was not previously informed of the motion. Ms. Kernaghan added that she did not inform Ms. Berlin of the motion because she thought she could submit the information to TAC in writing this morning. Ms. Berlin asked if there was any issue preventing BOS from revisiting the issue, since the funding marks would not be acted upon by the MTA Board until its June meeting and any outcome from the recommendation would not take effect until next year's budget. Mr. Colaiace replied that he desired that the motion go to the Board with the funding marks in June, and whether it was possible to still get TAC approval. Mr. Lantz asked for further clarification of the issue. Ms. Kernaghan elaborated on their concern that they need earlier notification of funding levels from the MTA in order to better plan their services. Mr. Clifford commented that the amount of funding involved for Propositions A/C interest is relatively small when compared to the amount allocated through the FAP, and many of the muni operators did not submit their paper work so that the FAP could be finalized two months prior to the beginning of the new fiscal year.

The priority should be to get the large dollar FAP allocations set earlier because those are the bulk of the dollars for the muni operators. Ms. Berlin stated that she thought that the issue could be addressed during the June 4th -TAC meeting. It was agreed to send the motion back

to BOS and have MTA Budget staff present at the June 3rd BOS meeting to discuss it. The item will be agendaized for the June 4th TAC meeting.

10. Proposition A and C Local Return Capital Reserve (M. J. West)

Handout

Ms. West prefaced her discussion by discussing an analysis disseminated to the 88 cities and the County of Los Angeles of all funding which potentially could lapse by the end of FY 03, which was based on fund balances as of FY 00. The result is that many cities have set up capital reserves for larger projects. Ms. West stated that these steps were a positive development because the MTA supports local jurisdictions funding and delivering projects and wants to avoid lapsing funds. Ms. West commented that as a result of the advanced notification given to cities regarding the possible lapses, 8 cities have requested Capital Reserve accounts for 11 projects.

Ms. West highlighted changes to the list shown on Attachment 8 in the agenda package. The City of Arcadia would not be reserving funds for the I-210 Freeway soundwall and the Major Street Improvement projects. The City of Santa Monica will expend their remaining funds by the end of FY 03 and will therefore not extend their existing capital reserve MOU. Of the 11 cities projects requesting Capital Reserves, four cities have previously gone to the Board, and three have MOUs that were established and the cities require extensions. The Board approved Pico Rivera's project 01-380, but never had an MOU established. She stated that seven of the projects are new. The City of Arcadia is requesting funding reserves for the Pasadena Gold Line future mass-transit station. This was previously approved by the Board, and Arcadia is now asking for an amendment to the MOU for a time extension. The City of Irwindale has Proposition C funds that are at risk of lapsing, and the City intends to construct a bus shelter enhancement project (phase II, and III), which would install 13 new bus shelters. The City of Industry has an existing MOU, which is in danger of lapsing, so they are requesting an extension. There have been delays in their commuter rail enhancement project. Malibu is requesting to establish a Capital Reserve account for a new project (a local match for a project that received funding in the 2001 Call for Projects). The City of Montebello has \$1.9 million in danger of lapsing and is proposing three projects for reserves, construction of the Beverly Blvd. Bridge widening, the Wilcox Ave. widening (previously approved), and the Whittier Blvd. reconstruction project. Pico Rivera is requesting an extension to their MOU and an additional amendment for the Whittier Blvd. bridge-widening project. They are also requesting funds to widen the bridge over Washington Blvd. The City of Rosemead is asking for funding to reconstruct the Garvey Ave. Bridge (in conjunction with the City of Pico Rivera). This item will go to the Board in June.

11. Metrolink Work Program (Patricia Chen)

Ms. Chen explained that she presents a request each year to the MTA Board to grant authority to provide a subsidy for the Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) operations and rehabilitation needs. The FY 04 funding request is approximately \$37.5

million, which is 0.02% less than last year's request. Of that amount, the proportion for operations funding will be somewhat higher, while the amount for rehabilitation is somewhat less. Rehabilitation needs are less because SCRRA has cleared a large backlog of work in preparation for one large project which will occur next year. The MTA contribution of \$37.5 million is approximately 26% of the SCRRA budget for operations and rehabilitation. Half of the Metrolink system is in Los Angeles County, and approximately half of the costs are paid for through the fair box and other operating revenues such as revenues from freight-train operations over SCRRA trackage.

Mr. DeChellis asked what percentage does Los Angeles County ridership compose of the total Metrolink ridership? Ms. Chen responded that more than half of Metrolink's patrons have trips originating within Los Angeles County. She then went on to say that MTA provides one half of the five county member-agency funding contributions to Metrolink, however, 60% of the people riding Metrolink are from Los Angeles County. Ms. Chen emphasized this is a good deal for Los Angeles County. Mr. DeChellis suggested that it might be prudent to review Metrolink usage in terms of cost per passenger-mile. David Yale (MTA) commented that Los Angeles County riders are probably shorter trips than riders from outside of the county. Mr. Lantz said that the average passenger trip is 38 miles and he would like to do an analysis of the cost per passenger mile. Mr. Lantz also commented that SCRRA is a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) whose purpose is to provide for long distance inter-county trips.

Ms. Chen explained that Recommendation B of her Board Report is a reprogramming action that takes surplus funds from previous year's funding allocations and reprograms them for capital projects. The amount for FY 04 is approximately \$3.5 million.

12. 2003 Call For Projects Update (Heather Hills)

Ms. Hills stated that MTA received 385 applications, as compared with 359 applications received in the 2001 Call for Projects. The preliminary total funding requested is approximately \$2.8 billion in inflated dollars, as compared to \$1.7 billion in the 2001 Call for Projects. Total project costs are \$5.2 billion, as compared with \$3.7 billion in the 2001 Call for Projects. Ms. Hills reminded everyone that the purpose of the 2003 Call for Projects is to show Los Angeles County's needs. She stated that based on the current schedule, the Rainbow report would be released sometime in mid November. She also remarked that the Call schedule would be updated. Mr. Bozigian asked if staff are currently evaluating the projects. Ms. Hills replied yes. She also stated that staff's goal is to distribute the Reconciliation report by the end of May. Ms. Berlin added that there have been some delays with the copy center, due to the volume of printing that was needed.

13. Short Range Transportation Plan (Brad McAllester) *Handout*

Brad McAllester (MTA) remarked that the Short Range Transportation Plan (SRTP) has been released for public review and that it reflects the financial shortfall issues. It also addresses some possible funding strategies. Ms. Hills gave a Power-Point presentation. The SRTP is

the implementation of the first six years of the MTA's Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and identifies MTA's funding priorities for the next six years. The SRTP provides a project implementation schedule for each mode and considers sub-regional and congested corridor needs. Finally, it recommends a strategy for seeking additional funding.

The SRTP addresses many of the challenges facing Los Angeles County in the coming years. The County's population is expected to grow by 11%, but transportation system capacity will not keep pace. With the projected \$2.0 billion in State funding cuts, there is a need to build consensus. Over the six-year period, the SRTP is forecasting \$19.3 billion in available funding. She reviewed the fact that \$2.0 billion translated to \$333 million per year. Various taxes and fees are proposed in the plan to address the funding cuts. One of the proposals is to ask the Board to consider modifying the CMP deficiency plan to move away from the debit and credit approach, and move toward a Traffic Impact fee.

There are 6 major components of the SRTP: improve public transportation, expand the car-pool lane system, achieve better systems management (ITS), encourage alternatives to driving alone like the Ride-share Program, implement and plan a freight movement program, and implement mechanisms to link land use to the transportation system. MTA staff is working closely with the muni operators on their Short Range Transit Plan so that the SRTP incorporates the priorities. The SRTP identifies new bus purchases, service coordination improvements, new facilities, new technologies, bus signal priority, local feeder networks, and most importantly, seeking additional funding. For the Metro Rapid, the SRTP identifies 24 new corridors with implementation schedules and costs. For Metro Rail, the SRTP includes the Pasadena Gold Line opening in 2003; Eastside Gold Line Extension by 2009; Expo Line to Venice/Robertson for preliminary engineering and seeking construction funding. There will be provisions for preliminary engineering for the Gold Line extension to Irwindale. The SRTP also includes funding needs for rail cars and maintenance facilities.

The SRTP also states the goal of seeking additional funding for System Preservation. Mr. Bozigian questioned the accuracy of the funding schedule, stating that the schedule for the SR-14 HOV lane from Pearblossom to P-8 conflicted with what was reported to the Board. The Board was told there would be a two-year deferral, while the SRTP schedule shows a seven-year deferral. Mr. Yale responded that CMAQ funding was programmed to the project to allow the project to move forward in 2005, in the worst case it might slip to a later year, as reflected in the SRTP. TEA-21 Reauthorization could provide some of the needed replacement funding. The plan calls for improvements to accommodate one million more residents over the next six years, and without the plan freeway speeds decrease to 33 mph, with the plan average speeds will increase to 37 mph. Air quality will be improved 50% and the plan will bring \$10 billion to the economy and provide 95,000 new jobs.

Ms. Hills announced there would be a CMP Policy Advisory Committee meeting on May 20th at 2:30 p.m. to discuss the Traffic Impact Fee proposal. She also announced there will be an SRTP public workshop on May 13th from 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. in the MTA Board Room. There will also be 25-30 outreach meetings during May with the COGs and various stakeholders. Written comments are due on June 4th. The SRTP is scheduled for MTA Board action on June 26th. Mr. McAllester reiterated that the funding shortfalls would be a

major challenge and that every possible opportunity is being explored to overcome budgetary constraints. He also encouraged TAC members to solicit Sacramento to preserve Proposition 42 funding. Doug Kim (MTA) added that the SRTP will be updated every year and if MTA is successful in obtaining more funding, it will be reflected in future drafts of the plan.

14. Statewide Deficit and Impact on LA County Projects (David Yale/Renee Berlin)

Mr. Yale referenced a Power-Point presentation he gave to the Board on April 24th (see Attachment 9 on p. 126). The total impact of the potential loss of the Transportation Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) is approximately 24%. The first 5% of that amount was dealt with in the February 5th Board action approving the STIP amendment to incorporate the San Fernando Valley, Eastside Light Rail, and purchase of 200 articulated buses into the STIP. If the MTA recovers any of the lost TCRP funds at a later date, the deficit would be reduced (if the funds are returned, they will become unallocated TCRP funds, if not returned the funds become part of the STIP). The priority setting criteria that was reviewed with TAC were brought before the Board in April. Mr. Yale referenced page 131 in the agenda and reported that the total amount of funds available in the summary of funded and deferred projects is approximately \$4.6 billion; the Regional Transit Projects that are funded is approximately \$1.7 billion, and the Call for Projects funded is approximately \$2.9 billion. This would leave a \$47 million shortfall. This would be covered by some degree by project delivery slippage, deobligations in the Call and new revenue sources, if any, from TEA-21 Reauthorization. Projects deferred total approximately \$392 million. Mr. Yale expected that the referenced deferrals would take place over time, if needed, to respond to future annual budget negotiations in Sacramento and to TEA-21 Reauthorization.

Mr. Yale reported that approximately \$184 million in deferred Call for Projects projects are prioritized at ranking levels 4, 5, and 6, and for which sponsors can appeal at the special TAC meeting on May 21st, if they cannot resolve the rating with MTA staff. Mr. DeChellis noted that there are many projects from the 2001 Call that have not yet begun as their funds were programmed in out years. He asked if MTA was taking back the money because the projects had not started? Ms. Berlin replied no, the recommendation is to defer the projects. Mr. Yale responded that certain projects would be deferred on a year-by-year basis as necessary, should TCRP money not be made available. Ms. Berlin added that this was meant to convey advanced notice for the FY '05 and '06 projects that funding is not presently available to begin those projects unless sponsors use their own funds. She went on to say that they were hoping that other funding sources would be become available.

Mr. Bozigian commented that "ready-to-go" projects have also been deferred. Mr. Yale confirmed that the Route 14 project was given a lower priority ranking due to a low mobility rating. Mr. Bozigian stated that it was to begin construction in July 2003, but would now be delayed by two years and cost more because of MTA's efforts to fund shortfalls in other projects. Mr. Bozigian commented for the record that he disagreed with the funding methodology. Mr. Yale responded that it was a "living" document, that if funding were made available, some deferred projects would be reviewed. Sumi Gant (City of Long Beach)

asked if the deferred projects would be funded before funding this year's Call for Projects. Ms. Berlin said yes, and any projects ranked at priority levels 4, 5 or 6 need not apply for funding in the Call for Projects.

Mr. DeChellis asked about a plan from the State Assembly to retain \$500 million from Proposition 42 funds for transportation. He stated that his understanding was that this would transfer approximately \$687 million to the General Fund, leaving \$500 million for transportation projects. He asked how would those funds be distributed. Mr. Yale said his guess is that approximately \$200 million would fund previously allocated TCRP projects. That is Sacramento's estimate as to the FY 04 drawdowns against previous TCRP project allocations. This would leave approximately \$300 million that could be paid back to the State Highway Account or for new TCRP allocations. Mr. Yale said his best guess would be that the \$300 million would be put into the State Highway Account for additional STIP project allocations. Mr. DeChellis asked if this process would affect any of Los Angeles County's projects that MTA staff is trying to fund? Mr. Yale referred to the CTC list of FY 03 and FY 04 capacity enhancing projects in the STIP. He stated that those for Los Angeles County projects would in part probably absorb those funds. Ms. Berlin asked what will happen to Caltrans projects that already have funding allocations, but have not drawn down their funding. Mr. Yale responded that those projects would be candidates to receive some of the \$200 million for previously allocated projects. Mr. DeChellis then asked if that would improve the budget outlook that was just presented. Mr. Yale responded that it would not because MTA is letting all FY 04 STIP projects go forward for allocation.

Mr. Burt asked if there was a comprehensive list of the project rankings. Ms Berlin responded that there is, but it will not be released until local jurisdictions have a chance to review and appeal their project rankings. Each sponsor received their own list.

15. New Business

No new business

16. Adjournment

The May 5th TAC meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m. The next TAC meeting will be held on Wednesday, June 4 in the third floor Union Station Room starting at 9:30 a.m.