

# **Metro**

*Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
One Gateway Plaza  
3rd Floor Board Room*



## **Agenda - Final**

**Wednesday, September 18, 2019**

**11:00 AM**

**One Gateway Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90012,  
3rd Floor, Metro Board Room**

### **Planning and Programming Committee**

*Hilda Solis, Chair*

*Jacquelyn Dupont-Walker, Vice chair*

*Mike Bonin*

*Janice Hahn*

*Ara Najarian*

*John Bulinski, non-voting member*

*Phillip A. Washington, Chief Executive Officer*

**METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY BOARD RULES**  
**(ALSO APPLIES TO BOARD COMMITTEES)**

**PUBLIC INPUT**

A member of the public may address the Board on agenda items, before or during the Board or Committee's consideration of the item for one (1) minute per item, or at the discretion of the Chair. A request to address the Board must be submitted electronically using the tablets available in the Board Room lobby. Individuals requesting to speak will be allowed to speak for a total of three (3) minutes per meeting on agenda items in one minute increments per item. For individuals requiring translation service, time allowed will be doubled. The Board shall reserve the right to limit redundant or repetitive comment.

The public may also address the Board on non agenda items within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board during the public comment period, which will be held at the beginning and/or end of each meeting. Each person will be allowed to speak for one (1) minute during this Public Comment period or at the discretion of the Chair. Speakers will be called according to the order in which their requests are submitted. Elected officials, not their staff or deputies, may be called out of order and prior to the Board's consideration of the relevant item.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and in accordance with the Brown Act, this agenda does not provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the Board on any Consent Calendar agenda item that has already been considered by a Committee, composed exclusively of members of the Board, at a public meeting wherein all interested members of the public were afforded the opportunity to address the Committee on the item, before or during the Committee's consideration of the item, and which has not been substantially changed since the Committee heard the item.

In accordance with State Law (Brown Act), all matters to be acted on by the MTA Board must be posted at least 72 hours prior to the Board meeting. In case of emergency, or when a subject matter arises subsequent to the posting of the agenda, upon making certain findings, the Board may act on an item that is not on the posted agenda.

**CONDUCT IN THE BOARD ROOM** - The following rules pertain to conduct at Metropolitan Transportation Authority meetings:

**REMOVAL FROM THE BOARD ROOM** The Chair shall order removed from the Board Room any person who commits the following acts with respect to any meeting of the MTA Board:

- a. Disorderly behavior toward the Board or any member of the staff thereof, tending to interrupt the due and orderly course of said meeting.
- b. A breach of the peace, boisterous conduct or violent disturbance, tending to interrupt the due and orderly course of said meeting.
- c. Disobedience of any lawful order of the Chair, which shall include an order to be seated or to refrain from addressing the Board; and
- d. Any other unlawful interference with the due and orderly course of said meeting.

**INFORMATION RELATING TO AGENDAS AND ACTIONS OF THE BOARD**

Agendas for the Regular MTA Board meetings are prepared by the Board Secretary and are available prior to the meeting in the MTA Records Management Department and on the Internet. Every meeting of the MTA Board of Directors is recorded and is available at [www.metro.net](http://www.metro.net) or on CD's and as MP3's for a nominal charge.

## DISCLOSURE OF CONTRIBUTIONS

The State Political Reform Act (Government Code Section 84308) requires that a party to a proceeding before an agency involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use, including all contracts (other than competitively bid, labor, or personal employment contracts), shall disclose on the record of the proceeding any contributions in an amount of more than \$250 made within the preceding 12 months by the party, or his or her agent, to any officer of the agency, additionally PUC Code Sec. 130051.20 requires that no member accept a contribution of over ten dollars (\$10) in value or amount from a construction company, engineering firm, consultant, legal firm, or any company, vendor, or business entity that has contracted with the authority in the preceding four years. Persons required to make this disclosure shall do so by filling out a "Disclosure of Contribution" form which is available at the LACMTA Board and Committee Meetings. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in the assessment of civil or criminal penalties.

## ADA REQUIREMENTS

Upon request, sign language interpretation, materials in alternative formats and other accommodations are available to the public for MTA-sponsored meetings and events. All requests for reasonable accommodations must be made at least three working days (72 hours) in advance of the scheduled meeting date. Please telephone (213) 922-4600 between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. Our TDD line is (800) 252-9040.

## LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

A Spanish language interpreter is available at all Committee and Board Meetings. All other languages must be requested 72 hours in advance of the meeting by calling (213) 922-4600 or (323) 466-3876.



**323.466.3876 x2**

*Español*

**323.466.3876 x3**

한국어

日本語

中文

русский

ភាសាខ្មែរ

ภาษาไทย

Tiếng Việt

ភាសាវៀតណាម

## HELPFUL PHONE NUMBERS

Copies of Agendas/Record of Board Action/Recordings of Meetings - (213) 922-4880 (Records Management Department)

General Information/Rules of the Board - (213) 922-4600

Internet Access to Agendas - [www.metro.net](http://www.metro.net)

TDD line (800) 252-9040

**NOTE: ACTION MAY BE TAKEN ON ANY ITEM IDENTIFIED ON THE AGENDA**

## CALL TO ORDER

## ROLL CALL

6. SUBJECT: FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES AND STRATEGIES [2019-0601](#)

### RECOMMENDATION

RECEIVE AND FILE report on funding opportunities and strategies.

Attachments: [Attachment A - FY 2018 and 2019 Federal and State Funding Awards](#)  
[Attachment B - Anticipated Schedule for FY 2020 Funding Opportunities](#)

7. SUBJECT: WEST SANTA ANA BRANCH TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT [2019-0586](#)

### RECOMMENDATION

RECEIVE AND FILE the project status update on the:

- A. Initial Operating Segments (IOS) Analysis;
- B. Planning process and delivery; and
- C. Public-private partnership (P3) delivery procurement.

Attachments: [Attachment A - WSAB IOS Options.pdf](#)

8. SUBJECT: QUARTERLY STATUS DASHBOARD OF COUNTYWIDE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT'S STRATEGIC PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS [2019-0570](#)

### RECOMMENDATION

RECEIVE AND FILE the Quarterly Status Dashboard of Countywide Planning and Development (CPD) Department's strategic projects and programs.

Attachments: [Attachment A - Countywide Planning & Development Dashboard](#)

9. **SUBJECT: SR-710 NORTH CORRIDOR MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT  
PROJECTS - ROUND 2**

[2019-0245](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

APPROVE the following actions pertaining to the development and implementation of additional corridor mobility improvement projects (MIPs) on local arterials and local freeway interchanges experiencing congestion because of the discontinuity of the SR 710 North Freeway:

- A. APPROVE the attached Round 2 list of eligible MIPs recommended for funding (Attachments A and B);
- B. AUTHORIZE staff to program an additional \$280 million in Measure R funds and \$232.3 million in State and federal funds for a total of \$512.3 million for the Round 2 MIPs starting in FY 2020-21;
- C. AUTHORIZE staff to reallocate \$18 million in Measure R funds from three MIPs in the City of San Marino approved by the Board in December 2018 for projects to other projects due to the City's decision not to pursue those projects;
- D. AUTHORIZE staff to consolidate the \$105 million Measure R funds allocated to the TSM/TDM Projects cleared under the SR-710 North Final Environmental Document with the Measure R funds for the MIPs under one "MIP" category for ease in managing and reporting all SR-710 North Corridor Mobility Improvements;
- E. AUTHORIZE the CEO or his designee to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements with project sponsors to implement the approved MIPs; and
- F. AUTHORIZE staff to approve changes in the number, scopes, and budgets of projects within the overall program approvals requested in this board report and consistent with the directives in Motion 29.1 (Attachment C).

Approval of the above recommendations will allow programming of all remaining Measure R, State and federal funds for the MIPs listed in this Board Report subject to the availability of funds.

- 
- Attachments:**      [Attachment A -SGV Rd 2 MIPs Recommended for Funding.pdf](#)  
[Attachment B - LA City LA County MIPs - Rd 2 Recommended for Funding](#)  
[Attachment C - Motion](#)  
[Attachment D - Rd 1 Project Sponsor Submittals](#)  
[Attachment E - Rd 1 MIPs Recommended for Funding](#)  
[Attachment F - Rd 2 Project Sponsor Submittals](#)  
[Attachment G - Rd 2 Recommended MIP Descriptions - SGV Cities Projects](#)  
[Attachment H - Rd 2 Recommended MIP Descriptions City County of LA](#)  
[Attachment I - Recommended Projects and Funding Allocations Summaries](#)

**10. SUBJECT: LA RIVER PATH**

[2019-0443](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

CONSIDER:

- A. RECEIVING AND FILING the Conceptual Design Report; and
- B. AUTHORIZING the CEO to initiate the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR).

- Attachments:**      [Attachment A - Study Area](#)  
[Attachment B - June 2014 Metro Board Motion](#)  
[Attachment C - Executive Summary - Conceptual Design Report](#)  
[Attachment D - Alternative A](#)  
[Attachment E - Alternative B](#)  
[Attachment F - Alternative C](#)  
[Presentation](#)

**11. SUBJECT: METRO BIKE HUB MANAGEMENT SERVICES CONTRACT  
EXTENSION**

[2019-0553](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer to execute Modification No. 6 to Contract No. PS43203266 with Bike Hub to continue management services and optional tasks for Metro Bike Hubs for up to one year in the not-to-exceed amount of \$265,836, increasing the total contract value from \$575,977 to \$841,813.

- Attachments:**      [Attachment A - Procurement Summary](#)  
[Attachment B - Contract Modification/Change Order Log](#)  
[Attachment C - DEOD Summary](#)

**12. SUBJECT: PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP (P3) FINANCIAL  
ADVISORY SERVICES BENCH**

[2019-0560](#)

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to:

- A. AWARD AND EXECUTE five bench Contracts listed below for P3 Financial Advisory Services for a five-year base period in the overall funding amount of \$25 million, subject to resolution of protest(s), if any:
  - 1. Arup Advisory, Inc (PS61431000)
  - 2. Deloitte Transactions and Business Analysis LLP (PS61431001)
  - 3. Ernst & Young Infrastructure Advisors, LLC (PS61431002)
  - 4. Public Financial Management Financial Advisors LLC (PS61431003)
  - 5. Sperry Capital Inc. (PS61431004)
  
- B. APPROVE Contract Modification Authority (CMA) in the amount of 20% specific to Contract Nos. PS61431000 through PS61431004 to support the cost of unforeseen issues that may arise during the course of the Contract; and
  
- C. EXECUTE Task Orders under these Contracts for P3 Financial Advisory Services in a total amount not to exceed \$25 million.

**Attachments:**      [Attachment A - Procurement Summary](#)  
                                 [Attachment B - DEOD Summary](#)

**13. SUBJECT: LINK UNION STATION**

[2019-0652](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

CONSIDER:

- A. APPROVING funding for additional Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA operated as "Metrolink") costs for the Link Union Station (Link US) Project in the amount of \$400,000 in Measure R 3% funds; and
  
- B. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to negotiate and execute all necessary Metrolink agreements up to \$400,000.

**44. SUBJECT: MEASURE M MULTI-YEAR SUBREGIONAL PROGRAM -  
SOUTH BAY SUBREGION**

[2019-0462](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

CONSIDER:

A. APPROVING:

1. Programming of \$65,897,857 in Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) - Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 50);
2. Programming of \$2,950,000 in Measure M MSP - South Bay Highway Operational Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 63)
3. Programming of \$33,694,502 in Measure M MSP - Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 66); and

B. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or his designee to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements for approved projects.

**Attachments:**      [Attachment A - Transportation System Mobility Improvemtns Program \(Expendit](#)  
[Attachment B - South Bay Highway Operational Improvements \(Expenditure Lin](#)  
[Attachment C - Transportation System Mobility Improvemtns Program \(Expendit](#)

**SUBJECT: GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

[2019-0694](#)

RECEIVE General Public Comment

Consideration of items not on the posted agenda, including: items to be presented and (if requested) referred to staff; items to be placed on the agenda for action at a future meeting of the Committee or Board; and/or items requiring immediate action because of an emergency situation or where the need to take immediate action came to the attention of the Committee subsequent to the posting of the agenda.

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ITEMS OF PUBLIC INTEREST WITHIN COMMITTEE'S  
SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION**

**Adjournment**





## Board Report

---

**File #:** 2019-0601, **File Type:** Informational Report

**Agenda Number:** 6.

---

### PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE SEPTEMBER 18, 2019

**SUBJECT: FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES AND STRATEGIES**

**ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

RECEIVE AND FILE report on funding opportunities and strategies.

#### **ISSUE**

The Measure M expenditure plan recognized that Metro must secure federal and state funding to leverage the revenues generated through Measure M and implement the priority projects approved by the voters in 2016. Concurrent with the passage of Measure M, important funding opportunities at the federal level, through the passage of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act of 2015, and the state level, through the passage of the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 (Senate Bill 1 or SB-1) have provided Metro with opportunities to secure vital funding to deliver these priority projects.

To maximize Metro's ability to secure as much federal and state funding as possible, staff implemented the Evaluative Criteria Framework in 2017 as the set of guiding principles to support decisions on project evaluation and selection for the various funding programs, each with its own set of evaluative criteria to consider. Thanks to the Board's support of this method of selecting projects for both competitive and formula grant funding programs, Metro staff secured over \$2.4 billion in federal and state funding awards between 2018 and 2019.

Metro staff anticipates additional cycles of funding to be made available through various on-going federal and state funding programs in Fiscal Year 2020 (FY 20). To build upon the success of the last two years, staff will continue to use the Evaluative Criteria Framework to guide staff recommendations for submitting funding applications to these grant programs. This report provides information and an overview of anticipated schedules for federal and state grant funding opportunities expected to be available in FY 20.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Local jurisdictions, subregional agencies, and system users throughout Los Angeles County depend on federal and state funding to complete the funding needed to implement important Measure M,

Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and other Board priority projects. Metro's previous successful efforts to leverage and supplement Measure M dollars with federal and state funds (Attachment A) relied upon the use of the Evaluative Criteria Framework introduced in 2017 to maximize Metro's competitiveness in each of the various funding programs to secure as much funding as possible for priority projects. With ongoing SB-1 funding programs entering into the next cycle of grant opportunities, it is vital that Metro staff continue to use the Evaluative Criteria Framework to analyze, evaluate, and submit applications for Metro priority projects to these funding programs to ensure maximum competitiveness for state discretionary funding.

## **DISCUSSION**

SB-1 provides Metro with an opportunity to secure ongoing funding available at the state level in FY 20. By statute the majority of the funding eligible for Metro under SB-1 is administered through statewide competitive grant programs. The number of state funding programs-when combined with ongoing federal funding programs available in FY 20-has challenged Metro to use a strategic, comprehensive planning method to analyze the various funding programs and evaluate the many Board priorities adopted through Measure M, the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and other board actions to determine the best course of action to compete for as much state and federal funding for Metro's priority projects. The Evaluative Criteria Framework developed by Metro staff for the first cycle of state and federal funding programs proved very successful in this regard, allowing Metro to secure over \$2.3 billion in new revenues to leverage existing Measure M commitments for a variety of priority projects throughout Los Angeles County (as shown in Attachment A).

As staff prepares to undertake another cycle of federal and state grant applications, the Evaluative Criteria Framework will allow Metro to be competitive for these funding programs by reducing risks associated with project readiness and project costs and by developing competitive grant applications for projects most suitable for each respective program. Metro staff will also be able to leverage state funding as match for federal funding opportunities, and vice versa, to optimize the leveraging of Measure M funding.

The Evaluative Criteria Framework comprises six main project assessment parameters to guide project selection for competitive state and federal grant opportunities:

- 1) Sustain Measure M and other Pre-Measure M/LRTP Priorities and Schedules** - As Metro moves forward with the implementation of Measure M, staff must actively pursue funding opportunities and strategies that can effectively support realizing prior assumptions of other local, state, and federal revenues; however, it is imperative that Metro commits and identifies the amounts and sources of funding match.
- 2) Match Competitiveness of Projects to New/Expanded Programs Criteria** - As program guidelines are adopted, Metro staff will need to review application criteria and identify projects that are not only eligible, but highly competitive.
- 3) Certainty (Formula) vs. Risk (Competitive/Discretionary)** - Staff is tasked with identifying competitive capital projects that can tolerate some uncertainty with timing for competitive funding, and retaining projects that are either less competitive or less tolerant of timing risk for formula funding.

- 4) **Geographic Balance** - Measure M created a structure for geographic balance in the expenditure plan. As state and federal funding is pursued, geographic balance may be achieved over the entire program portfolio and over multiple discretionary program cycles.
- 5) **Consistency with Board Policies and Directives** - In addition to specific projects identified in Measure M, Measure R and the 2009 LRTP, the Metro Board has expressed or adopted plans and policies for other interests over time. Consistency with these types of Board interests and policies will be considered.
- 6) **Consistency with Metro LRTP and SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)** - Consistency with the LRTP and RTP is a frequently used screening criterion.

#### Project Readiness is Paramount

A key criterion relevant to the first two parameters listed above is project readiness. As these cycles are ongoing and highly competitive, the grantor agencies administering each program competition have adopted aggressive schedules and readiness requirements for the eligibility of projects seeking funding.

These criteria often involve near-term project readiness milestones such as the following:

- Grant application deadline
- Completion of environmental review
- Obligation of funds
- Advertisement/procurement of a construction contract
- Awarding of the construction contract
- Anticipated start/end of construction
- Expenditure of grant funds.

As a result, projects that are submitted to these funding programs for awards encounter several forms of risk if they cannot meet or maintain these strict criteria:

- Projects that do not meet these criteria at the time of application are deemed ineligible to compete for the current funding cycle. Deferral of the project to a future cycle will likely cause delay to the implementation of the project, affecting projects costs, schedules, and other associated benefits. Additionally, Metro may lose the opportunity to put forth another competitive project for the current funding cycle, and may lose an opportunity to fund another project in the next funding cycle that has been displaced due to the deferral of the original project.
- Eligible projects that are awarded funding but that cannot maintain these milestones will ultimately lose the funding award, creating a postponement in the implementation of the project and creating an opportunity cost for Metro to maximize funding within the current cycle. Funding lost in one cycle will not be recovered in future cycles. Additionally, the deferral of this

project to compete for the next funding cycle may cause Metro to lose the opportunity to put forth another project in that cycle due to limited funding capacity.

- Projects that do not maintain their project costs create revenue shortfalls that must be resolved with local/regional funding that may not be readily available or may be committed elsewhere. The funding program criteria do not allow the grantor agency to share in project cost overruns by augmenting a funding award, and the project is not eligible for additional funding in future cycles for the same phase of the project to address these cost overruns.

An additional screening criterion relevant to project readiness, as well as to the last two main parameters listed above, is the status of planning and environmental approvals, such as:

- Inclusion in the adopted LRTP/RTP and Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)
- Selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative
- Receiving CEQA/NEPA clearances, as applicable.

### Equity Platform

The Evaluative Criteria Framework comprises six main project assessment parameters to guide project selection for competitive state and federal grant opportunities. These parameters address equity both directly through project priorities and through the emphasis on consistency with Board policies and directives. The first and primary parameter is focused on sustaining Measure M and other pre-Measure M/Long Range Transportation Plan priorities and schedules. Equity-related factors were considered as part of the five performance measures developed to assess and prioritize Measure M's expenditure plan projects. Specifically, the "Economy" and "Sustainability/Quality of Life" themes included metrics attached to investments in disadvantaged communities. As part of ensuring consistency with Board policies and directives Metro staff will also incorporate equity in the Evaluative Criteria Framework assessment of individual projects under each State and Federal funding program.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

Developing a sound policy for addressing federal and state grant opportunities is an essential part of the strategy to maximize funding for Los Angeles County and fully implement Measure M and the Long Range Transportation Plan.

### Impact to Budget

Approving the staff recommendations will have no impact on the FY 2020 Budget. Any grant awards will offset the projected need for non-sales tax resources to implement the Measure M Expenditure Plan, Long Range Transportation Plan, and other Board project priorities and commitments.

## **IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS**

This report provides information about staff's efforts to provide funding to make all the goals of the Vision 2028 goals, especially the first goal, provide high-quality mobility options that enable people to

spend less time traveling.

### **NEXT STEPS**

Staff anticipates multiple federal and state funding programs to become available for grant applications during FY 20. Staff will continue to participate in guidelines workshops for these programs to support the inclusion of Metro's objectives within these programs' final guidelines. Staff will also work with Metro departments and with stakeholder agencies (i.e., Caltrans District 7) to evaluate, develop, and prepare projects for grant applications for each respective funding program. Staff will provide Board Boxes and Board Reports at key milestones to present the results of the Evaluative Criteria Framework assessment of individual projects under each state and federal funding program.

Attachment B provides an overview of these grant programs and their anticipated schedules from guideline development to the awarding of grant funding.

### **ATTACHMENTS**


Attachment A - Fiscal Year 2018 and 2019 Federal and State Funding Awards

Attachment B - Anticipated Schedule for Fiscal Year 2020 Federal and State Funding Opportunities

Prepared by:

Patricia Chen, Senior Director, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-3041  
Ashad Hamideh, Senior Director, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-5539  
Michael Cano, Deputy Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3010  
Wil Ridder, Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-2887  
Laurie Lombardi, Senior Executive Officer, (213) 418-3251

Reviewed by: James de la Loza, Chief Planning Officer, (213) 922-2920



---

Phillip A. Washington  
Chief Executive Officer

## Fiscal Year 2018 and 2019 Federal and State Funding Awards

(\$ millions, year of expenditure)

Federal and State Funding Programs	Notes	Board Priority	Total Project Cost	Award
<b>Infrastructure For Rebuilding America (INFRA)</b>				
Interstate 5 Golden State Chokepoint Relief Program (I-5 Component)		1	\$500.3	\$47.0
<b>INFRA Total Awards</b>			<b>\$500.3</b>	<b>\$47.0</b>
<b>Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP)</b>				
Gold Line Foothill Light Rail Extension to Montclair		1	\$1,486.9	
East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor	1	2	\$1,563.0	
West Santa Ana Light Rail Transit Corridor		3	\$1,250.2	\$1,076.5
Green Line Light Rail Extension to Torrance		4	\$1,167.3	
Orange/Red Line to Gold Line BRT Connector		5	\$267.0	
Vermont Transit Corridor		6	\$524.2	\$5.0
Network Integration Opportunities	2	N/A	N/A	\$7.0
<b>TIRCP Total Awards</b>			<b>\$6,258.6</b>	<b>\$1,088.5</b>
<b>Active Transportation Program (ATP)</b>				
Reconnecting Union Station to the Historic Cultural Communities of DTLA		N/A	\$5.3	\$5.3
Doran Street Grade Separation Active Transportation Access Project		N/A	\$22.2	\$16.3
Local Agency Projects Supported by Metro Grant Assistance		N/A	\$115.0	\$55.2
<b>ATP Total Awards</b>			<b>\$142.5</b>	<b>\$76.8</b>
<b>Local Partnership Program - Discretionary (LPP)</b>				
Metro Orange Line Bus Rapid Transit Improvements Project		2	\$320.0	\$75.0
La Cañada Flintridge Soundwalls Project		4	\$10.7	\$5.0
<b>LPP-C Total Awards</b>			<b>\$330.7</b>	<b>\$80.0</b>
<b>Local Partnership Program - Formula (LPP)</b>				
Green Line Light Rail Extension to Torrance (PAED)		N/A	\$1,167.3	\$19.7
West Santa Ana Light Rail Transit Corridor (PAED)		N/A	\$1,250.2	\$23.9
Willowbrook/Rosa Parks Station Mezzanine Improvement Project		N/A	\$45.5	\$14.8
Transit Access Pass (TAP) Bus Farebox Upgrade		N/A	\$55.0	\$27.5
<b>LPP-F Total Awards</b>			<b>\$2,518.0</b>	<b>\$85.9</b>
<b>Solutions for Congested Corridors Program (SCCP)</b>				
Airport Metro Connector 96th Street Transit Station Project		1	\$525.2	\$150.0
<b>SCCP Total Awards</b>			<b>\$525.2</b>	<b>\$150.0</b>
<b>Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP)</b>				
Interstate 5 Golden State Chokepoint Relief Project		1	\$539.2	\$247.0
America's Global Freight Gateway: Southern California Rail Project		2	\$1,039.8	\$128.6
Interstate 605/State Route 91 Interchange Improvement: Gateway Cities Freight Crossroads Project	1	3	\$187.8	\$32.0
State Route 71 Freeway Conversion Project	1	4	\$175.5	\$44.0
SR-57/60 Confluence: Chokepoint Relief Program	3	N/A	\$288.6	\$22.0
<b>TCEP Total Awards</b>			<b>\$2,230.9</b>	<b>\$473.6</b>
<b>State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)</b>				
SR 138 (Segments 4, 6, and 13)		N/A	\$163.1	\$130.7
East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor	1	N/A	\$1,563.0	\$202.1
SR 71	1	N/A	\$327.2	\$20.0
Bus Acquisitions/ Fleet Replacement		N/A	\$528.0	\$47.3
I-405 Crenshaw Ramp Improvements		N/A	\$92.4	\$12.0
I-710 Shoemaker Bridge LB		N/A	\$14.0	\$14.0
I-605/I-5 interchange		N/A	\$81.6	\$18.2
I-605/SR-91 interchange	1	N/A	\$187.8	\$22.0
<b>STIP Total Awards</b>			<b>\$2,969.1</b>	<b>\$466.3</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL (Eliminating Duplicate Applications)</b>			<b>\$11,307.1</b>	<b>\$2,468.1</b>

**Notes:**

1. Project receiving formula funding from State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and discretionary grant funding
2. Additional funding award provided by CalSTA to address network integration opportunities with other rail and transit systems
3. Project with application submitted directly by Caltrans

\* Board Priority refers to Metro's project priority ranking within each respective funding program

\* Total Project Cost listed reflects project cost at time of application

## Anticipated Schedule for Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 Federal and State Funding Opportunities

Ln	Program	Fiscal Year 19-20												FY 20-21		
		Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep
1	2020 LPP-F		◆	■	▲	■	●									
2	2020 STIP		◆	■		▲	■			●						
3	2020 TIRCP				◆	▲		■			●					
4	2020 SCCP						◆	▲	■						●	
5	2020 BUILD						◆	▲	■				●			
6	2020 INFRA						◆	▲	■				●			
7	2020 LPP-C						◆	▲	■						●	
8	2020 TCEP							◆	▲	■			●			
9	2021 ATP				▲					◆	■					

### Programs by Administering Agency

#### California Transportation Commission

- ATP: Active Transportation Program
- LPP-C: Local Partnership Program - Competitive
- LPP-F: Local Partnership Program - Formula
- SCCP: Solutions for Congested Corridors Program
- TCEP: Trade Corridor Enhancement Program

#### California State Transportation Agency

- TIRCP: Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program
- STIP: State Transportation Improvement Program (via Caltrans)

#### United States Department of Transportation

- INFRA: Infrastructure for Rebuilding America
- BUILD: Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development
- SGT: State of Good Repair (via Federal Transit Administration)

### Legend

- = Guidelines development
- = Application period
- ◆ = Guidelines/Share Adoption/Notice of Funding Opportunity
- = Application/submittal
- = Adoption of awards
- ▲ = Anticipated Metro Board Report/Box - Program-specific
- | = Metro Board Report - Cross-program



## Board Report

File #: 2019-0586, File Type: Informational Report

Agenda Number: 7.

---

### PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE SEPTEMBER 18, 2019

**SUBJECT: WEST SANTA ANA BRANCH TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT**

**ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

RECEIVE AND FILE the project status update on the:

- A. Initial Operating Segments (IOS) Analysis;
- B. Planning process and delivery; and
- C. Public-private partnership (P3) delivery procurement.

#### **ISSUE**

This is a milestone update to the Board on the status and direction of the West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor (WSAB) Project. Accordingly, the Board may provide direction and feedback based on this report. Key updates include a preliminary determination on the first phase of accelerated project delivery, consistent with the Twenty-Eight by '28 Initiative, and preview of a forthcoming funding strategy being prepared for it.

#### **BACKGROUND**

The WSAB Project is a proposed light rail transit (LRT) line that would extend approximately 19 miles between downtown Los Angeles and southeast Los Angeles County (LA County) communities. South of downtown Los Angeles, a single alignment parallel to the Blue Line has been identified following existing right-of-way (ROW) (owned by Union Pacific Railroad [UP]), then turning east along Randolph Avenue and the La Habra Branch ROW (owned by UP) in the City of Huntington Park, transitioning south following the San Pedro Subdivision Branch (owned by Port of Los Angeles and Port of Long Beach), to the eight-mile abandoned Pacific Electric ROW (owned by Metro) and terminating in the City of Artesia. WSAB would traverse a highly populated area, with high numbers of low-income and heavily transit-dependent residents.

According to Measure M and Metro's Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) financial forecast, as amended, the Project has a \$4 billion (2015\$) allocation of funding (comprised of Measure M and



other local, state, and federal sources) based on the cost estimate that was current at the time the Measure M Expenditure Plan was approved. Measure M funding becomes available in two cycles as follows:

Measure M Expected Opening Date	L RTP Funding Allocation (2015\$)
FY 2028	\$1 billion (\$535 million from Measure M)
FY 2041	\$3 billion (\$900 million from Measure M)

The Project is also identified by Board direction as a “pillar project”. Accordingly, efforts are underway to facilitate an early project delivery.

Measure M indicates that an early delivery of the subsequent project phase may be made possible with a public-private partnership (P3) delivery method. A P3 with a comprehensive delivery approach is being pursued as a strategy for accelerating a significantly increased project scope by 2028.

## **DISCUSSION**

### Initial Operating Segments Analysis

To accelerate delivery of the Project faster than assumed in the Measure M Expenditure Plan, while remaining consistent with Federal Transit Administration rules, staff has evaluated various initial operating segments (IOS) options. The IOS options were developed based on physical infrastructure limits and barriers, major origins/destinations, market trends, and high activity areas. Proposed stations serving major activity areas and operational feasibility were also considered. These options were evaluated based on how they met the project’s five goals: improve mobility; support local and regional land use; minimize environmental impacts; ensure cost effectiveness and financial feasibility; and ensure equity. Based on the evaluation, staff will be further evaluating two IOS options as part of the Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR):

- IOS 1 - I-105/Green Line Station to Pioneer Station
- IOS 2 - Slauson Station to Pioneer Station

Attachment A shows these two IOS options being evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

The EIS/EIR will study the entire project and the two IOS options. However, staff will focus P3-related activities, such as value for money analysis, risk analysis, Request for Proposal (RFP) specifications, etc., on these IOS options, as these segments are a better use of current resources because of the mobility value of each and delivery by 2028.

Staff is optimistic that IOS 2 is feasible to fund and deliver by 2028 based on P3 market soundings and preliminary work on funding strategy options. This IOS has meaningful mobility value attracting the same number of new riders compared to Alternatives E and G. As a result, IOS 2 is the most cost-effective option. Connectivity with downtown Los Angeles could be accomplished via a transfer to the Blue Line at the Slauson Avenue Station. Bus connections may also be provided from this station. As such, a mobility hub is under consideration for the Slauson Avenue Station.

Interlining with the Blue and Expo Lines between the Slauson Avenue and 7<sup>th</sup>/Metro Center Stations is not being considered because of operational constraints that would result from three lines sharing one alignment. Furthermore, doing so would severely limit or entirely preclude the viability of a P3 deliver, operate and maintain model.

### Need for Funding Strategy

The current end-to-end project capital cost is estimated at \$6.5-\$6.6B (in 2018\$). This cost range includes rough order of magnitude (ROM) right-of-way estimates; however, a comprehensive capital cost estimate (not a Life of Project budget) is contingent upon further project design, negotiation with the freight railroads and ports, as well as first-last mile (FLM) costs, which will be prepared during the advanced conceptual engineering phase.

Alternative funding strategy options are being developed based on (a) the amount of funding allocated to the WSAB Project from Measure M, (b) the amount of other local, state, and federal funds that can be made available by FY 2028, (c) current cost estimates for the end-to-end project and initial operating IOS, and (d) accelerated delivery. The funding strategy to deliver the most project scope will involve more aggressive debt and grant assumptions, as well as the reallocation of funding from other Metro purposes. Funding strategy options for the end-to-end project and IOS will be provided to the Board as part of the report back on the Pillar Projects later this year and at its February 2020 meeting. All funding strategy options to be presented will show the funding sources for the Project and describe the financial impact on Metro's system-wide needs.

### First-Last Mile Walking/Rolling Connectivity Approach

Motion 14.1 (May 2016) directed that FLM be an integral part of rail transit projects and may not be value engineered out later. Furthermore, Motion 14.2 (June 2016) and the Measure M Guidelines provide that cities may apply their FLM improvements as a credit toward the required 3% local contribution to the Project cost. The WSAB Project is federalized because it is a priority for Metro to obtain federal funding participation.

Because of that, the required environmental clearance includes a joint National Environmental Policy Act/California Environmental Quality Act (NEPA/CEQA) document. Only FLM access and safety improvements at the station site can be defined at this stage. Broader FLM pathway networks are undefined, pending FLM planning activities to be conducted with corridor cities. Increasing the footprint of the Project to address these full FLM network improvements could substantially delay the planning process, which includes environmental clearance.

Therefore, broader FLM network improvements will be addressed separately from this Project. Staff is developing FLM Guidelines, which will incorporate an approach for the 3% contribution as it relates to planning and environmental clearance for each project, including WSAB. Staff anticipates that the FLM Guidelines will be presented to the Board for consideration later this year.

### Planning Process and Delivery Schedule Overview

Groundbreaking for the Project is anticipated to start as early as the beginning of 2022, with a revenue service date of 2028. Key environmental clearance process milestone dates include:

- Draft EIS/EIR Release: December 2020
- Board Selects Locally Preferred Alternative: April 2021

Achieving these dates requires timely coordination and reaching an agreement with UP on project design features and ROW negotiations. Additionally, Metro and FTA will need to continue working in partnership to streamline review of the environmental document. These milestone dates are highly aggressive and subject to change based on actual progress.

Public-Private Partnership (P3) Delivery Procurement Status Update

Metro has established an internal process based on P3 best practices from around the world to identify, evaluate, develop, and execute P3 projects from Metro’s capital investment program. The P3 development process is shown in the graphic below. The WSAB project is currently nearing completion of Step 5: Risk Assessment.



Certain steps of the P3 development process depend on the project attaining key design milestones.

Before moving to the next step - Step 6: Value for Money & Financial Analysis - a clear definition of the project scope is needed, which involves further conceptual engineering design work, based on the Board’s approved December 2018 project description. The Value for Money analysis of the full project will differ from analysis of a potential IOS, so to avoid erroneous conclusions, Metro should ensure that the project scope that is likely to be built is the scope examined in the Value for Money report.

Metro continues to engage with the P3 industry regarding this project, such as through market sounding sessions conducted earlier in 2019. The market response to these sessions is a clear indicator of whether acceleration of a project or project segment is viable. As a next step, Metro is

---

planning for an industry forum in late 2019 or early 2020. Market feedback has indicated that there is clear potential for acceleration of a meaningful IOS, beyond what is possible if solely relying on the P3 financing and delivery of Measure M programs. However, the market is also signaling that this is only possible if key design thresholds are met, major permits and third-party approval are in place, and adequate Metro funding for milestone and availability payments is identified. The P3 procurement will encourage proposers to suggest how the Project could be built in entirety rather than in phases and potentially even earlier than 2028.

### Equity Platform Consistency

The Project is consistent with the Equity Platform and will provide new benefits of enhanced mobility and regional access to minority and low-income populations within the Project Area. Approximately 60% of the corridor has been identified as having environmental justice communities. Minority residents are 66% of the total Project area population and 25% of Project area residents live below poverty, which is higher than the LA County average of 17%. Most of the transit service in the Project area is local with limited express buses operating on the congested roadway network. These communities have been historically underserved in terms of transit investments.

The IOS for the Project provides meaningful mobility value by improving trips within southeastern LA County communities and connectivity with downtown Los Angeles much sooner than is anticipated in the Measure M Expenditure Plan. The Project will also significantly reduce travel times and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in the Project area, which could lead to air quality, safety, and livability improvements for the Project area's most vulnerable communities. All the aforementioned Project benefits will collectively expand economic opportunities and enhance the quality of life for residents of the Project area by greatly improving access to opportunity. Staff will ensure that Metro's Equity Platform will guide the process for evaluating the project in the Draft EIS/EIR.

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

This is a Receive and File report for information only with no financial impacts. Any Board direction provided on the information presented in this report could result in financial and/or schedule impacts.

### **IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS**

The Project supports Strategic Plan Goal 1: Provide high quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling. WSAB is anticipated to provide an approximately 35-minute one-seat ride from the proposed Pioneer Station in the southern terminus to either WSAB northern terminus. Taking a similar trip today on existing Metro bus and rail lines would take approximately two to three times as long, depending on the route, number of transfers, and local traffic conditions. The WSAB corridor traverses some of LA County's most densely-developed, historically underserved and environmental justice communities. Many of the Project area communities are characterized by heavily transit-dependent populations who currently lack access to a reliable transit network. The Project area is served by buses that operate primarily along a heavily congested freeway and arterial network with limited connections to the Metro Rail system. A high-capacity and reliable transit investment between the Metro Rail system and the Gateway Cities would provide mobility and travel choices within the WSAB corridor and reduce dependence on auto travel. The Project aims to

---

increase mobility, reduce travel times on local and regional transportation networks and accommodate future population and employment growth in southeastern LA County.

### **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The Board could direct staff to take action contrary to those described in this report. This is not recommended as it may have implications on schedule and project delivery.

### **NEXT STEPS**


The next milestone update to the Board will be in February 2020, when action will be requested on the project funding strategy. Community and stakeholder meetings are ongoing and will continue.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A - WSAB IOS Options

Prepared by: Ivan Gonzalez, Manager, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-7506  
Meghna Khanna, Senior Director, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-3931  
Craig Hoshijima, DEO, Countywide Planning & Development (213) 418-3384  
Laurie Lombardi, SEO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3251  
David Mieger, Acting SEO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-3040

Reviewed by: James de la Loza, Chief Planning Officer, (213) 922-2920  
James Gallagher, Chief Operations Officer, (213) 418-3108  
Richard Clarke, Chief Program Management Officer, (213) 922-7382  
Joshua Schank, Chief Innovation Officer, (213) 418-3345



---

Phillip A. Washington  
Chief Executive Officer

IOS 1: I-105/Green Line Station to Pioneer Station



## IOS 2: Slauson Station to Pioneer Station



# Next stop: new rail to southeast LA County.

WEST SANTA ANA BRANCH TRANSIT CORRIDOR



Planning and Programming Committee  
September 18, 2019

File 2019-0586





# Recommendation

## A. RECEIVE AND FILE Project Status Update:


1. Initial Operating Segments (IOS) analysis;
2. Planning process and delivery schedule; and
3. Public-Private Partnership (P3) delivery procurement

# Initial Operating Segments (IOS)

## IOS 1: I-105/Green Line to Pioneer



## IOS 2: Slauson to Pioneer



# Planning Process and Delivery Schedule Overview

- Technical Environmental analysis (Draft EIR/EIS) and engineering work continues for the entire project and the IOS segments
- Staff is actively coordinating with Union Pacific Railroad (UP) and Ports of LA/LB Union Pacific Railroad (UP)
  - Timely agreement with UP on design and ROW is critical to meeting project schedule and has cost implications
- Key environmental clearance milestone dates:
  - Draft EIS/EIR Release: December 2020
  - Board Selects Locally Preferred Alternative: April 2021

# Next stop: new rail to southeast LA County.

WEST SANTA ANA BRANCH TRANSIT CORRIDOR



Thank You!



**Board Report**

---

**File #:** 2019-0570, **File Type:** Informational Report

**Agenda Number:** 8.

---

**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 18, 2019**

**SUBJECT: QUARTERLY STATUS DASHBOARD OF COUNTYWIDE PLANNING AND  
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT'S STRATEGIC PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS**

**ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE**

**RECOMMENDATION**

RECEIVE AND FILE the Quarterly Status Dashboard of Countywide Planning and Development (CPD) Department's strategic projects and programs.

**ISSUE**

This item provides a snapshot of CPD's work program, with the status of key projects and programs that are pending or ongoing before the Board during the next 10 years in a dashboard format (Attachment A). To be provided on an approximately quarterly basis, the Dashboard is a simplified approach to communicating information to enhance transparency and accountability, along with providing a comprehensive context for informed decision-making.

**BACKGROUND**

CPD introduced its Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 work program and intent to provide periodic updates at the September 2017 Planning and Programming Committee meeting (Legistar File #2017-0565). As part of that report, an overview of CPD's core services was provided. The prior quarterly update was in June 2019 (Legistar File #2019-0247).

**DISCUSSION**

CPD is responsible for planning Los Angeles County's regional transit system and programming federal, state and local transportation funds for the county's transit system, highway program and locally-sponsored, regionally-significant projects for all modes of transportation and related programs. As such, it is at the forefront of many of Metro's planning and policy efforts, along with having a significant role in the implementation of those efforts through numerous programs. Direction and decisions on these significant policy and planning efforts come from the Metro Board of Directors.

The Dashboard summarizes the status of CPD's key projects and programs that are pending or anticipating action by the Board. These include the well-known capital projects in the Measure M

Expenditure Plan, policy initiatives, strategic financial planning and programming, mobility programs, and real estate stewardship. Most of the projects and programs on the Dashboard are led by CPD, while a few involve a support role, due to a transition of project leadership to Program Management through the project delivery lifecycle. CPD is currently developing a more robust Dashboard. As such, this version of the Dashboard should be viewed as an interim deliverable.

Measure M capital projects (excluding highway projects) represent a significant area of work by CPD. Of the 20 major capital projects on the Dashboard, 14 are Measure M projects. CPD is meeting or exceeding the Measure M project schedules, as set forth in the Expenditure Plan for the ordinance. Nine of these Measure M projects are anticipated to be completed within the next 10 years; however, work is also advancing on the remaining projects that are scheduled for completion beyond the next decade. In addition, significant resources are being allocated to six projects that are not part of the Measure M Expenditure Plan, five of which currently have completion dates that are undefined due to funding uncertainties.

#### Consistency with Metro's Equity Platform Framework

The transparency and accountability inherent to the Dashboard facilitates access to information that supports engagement and decision-making. Access to information promotes access to opportunity, a fundamental principle of the Equity Platform Framework.

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

There is no financial impact to this action.

### **IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS**

The Dashboard is consistent with Metro Vision 2028 Goal #5: Provide responsive, accountable, and trustworthy governance within the Metro organization. The Dashboard is transparent about CPD's work programs that are pending before the Board, which promotes accountability and trust in delivering public services.

### **NEXT STEPS**


CPD will provide an update of the Dashboard approximately every quarter. Of the Twenty-Eight by '28 projects, inclusive of pillar projects, this Dashboard only includes CPD transit and active transportation projects.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A - Countywide Planning & Development Dashboard

Prepared by: Alexandra Valle, Transportation Associate II, Countywide Planning & Development,  
(213) 922-5279  
Brian Lam, Principal Transportation Planner, Countywide Planning & Development,  
(213) 922-3077  
Manjeet Ranu, SEO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3157

Reviewed by: James de la Loza, Chief Planning Officer, (213) 922-2920



Phillip A. Washington  
Chief Executive Officer

# Countywide Planning & Development Projects and Programs Dashboard

Capital		Notes	Groundbreaking/ Initiation Fiscal Year	Opening/ Completion Fiscal Year	Planning Process Phase			Next Board Date ▲ Sorted	Next Board Action 
					Alternatives Analysis	Draft Environmental	Final Environmental		
2	West Santa Ana Branch LRT	▲	2022	2028 - 2030		●		September 2019	> Receive and File Project Status Update; including preview of funding strategy approach and Initial Operating Segments (IOS) Analysis
3	West Santa Ana Branch LRT	▲	2022	2041 - 2043		●		September 2019	> Receive and File Project Status Update; including preview of funding strategy approach and Initial Operating Segments (IOS) Analysis
4	LA River Path (central gap)	▲	2023	2025 - 2027	●			September 2019	> Receive Conceptual Design Report > Select Alternatives for environmental review
1	North San Fernando Valley BRT	▲	2019	2023 - 2025	●			October 2019	> Receive Alternatives Analysis > Select Alternatives for environmental review
5	Sepulveda Transit Corridor - Section 2	▲	2024	2033 - 2035	●			December 2019	> Receive Feasibility Study and Technical Compendium > Select Alternatives for environmental review
6	Sepulveda Transit Corridor - Section 3	■	2048	2057 - 2059	●			December 2019	> Receive Feasibility Study and Technical Compendium
7	Rio Hondo Confluence Station Feasibility Study	✘	2019	2022	●			December 2019	> Award Feasibility Study Contract
8	Crenshaw Northern Extension LRT	■	2041	2047 - 2049	●			Winter 2019	> Receive Advanced Alternatives Screening Study > Select Alternatives for environmental review > Authorize Award of Environmental Contract
9	East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor LRT	▲	2021	2027 - 2029			●	Winter 2019	> Certify Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve First Last Mile Pathways
10	Green Line Extension to Torrance LRT	▲	2025	2030 - 2032		●		Winter 2019	> Award environmental and advanced conceptual design contract
11	Vermont Transit Corridor	▲	2024	2028 - 2030	●	●		Winter 2019	> Award Environmental Contract
12	Centinela Grade Separation LRT	✘	TBD	TBD		●		Spring 2020	> Approve findings of Feasibility Study, Environmental Statutory Exemption, and recommendation for next steps
13	Dodger Stadium Gondola (private proposal)	✘	TBD	TBD		●		Summer 2020	> Certify Environmental Impact Report
14	Rail-to-River ATC (Segment B)	✘	TBD	TBD	●			Fall 2020	> Receive Supplemental Alternatives Analysis > Select Revised Locally Preferred Alternative

### NOTES:

Groundbreaking and opening fiscal years have a three-year range.


▲ Indicates Twenty-Eight by '28 capital project (7 projects).

▲ PILLAR PROJECTS: Indicates Measure M capital projects in the Twenty-Eight by '28 list with Measure M completion date beyond 2028; dates shown are Measure M Expenditure Plan dates (4 projects).

■ Indicates Measure M project not on Twenty-Eight by '28 list but is being studied faster than otherwise needed to meet Measure M schedule (3 projects).

✘ Indicates major capital project effort that is neither Measure M or in the LRTP (6 projects).



Capital		Notes	Groundbreaking/ Initiation Fiscal Year	Opening/ Completion Fiscal Year	Planning Process Phase			Next Board Date ▲ Sorted	Next Board Action 
					Alternatives Analysis	Draft Environmental	Final Environmental		
15	New Bus Rapid Transit Corridors (Phase 1)	▲	2020	2022 - 2024	●			Winter 2020	> TBD
16	Eastside Extension LRT - Corridor 1	▲	2029	2035 - 2037		●		Winter 2022	> Select Locally Preferred Alternative
17	Eastside Extension LRT - Corridor 2	■	2053	2057 - 2059		●		Winter 2022	> Select Locally Preferred Alternative
18	North Hollywood - Pasadena BRT	▲	2020	2022 - 2024		●		TBD	> Select Locally Preferred Alternative
19	Arts District/6 <sup>TH</sup> Street Station HRT	✘	TBD	TBD		●		TBD	> Select Locally Preferred Alternative
20	LAUS Forecourt and Esplanade Improvements	✘	2022	2022			●	TBD	> Approve Addendum to EIR

Joint Development		Notes	Groundbreaking/ Initiation Fiscal Year	Opening/ Completion Fiscal Year	Status			Next Board Date ▲ Sorted	Next Board Action 
					Development Programming	ENA	Ground Lease		
21	Expo/Crenshaw Joint Development		2021	2023		●		October 2019	> Extend 14-month Exclusive Negotiation Agreement (Board updated March 2019)
22	North Hollywood Joint Development		2021	2028		●		October 2019	> Extend Exclusive Negotiation Agreement term
23	1 <sup>st</sup> /Soto Joint Development		2021	2023		●		November 2019	> Extend Exclusive Negotiation Agreement
24	Little Tokyo/Arts District Joint Development		TBD	TBD	●			January 2020	> Authorize Exclusive Negotiation Agreement (Board update in June 2019)
25	Chavez/Fickett Joint Development		2022	2024		●		Spring 2020	> Authorize Joint Development Agreement and Ground Lease
26	El Monte Joint Development		TBD	TBD	●			Spring 2020	> Exclusive Negotiation Agreement
27	Vermont/Santa Monica Joint Development		2021	2023		●		Spring 2020	> Authorize Joint Development Agreement
28	Mariachi Plaza Joint Development		2021	2023		●		Summer 2020	> Authorize Joint Development Agreement
29	Division 6 (Venice Bus Yard)		2023	2024	●			Fall 2020	> Approve Exclusive Negotiation Agreement (TBD)
30	LAUS Master Commercial Development		TBD	TBD	●			FY 2021	> Authorize Exclusive Negotiation Agreement
31	Taylor Yard Lot 9 Joint Development		TBD	TBD			●	TBD	> TBD

Joint Development		Notes	Groundbreaking/ Initiation Fiscal Year	Opening/ Completion Fiscal Year	Development Programming	Status	Ground Lease	Next Board Date ▲ Sorted	Next Board Action
						ENA			
32	<a href="#">1<sup>st</sup>/Lorena Joint Development</a>		TBD	TBD		●		TBD	> Authorize Joint Development Agreement and Ground Lease
33	Unsolicited Proposal 1		2023	2025	●			TBD	> Authorize Exclusive Negotiation Agreement
34	Unsolicited Proposal 2		2023	2025	●			TBD	> Authorize Exclusive Negotiation Agreement

Programs		Notes	Groundbreaking/ Initiation Fiscal Year	Opening/ Completion Fiscal Year	Development	Phase	Implementation/Operation	Next Board Date ▲ Sorted	Next Board Action
35	Projects & Programs Dashboard		2018	Ongoing			●	September 2019	> Receive and File interim dashboard
36	Multi-year Sub-regional Programs		2019	2057	●			September 2019	> Approve Programming of the Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program funds for the Southbay
37	Subregional Equity Program		N/A	N/A			●	October 2019	> Receive Board Box on availability of Subregional Equity Program Funds.
38	TOC Small Business Fund		Ongoing	Ongoing			●	Fall 2019	> Approve amended program eligibility and additional lending partner
39	Twenty-Eight by '28 Financial and Funding Plan		N/A	N/A	●			December 2019	> Receive Board Box on the task force, feasibility, and commitments to subregions
40	Metro Active Transport (MAT) Program - Cycle 1 Authorization		N/A	N/A	●			December 2019	> Approve cycle 1 program funding and Authorize Solicitation

# Strategies/Policies

	Notes	Groundbreaking/ Initiation Fiscal Year	Opening/ Completion Fiscal Year	Type		Next Board Date ▲ Sorted	Next Board Action 
				Policies/ Strategic Plans	Implementation Plans		
41		N/A	N/A	●		October 2019	> Approve fund assignments, financial outlook, and financial risk assessment
42		N/A	N/A	●		October 2019	> Receive and File the 10-year review
43		2019	2021	●		Fall 2019	> Receive and File status update
45		2019	2020		●	Winter 2019	> Receive and File 6-month progress update
46		N/A	N/A	●		FY 2020	> Transit Oriented Development Planning Grant Program Lessons Learned and Recommendations
47	<a href="#">First/Last Mile Planning: Purple Line Sections 2 and 3</a>	N/A	N/A		●	January 2020	> Approve First Last Mile Plan
48		N/A	N/A	●		January 2020	
44		2017	2020	●		February 2020	> Approve release of Draft LRTP for public review
49		2018	2020	●		Summer 2020	> Approve draft Plan
50		N/A	N/A	●		FY 2020	> Approval of Action Plan
51		Ongoing	Ongoing		●	FY 2020	> Receive and File Implementation Plan
52		February 2018	Ongoing	●		TBD	> Selection of Equity Officers
53		2018	2020		●	TBD	> Final Findings (TBD)

## NOTES:

Groundbreaking and opening Fiscal years have a three-year range.

▲ Indicates Twenty-Eight by '28 capital project (7 projects).

▲ PILLAR PROJECTS: Indicates Measure M capital projects in the Twenty-Eight by '28 list with Measure M completion date beyond 2028; dates shown are Measure M Expenditure Plan dates (4 projects).

■ Indicates Measure M project not on Twenty-Eight by '28 list but is being studied faster than otherwise needed to meet Measure M schedule (3 projects).

✕ Indicates major capital project effort that is neither Measure M or in the LRTP (6 projects).



**Board Report**

**File #:** 2019-0245, **File Type:** Program

**Agenda Number:** 9.

**REVISED**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE**  
**SEPTEMBER 18, 2019**

**SUBJECT: SR-710 NORTH CORRIDOR MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS - ROUND 2**

**ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS**

**RECOMMENDATION**

APPROVE the following actions pertaining to the development and implementation of additional corridor mobility improvement projects (MIPs) on local arterials and local freeway interchanges experiencing congestion because of the discontinuity of the SR 710 North Freeway:

- A. APPROVE the attached Round 2 list of eligible MIPs recommended for funding (Attachments A and B);
- B. AUTHORIZE staff to program an additional \$280 million in Measure R funds and \$232.3 million in State and federal funds for a total of \$512.3 million for the Round 2 MIPs starting in FY 2020-24;
- C. AUTHORIZE staff to reallocate \$18 million in Measure R funds from three MIPs in the City of San Marino approved by the Board in December 2018 for projects to other projects due to the City’s decision not to pursue those projects;
- D. AUTHORIZE staff to consolidate the \$105 million Measure R funds allocated to the TSM/TDM Projects cleared under the SR-710 North Final Environmental Document with the Measure R funds for the MIPs under one “MIP” category for ease in managing and reporting all SR-710 North Corridor Mobility Improvements;
- E. AUTHORIZE the CEO or his designee to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements with project sponsors to implement the approved MIPs; and
- F. AUTHORIZE staff to approve changes in the number, scopes, and budgets of projects within the overall program approvals requested in this board report and consistent with the directives in Motion 29.1 (Attachment C).

Approval of the above recommendations will allow programming of all remaining Measure R, State and federal funds for the MIPs listed in this Board Report subject to the availability of funds.

## **ISSUE**

At its December 2018 meeting, the Metro Board of Directors approved allocation of \$515 million from the SR-710 freeway gap closure project to 51 eligible MIPs consistent with the guidelines in Board Motion 29.1 (Attachment C). This action left a balance of approximately \$512.3 million (\$280 million in Measure R funds and \$232.3 million in State and federal funds) available for additional eligible MIPs.

The SR-710 North MIP appraisal/selection process was extended to a second round to identify/qualify additional MIPs for funding and implementation.

Recently, \$18 million in Measure R funds became available for Round 2 MIPs after the City of San Marino withdrew three projects that were approved by the Board in December 2018 without substitution projects.

This Board report presents all updates and changes in the SR-710 local project funding program since December 2018 Board action.

## **BACKGROUND**

The SR-710 North Project Approval and Environmental Document (PAED) process was initiated in 2011 by Metro and Caltrans following decades of unsuccessful efforts to identify investments to alleviate the escalating traffic congestion in east/northeast Los Angeles and western San Gabriel Valley resulting from the absence of a portion of the SR-710 and freeway linkage between the I-10 and I-210.

Alternatives including No-Build, Transportation System Management/Transportation Demand Management (TSM/TDM), Bus Rapid Transit, Light Rail Transit, and a freeway tunnel were studied. Current and potential future traffic and the anticipated benefits of each alternative considered and studied were discussed with the impacted communities and stakeholders and feedback was documented/incorporated in the environmental document.

At its May 2017 meeting, the Metro Board of Directors introduced Motion 29.1, which adopted the TSM/TDM as the Locally-Preferred Alternative and directed staff to identify additional mobility improvements beyond the TSM/TDM projects listed in the SR-710 environmental document that could improve traffic flow along the SR-710 corridor between I-10 and I-210 as well as mobility improvements projects in the City and County of Los Angeles. Based on Motion 29.1, approximately \$1 billion in local, State and federal funds were to be made available for eligible MIPs.

Caltrans signed the final environmental document (FED) on November 26, 2018 confirming the TSM/TDM as the Preferred Alternative. The Record of Decision (ROD) was signed on August 6, 2019.

Upon adoption of the TSM/TDM as the LPA, Metro and local agencies identified projects that, upon implementation, would improve mobility in the SR-710 corridor. Lists of 170 projects with a total value of approximately \$1.3 billion were submitted by project sponsors (Attachment D). Recommended

projects were submitted to and approved by the Metro Board of Directors in December 2018 (Attachment E). Since more funds were available in the SR-710 account, a second round of project identification/qualification was conducted.

New Round 2 allocations to the San Gabriel valley cities projects include \$18 million in Measure R funds approved by the Board in December 2018 for three San Marino projects. The City of San Marino declined to accept those funds and withdrew the three projects without substitution.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **SR-710 North MIP Appraisal/Selection Process**

Local agencies/project sponsors were invited to submit projects for the 2<sup>nd</sup> MIP funding cycle consistent with the program requirements described in Motion 29.1. Local agencies were encouraged to identify projects that would complement the Round 1 MIPs approved in December 2018 and maximize the mobility benefits and improve the roadway network efficiency.

Motion 29.1 required that the MIPs in the San Gabriel Valley sub-region be consistent with the Purpose and Need of the SR-710 Gap Closure project, with the highest priority given to projects proximate to I-10. Staff supported investing in major arterials and/or the freeway interchanges in San Gabriel Valley that are and/or will be overburdened by the escalating vehicular demand (including the facilities adversely impacted by the absence of the SR-710 freeway) on heavily used alternative/bypass routes.

Motion 29.1 also referenced dedicated State and federal funds for use in the Central sub-region comprised of parts of the City of Los Angeles and the unincorporated East Los Angeles for multi-modal and safety enhancement projects. The projects submitted by the City and County of Los Angeles were evaluated based on the guidance provided in Motion 29.1, the information provided by the project sponsors (socio-economic data, dominant trip modes, prevailing origins and destinations of trips, etc.), consideration of those areas being outside the core area of impact of the SR-710 and the roadway network operational benefits gained by focused roadway capacity enhancements/operational improvements projects.

A total of 81 project proposals (Attachment F) were submitted by the project sponsors, 25 MIPs with an approximate value of \$298 million in the San Gabriel Valley cities and 28 projects totaling \$233 million in the City and County of Los Angeles are presented in this report for Board approval and programming/funding starting in FY2020-21 based on availability of funds and anticipated cash flow.

### **Project Types**

Selection and qualification of projects in Round 2 was consistent with the Round 1 process with continued focus on operational/mobility improvement and system and demand management.

Consistent with Round 1 evaluations, rehabilitation/maintenance projects submitted by project sponsors were not considered. There were no funding requests for Studies or Parking Structures in Round 2.

Requests to fund active transportation projects were considered if integrated into street/local freeway interchange capacity enhancements or operational improvement projects. For example, Class II or III bicycle lanes that are built as part of a street widening for additional traffic lanes (within the same limits) were considered for funding; pedestrian improvements incorporated into operational improvement projects at intersections (within the limits of the intersections being improved) were also considered for funding; and other projects with similar concepts that focus on investing in effective and verifiable congestion relief projects were considered for funding. Based on this criterion, there were no active transportation projects recommended for funding in Round 2.

### SR 710- North TSM/TDM Projects & New MIPs

Board Motion 29.1 allocated \$105 million of the SR-710 Measure R funds to the TSM/TDM projects listed in the SR-710 North environmental document. Most of the local agencies in the San Gabriel Valley that had TSM/TDM projects listed in the SR-710 North Project FED opted to replace those with new MIPs. Those MIPs have expanded scopes and higher costs than the TSM/TDM projects replaced.

For ease in reporting all SR 710 North corridor mobility improvements, staff has noted and consolidated the similar TSM/TDM projects and MIPs in this Board Report and will only reference the funding and programming of eligible MIPs that have been approved by the Metro Board of Directors from this point forward.

The Round 2 MIPs recommended for funding were conceptually approved based on the project information (Attachments G and H) and anticipated benefits presented by the project sponsors and a follow up cursory validation by the Metro staff. Staff will further validate the scopes and benefits of those projects before funding agreements are finalized.

#### Funding:

The recommended projects and funding allocations by project sponsor for Rounds 1 and 2 are shown in Attachment I.

Funds allocated for each MIP will be on a one-time basis. Metro will not fund any cost increases. Potential cost savings will remain in the Corridor and will be assigned to other projects consistent with the Purpose of the program as determined by Metro.

#### Other funds:

More funds will become available from the proceeds from the sale of more than 400 State-owned properties under the SR-710 North Rehabilitation Account (710 North Rehab Account) to fund additional projects in Pasadena, South Pasadena, Alhambra, La Canada Flintridge, and the 90032 Postal Zip Code not included in the Round 1 and 2 lists of projects consistent with the guidelines in Government Code 54237.7 and subject to all requirements governing the use of those funds. Those projects may include, but are not limited to, sound walls; transit and rail capital improvements;

---

bikeways; pedestrian improvements; signal synchronization; dedicated left- and right-turn lanes at intersections; and major street resurfacing, rehabilitation, and reconstruction.

The sale of the State-owned properties will be conducted in three phases and the proceeds from the sales will be assigned to eligible projects by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). As of the date of this report, the CTC has approved nine property sales. The guidelines for the revenue disposition from the sale of the State-owned properties are under development.

Caltrans will provide status updates on the disposition of the State-owned properties to CTC and Metro. Metro will continue to facilitate dialogue between Caltrans and the affected local jurisdictions; coordinate/submit the list of local projects to Caltrans and CTC for approval and funding; and program those funds when available.

### **DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

The proposed action has no known adverse impact on the safety of Metro's patrons and employees or users of the facility. Caltrans' and local safety standards will be adhered to in the design and implementation of the proposed improvements.

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

Upon approval of the recommendations, a new FY20 project number will be created and funded for all of the MIPs. FY20 Budget for the MIPs will be created through a net zero budget transfer using existing Highway Program funds currently budgeted in Cost Center 4730, SR-710 North Corridor project 460315, Professional Services Account 50316, Task 01. No amendment to the FY 20 budget is required at this time.

A total of \$532.2 million in local, State and federal funds will be programmed for the second round of projects based on eligibility and availability of specific fund sources starting in FY20, consistent with the start of programming for the initial list of MIPs approved by the Board in December 2018 (Board Report 2018-0513). Staff will continue to use the existing approved FY20 budget to reallocate any additional funds necessary for the MIP projects requiring funds beyond the current fiscal year budget as future costs are identified. Highway staff will also refine future cashflow needs for the recommendations and coordinate the funding impact as part of the agency's overall funding strategy. Since this is a multi-year project, the Project Manager, the Cost Center Manager, and the Senior Executive Officer, Program Management - Highway Program will be responsible for budgeting the remaining costs of the Project in future fiscal years.

### **Impact to Budget**

Per prior Board action, the Los Angeles City and Los Angeles County MIPs will be funded from Surface Transportation Block Grant Program, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality, and State Regional Improvement Program funds, subject to all requirements of those funds.

The source of funds will be Measure R Highway Capital (20%) Funds, State Funds (Interregional



---

Improvement Program and Regional Improvement Program funds), and Federal Funds (Regional Surface Transportation Program and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program funds). These funds are not eligible for bus and rail operation and capital expenditures. No other funds were considered.

### **IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS**

The additional MIPs recommended for funding herein reflect priorities collaboratively identified by local agencies and Metro to reduce congestion and improve mobility on local streets and at the freeway local interchanges.

Working collectively with project sponsors to implement the MIPs is consistent with Goal No. 1 (provide high-quality mobility option that enable people to spend less time traveling) and Goal No. 4 (transform LA County through regional collaboration) of the Metro Strategic Plan.

### **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The recommended projects in the San Gabriel Valley cities have been carefully selected to ensure, to the extent possible, operational improvements and connectivity for maximum benefits. The Board may choose to fund other projects submitted by the local agencies that were not approved by staff. This alternative is not recommended as it may not produce the intended and desired benefits. If the Board elects to consider substitute projects, staff will evaluate those projects for eligibility and will report to the Board.

### **NEXT STEPS**

Upon Board approval, project sponsors will be notified of the Board's decision. Staff, in collaboration with the project sponsors, will refine the project scopes of work, set the project implementation schedules, refine cost estimates, and prepare/execute Funding Agreements.

Staff will provide updates to the Board periodically on the implementation of the approved MIPs and assess the performance of the completed MIPs to determine the effectiveness of the overall program.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

- Attachment A - Round 2 Mobility Improvement Projects Recommended for Funding - San Gabriel Valley
- Attachment B - Round 2 Mobility Improvement Projects Recommended for Funding - City and County of Los Angeles
- Attachment C - Board Motion 29.1
- Attachment D - Round 1 Project Sponsor Submittals
- Attachment E - Round 1 Mobility Improvement Projects Recommended for Funding
- Attachment F - Round 2 Project Sponsor Submittals
- Attachment G - Round 2 Recommended Mobility Improvements Project Descriptions - San Gabriel


Valley Cities Projects

Attachment H - Round 2 Recommended Mobility Improvements Project Descriptions -  
City and County of Los Angeles Projects

Attachment I - Recommended Projects and Funding Allocations Summaries (Rounds 1 and 2)

Prepared by: Michelle Smith, Senior Director (213) 922-3057  
Steven Gota, Deputy Executive Officer (213) 922-3043  
Abdollah Ansari, Senior Executive Officer (213) 922-4781  
Bryan Pennington, Deputy Chief Program Management Officer (213) 922-7449

Approved by: Richard F. Clarke, Chief Program Management Officer



---

Phillip A. Washington  
Chief Executive Officer

ROUND 2  
MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS  
RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING  
SAN GABRIEL VALLEY

ID#	PROJECT SPONSOR	PROJECT NAME	COST ESTIMATE <sup>1</sup>
<b>PROJECT TYPE 1: Local Street/Road and Freeway Local Interchange Mobility and Operational Improvement Projects</b>			
2-1	Alhambra	Fremont Avenue Traffic Improvements [Valley Boulevard to Mission Road]	\$30,000,000
2-2	Alhambra	I-10/New Avenue Freeway Interchange Ramp Reconfiguration Project	\$10,000,000
2-3	Alhambra	Railroad Channel Bridge Widening Project [Mission Road and Atlantic Boulevard]	\$8,400,000
2-5	Alhambra	Railroad Channel Bridge Widening Project [Mission Road and Garfield Avenue]	\$8,400,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-6	Pasadena	Gold Line Grade Separation at California Boulevard [Right-of-Way Acquisition and Construction]	\$125,500,000 <sup>2</sup>
2-7	Pasadena	St. John Capacity Enhancement Project [Southbound I-210 Freeway to Fair Oaks Avenue and California Boulevard to Northbound I-210 Freeway]	\$2,600,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-8	Rosemead	I-10/Rosemead Boulevard Freeway [Westbound] Ramp Improvements	\$6,000,000
2-9	Rosemead	I-10/Walnut Grove Avenue Freeway [Westbound] Ramp Improvements	\$6,000,000
2-14	South Pasadena	SR-110/Fair Oaks Avenue Interchange Modifications [Right-of-Way Acquisition, Design Improvements and Construction]	\$32,000,000 <sup>3,4</sup>
TYPE 1 SUBTOTAL [9 PROJECTS]			\$228,900,000
<b>PROJECT TYPE 2: Local Street Intersection Improvement Projects</b>			
2-5	San Gabriel	San Gabriel and Marshall Street Realignment Project (SG-11)	\$4,900,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-6	San Gabriel	San Gabriel and Valley Boulevard Intersection Improvements Project	\$4,400,000
2-8	San Gabriel	Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue Intersection Improvements Project	\$5,500,000 <sup>4</sup>
TYPE 2 SUBTOTAL [ 3 PROJECTS]			\$14,800,000
<b>PROJECT TYPE 3: Intelligent Transportation Systems [ITS] Projects</b>			
2-1	Alhambra	Atlantic Boulevard Traffic Signal Synchronization Project– Adaptive Upgrade [Huntington Drive to I-10 Freeway]	\$3,600,000
2-2	Alhambra	Fremont Avenue Traffic Signal Synchronization Project – Adaptive Upgrade [North City Limit to Montezuma/I-10 Freeway]	\$1,400,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-3	Alhambra	Garfield Avenue Traffic Signal Synchronization Project – Adaptive Upgrade [Huntington Drive to I-10 Freeway]	\$2,600,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-4	Alhambra	Main Street Traffic Signal Synchronization Project– Adaptive Upgrade [West City Limit to East City Limit]	\$5,400,000
2-5	Alhambra	Mission Road Traffic Signal Synchronization Project– Adaptive Upgrade [West City Limit to East City Limit]	\$3,000,000
2-6	Alhambra	Valley Boulevard Traffic Signal Synchronization Project– Adaptive Upgrade [West City Limit to East City Limit]	\$4,600,000
2-13	Monterey Park	Monterey Park Adaptive Traffic/Traffic Responsive Control Project [Atlantic, Garfield and Garvey Avenues]	\$9,000,000
2-15	Pasadena	Fair Oaks Avenue/Bellevue Drive Signalized Intersections Project	\$850,000 <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

<sup>2</sup> This cost estimate includes additional an \$100,000,000 for construction of the Gold Line Grade Separation at California Blvd.

<sup>3</sup> This cost estimate reflects partial funding for the Fair Oaks Avenue Interchange Modifications.

<sup>4</sup> This project replaces a similar TSM/TDM project [in some cases miniscule project elements] listed in the SR-710 North FED.

ROUND 2  
MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS  
RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING  
SAN GABRIEL VALLEY

ID#	PROJECT SPONSOR	PROJECT NAME	COST ESTIMATE <sup>1</sup>
2-16	Pasadena	ITS Projects and Traffic Flow Improvements Project-Within Affected SR-710 Corridors [Orange Grove, Colorado, Green, Holly and Hill]	\$3,800,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-18	Pasadena	Walnut Street Corridor Signal Improvement Project	\$4,100,000
2-19	Rosemead	Adaptive Traffic/Traffic Responsive Control Project [Garvey, Valley, San Gabriel, Walnut Grove and Rosemead]	\$9,000,000
2-20	Rosemead	Traffic Signal Improvements [San Gabriel Walnut Grove at Mission, Rosemead and Valley]	\$6,000,000
2-21	San Gabriel	San Gabriel Traffic Signal Improvements [Del Mar Avenue, Las Tunas Drive, San Gabriel Boulevard, Valley Boulevard and Walnut Grove Avenue]	\$700,000
TYPE 3 SUBTOTAL [13 PROJECTS]			\$54,050,000
<b>TOTAL SAN GABRIEL VALLEY PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING [25 PROJECTS]</b>			<b>\$297,750,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

<sup>2</sup> This cost estimate includes additional an \$100,000,000 for construction of the Gold Line Grade Separation at California Blvd.

<sup>3</sup> This cost estimate reflects partial funding for the Fair Oaks Avenue Interchange Modifications.

<sup>4</sup> This project replaces a similar TSM/TDM project [in some cases miniscule project elements] listed in the SR-710 North FED.

ROUND 2  
MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS  
RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING  
CITY AND COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

ID#	PROJECT SPONSOR	PROJECT NAME	COST ESTIMATE <sup>1</sup>
<b>PROJECT TYPE 3: Intelligent Transportation Systems [ITS] Projects</b>			
2-7	Los Angeles City	Soto Street & Marengo Street Traffic Signal Enhancements	\$2,000,000
2-8	Los Angeles County	1st Street TSSP and ITS Improvements (E-W)	\$6,200,000
2-9	Los Angeles County	Cesar Chavez Ave Traffic Signal Synchronization Project [TSSP] and Intelligent Transportation Systems [ITS] Improvements (E-W)	\$5,500,000
2-10	Los Angeles County	East Los Angeles ITS Enhancements	\$800,000
2-11	Los Angeles County	Olympic Boulevard ITS Improvements (E-W)	\$2,900,000
2-12	Los Angeles County	Whittier Boulevard ITS Improvements (E-W)	\$2,200,000
TYPE 3 SUBTOTAL [6 PROJECTS]			\$19,600,000
<b>PROJECT TYPE 4: Transit Projects</b>			
2-2	Los Angeles City	DASH El Sereno /City Terrace Route Expansion & Bus Stop Enhancements	\$2,000,000
2-3	Los Angeles City	DASH Highland Park / Eagle Rock Bus Stop Enhancements	\$1,500,000
2-4	Los Angeles City	Eagle Rock Boulevard Multi-Modal Transportation Improvements	\$16,362,000 <sup>2</sup>
2-5	Los Angeles City	Eastern Avenue Multi-Modal Transportation Improvements	\$16,388,000 <sup>2</sup>
2-6	Los Angeles City	Huntington Drive Multi-Modal Transportation Improvements	\$17,000,000
2-7	Los Angeles City	Valley Boulevard Multi-Modal Transportation Improvements	\$34,100,000
2-8	Los Angeles County	El Sol Shuttle Service Improvements	\$18,185,000
2-9	Los Angeles County	Cesar Chavez Avenue Mobility Improvements	\$7,900,000
2-10	Los Angeles County	Olympic Boulevard Mobility Improvements	\$6,750,000
2-11	Los Angeles County	Wellness Shuttle Fleet Upgrade and Expansion Project	\$9,485,000
2-12	Los Angeles County	Whittier Boulevard Mobility Improvements	\$8,250,000
TYPE 3 SUBTOTAL [11 PROJECTS]			\$137,920,000
<b>PROJECT TYPE 5 – Active Transportation Projects</b>			
2-2	Los Angeles City	El Sereno Active Transportation Project & Transit Connectivity Enhancements	\$6,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
2-3	Los Angeles City	Northeast Los Angeles Active Transportation & Transit Connectivity Enhancements	\$5,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
2-4	Los Angeles County	Atlantic Boulevard Mobility Improvements	\$5,000,000
2-5	Los Angeles County	East Los Angeles Mobility Hub Project	\$2,000,000
2-6	Los Angeles County	East Los Angeles Pedestrian Accessibility Improvements	\$2,500,000
2-7	Los Angeles County	East Los Angeles Vision Zero Enhancements	\$10,000,000
2-8	Los Angeles County	Eastern Avenue Mobility Improvements	\$5,000,000
2-9	Los Angeles County	Floral Drive Pedestrian and Roadway Improvements	\$5,000,000
2-10	Los Angeles County	LA County +USC Medical Center Mobility Improvements [Valley Boulevard Multi-Modal Transportation Improvements]	\$30,000,000
2-11	Los Angeles County	Micro-Mobility Program and Infrastructure Improvements	\$2,500,000
2-12	Los Angeles County	Safe Routes to Schools Infrastructure Enhancements	\$2,500,000
TYPE 5 SUBTOTAL [11 PROJECTS]			\$75,500,000
<b>TOTAL LA CITY &amp; LA COUNTY PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING [28 PROJECTS]</b>			<b>\$233,020,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

<sup>2</sup> This project replaces a similar TSM/TDM project [in some cases miniscule project elements] listed in the SR-710 North FED.

---

File #:2017-0358, File Type:Motion / Motion  
Response

Agenda Number:29.1

---

REVISED  
REGULAR BOARD MEETING  
MAY 25, 2017

Motion by:

FASANA, BARGER, SOLIS, GARCETTI and NAJARIAN

May 25, 2017

Relating to Item 29; File ID 2017-0097: SR-710 North

The Expenditure Plan for Measure R, approved by voters in 2008, included \$780 million assigned to the San Gabriel Valley sub-region for the SR-710 North project, under the Highway Capital Subfund. The estimated \$3+ billion (in 2014\$) that will be required to pay for design and construction of a single bore freeway tunnel is not available and the BRT and LRT alternatives may not produce the expected traffic impact mitigation.

CONSIDER Revised Motion by Fasana, Barger, Solis, Garcetti and Najarian that to implement mobility improvements that are fundable with existing resources and bring some relief to affected corridor cities, the Metro Board:

- A. SUPPORT adoption of the Transportation System Management/Transportation Demand Management Alternative as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) and defer a decision on any other alternative for future consideration by the Board until the community collectively agrees on the value of that investment and funds are identified to implement a project. This decision and the Board's vote will allow for timely implementation of cost-effective transportation improvements that would include the projects that have support by affected jurisdictions on the TSM/TDM list in the EIS/EIR as well as additional improvement projects that can promote capacity enhancements and operational improvements consistent with the Purpose and Need statement of the project in communities along the corridor. The new Measure R and Government Code 54237.7 projects, described in this motion, that are not included in the environmental document will undergo their own environmental process and clearance as necessary.
- B. ALLOCATE \$105 million of Measure R funds available for the "Interstate 710 North Gap Closure (tunnel) Project" for development and implementation of TSM/TDM projects listed in the EIS/EIR.
- C. ALLOCATE remaining Measure R funds available for the "Interstate 710 North Gap Closure

---

(tunnel) Project" for new mobility improvement projects within the San Gabriel Valley sub-region, if consistent with the purpose and need of the Gap Closure Project to relieve congestion on local streets along the SR-710 alignment between 1-10 and 1-210, with highest priority for projects proximate to 1-10. Newly proposed projects not included in the environmental document will undergo their own environmental process and clearance as necessary. Other funding dedicated to this project, including Regional Surface Transportation, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality, and Regional Improvement Program funds, shall be allocated for use in the Central sub-region, including Unincorporated East Los Angeles. Funds shall be prioritized for multi-modal and safety enhancement projects within the SR-710 North Study Area. To ensure equitable cashflow, these funds shall be scheduled proportionally to Measure R funding in the next Long Ramie Transportation Plan update.

- D. **CONSULT WITH** affected jurisdictions and Caltrans and report back to the Metro Board within 90 days on a procedure to initiate the identification of projects to be funded through the SR-710 Rehabilitation Account, as prescribed in Government Code 54237.7. Such projects are to be located in Pasadena, South Pasadena, Alhambra, La Canada Flintridge, and the 90032 postal ZIP Code, and may include, but are not limited to: sound walls; transit and rail capital improvements; bikeways; pedestrian improvements; signal synchronization; left turn signals; and major street resurfacing, rehabilitation, and reconstruction. Metro shall be responsible for submitting the list of projects to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) who will have the final authority to approve those projects.
- E. **ENCOURAGE** the corridor cities, Caltrans, and Metro to collectively pursue policies and actions that would promote smart and functional land use, reduce automobile dependency, encourage multi-modal trips, improve traffic operations, and maximize the use of the latest available technologies to enhance the performance of the existing transportation system to minimize impacts of the regional traffic on the communities along the SR-710 corridor.
- F. **ENCOURAGE** Caltrans, working with Metro and affected jurisdictions, to identify corrective measures to contain the regional traffic on the freeway system and minimize impacts on the local street network in the SR-710 corridor.
- G. **DIRECT** the Metro staff to work with Caltrans, the corridor cities, and other affected jurisdictions to identify and pursue the new Measure R and the Government Code 54237.7 projects referenced in this motion.
- H. **REPORT BACK** to the Board when Caltrans selects the Preferred Alternative.

ROUND 1  
MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS  
PROJECT SPONSOR SUBMITTALS

ID#	PROJECT SPONSOR	PROJECT NAME	COST ESTIMATE <sup>1</sup>
PROJECT TYPE 1: Local Street/Road and Freeway Local Interchange Mobility and Operational Improvement Projects			
1	Alhambra	I-10/SR-710 Interchange Reconfiguration Project	\$100,000,000
2	Alhambra	I-10/Fremont Avenue On and Off Ramp Reconfiguration Project	\$20,000,000
3	Alhambra	I-10/Atlantic Blvd On and Off Ramp Reconfiguration Project	\$20,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
4	Alhambra	I-10/Garfield Avenue On and Off Ramp Reconfiguration Project	\$20,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
5	Alhambra	I-10/New Avenue On and Off Ramp Reconfiguration Project	\$10,000,000
6	Los Angeles City	Soto Street Bridge Widening Project [Valley Boulevard and UPRR]	\$4,000,000
7	Los Angeles City	Soto Street Widening Project [Multnomah Street to Mission Road]	\$26,330,000
8	Los Angeles City	Huntington Drive Transportation System & Mobility Improvements	\$25,000,000
9	Los Angeles County	Road Projects on Floral Drive	\$7,500,000
10	Los Angeles County	Road Projects on Cesar Chavez [at 12 intersections]	\$11,000,000
11	Los Angeles County	Road Projects on Whittier [at 24 intersections]	\$15,000,000
12	Los Angeles County	Road Projects on Eastern [at 16 intersections]	\$12,300,000
13	Los Angeles County	Road Projects on Olympic [at 25 intersections]	\$12,000,000
14	Los Angeles County	Road Projects on Atlantic [at 11 intersections]	\$12,000,000
15	Los Angeles County	Community Traffic Calming Measures	\$120,000
16	Monterey Park	Ramona Road Capacity Improvements [710 off s/o I-10 freeway]	\$2,400,000
17	Monterey Park	Corporate Center [CC] Drive Rehab	\$1,200,000
18	Monterey Park	Ramona Road Rehab – CC Drive to easterly city limits	\$1,100,000
19	Monterey Park	Ramona Road Rehab – CC Drive to westerly city limits	\$1,500,000
20	Monterey Park	Monterey Pass Road Widening [Floral to Fremont/Garvey fork]	\$30,000,000
21	Monterey Park	Garvey Avenue Capacity Improvement [Atlantic to New]	\$26,300,000
22	Monterey Park	Garfield Capacity Improvements [Hillman to Hilliard]	\$700,000
23	Monterey Park	Atlantic Capacity Improvements [Hillman to Garvey]	\$1,900,000
24	Pasadena	I-210 Connected Corridors Expansion	\$5,000,000
25	Pasadena	210 Ramp Modifications/Operational Street Improvements	\$50,000,000
26	Pasadena	Pasadena Avenue/St. Johns Avenue Complete Streets	\$15,000,000
27	Pasadena	Allen Avenue Complete Streets	\$1,500,000
28	Pasadena	Hill Avenue Complete Streets	\$1,500,000
29	Pasadena	Avenue 64 Complete Streets	\$2,000,000
30	Pasadena	Gold Line Grade Separation at California Boulevard	\$105,000,000
31	Rosemead	Rosemead Boulevard and Glendon Way Improvements	\$2,500,000 <sup>2</sup>
32	San Gabriel	I-10/ San Gabriel Boulevard Improvements [Reversible Lane between I-10 and Valley Boulevard]	\$700,000
33	San Gabriel	Del Mar Avenue /I-10 Improvements [Reversible Lanes between I-10 and Valley Boulevard]	\$1,300,000
34	San Gabriel	New Avenue/ I-10 Improvements [Signal @ Saxton and Reversible Lane from I-10 to Valley Boulevard]	\$1,300,000
35	San Gabriel	East Broadway Street Intersection Improvements	\$6,000,000

<sup>1</sup>All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

<sup>2</sup>This project replaces a similar TSM/TDM project listed in the SR 710 North Final EIR/EIS.

Link to the December 2018 Board Report: <https://boardagendas.metro.net/board-report/2018-0513/>



ROUND 1  
MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS  
PROJECT SPONSOR SUBMITTALS

ID#	PROJECT SPONSOR	PROJECT NAME	COST ESTIMATE <sup>1</sup>
		[2 intersections -San Gabriel Boulevard and Walnut Grove Avenue]	
36	South Pasadena	Regional Traffic Corridor Improvements [Fremont Avenue/ Huntington Drive/Fair Oaks Avenue]	\$10,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
37	South Pasadena	SR-110/Fair Oaks Avenue Interchange Modifications	\$38,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
38	South Pasadena	Additional Operational Improvements	TBD <sup>2</sup>
39	South Pasadena	Traffic Calming/Speed Management	TBD
40	South Pasadena	Remaining Funding	TBD
SUBTOTAL			\$600,150,000
<b>PROJECT TYPE 2: Local Street Intersection Improvement Projects</b>			
1	Los Angeles City	Cesar Chavez Ave/Lorena St./Indiana St - Roundabout	\$8,000,000
2	San Gabriel	Mission Road and Junipero Sierra Drive Intersection Improvements	\$1,100,000
3	San Gabriel	Del Mar Avenue/Mission Road/El Monte Street Reconfiguration	\$1,100,000 <sup>2</sup>
4	San Gabriel	Valley Boulevard and New Avenue Intersection Improvements	\$3,200,000
5	San Gabriel	Mission Drive and Las Tunas Drive Intersection Improvements	\$3,300,000
6	San Gabriel	San Gabriel Boulevard and Valley Boulevard Intersection Improvements	\$4,400,000
7	San Gabriel	San Gabriel Boulevard and Marshall Street Intersection Realignment	\$4,900,000 <sup>2</sup>
8	San Gabriel	Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue Intersection Improvements	\$5,500,000 <sup>2</sup>
9	San Gabriel	San Gabriel Boulevard and Las Tunas Drive Intersection Improvements	\$6,000,000
10	San Gabriel	Mission Road and Ramona Street Intersection Improvements	\$400,000
11	San Gabriel	Valley Boulevard and Abbot Avenue Intersection Improvements	\$971,000
12	San Gabriel	Walnut Grove Avenue and Las Tunas Drive Intersection Improvements	\$1,100,000
13	San Gabriel	Walnut Grove and Grand Avenue Intersection Improvements	\$1,100,000
14	San Marino	Huntington Drive Intersection Capacity Improvements [4 intersections from Atlantic Boulevard to San Gabriel Boulevard]	\$12,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
15	San Marino	Huntington Drive Capacity Enhancements [Segments between Virginia Road and Sunnyslope Drive]	\$6,000,000
16	San Marino	Sierra Madre Boulevard Corridor Capacity Improvements [between Huntington Drive and Del Mar Boulevard]	\$4,000,000
SUBTOTAL			\$63,071,000
<b>Project Type 3: Intelligent Transportation System [ITS] Projects</b>			
1	Alhambra	Garfield Avenue Traffic Signal Synchronization Project [Huntington Drive to I-10 Freeway]	\$2,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
2	Alhambra	Fremont Avenue Traffic Signal Synchronization Project [Northerly City Limit to Montezuma/I-10 Freeway]	\$1,500,000 <sup>2</sup>
3	Los Angeles City	ITS & Technology - Traffic Signal Upgrades in El Sereno	\$10,000,000
4	Los Angeles City	Modal Connectivity - EV Car Share [Northeast LA]	\$5,000,000

<sup>1</sup>All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

<sup>2</sup>This project replaces a similar TSM/TDM project listed in the SR 710 North Final EIR/EIS.

**Link to the December 2018 Board Report:** <https://boardagendas.metro.net/board-report/2018-0513/>

ROUND 1  
MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS  
PROJECT SPONSOR SUBMITTALS

ID#	PROJECT SPONSOR	PROJECT NAME	COST ESTIMATE <sup>1</sup>
5	Los Angeles City	Soto Street & Marengo Street Traffic Signal Enhancements	\$2,000,000
6	Pasadena	Gold Line At-Grade Crossing Enhancements	\$1,000,000
7	Pasadena	Pedestrian and Bicyclist Automated Data Collection	\$1,400,000 <sup>2</sup>
8	Pasadena	High Resolution Traffic Signal Data – Citywide	\$8,500,000 <sup>2</sup>
9	Pasadena	Walnut Street Corridor Upgrades	\$2,000,000
10	San Gabriel	Adaptive/Traffic Responsive Signal Control Project [on Valley Boulevard and San Gabriel Boulevard]	\$3,130,000
11-14	Los Angeles County	Atlantic Boulevard Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (N-S)	\$3,700,000
15-16	Los Angeles County	Beverly Boulevard Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (E-W)	\$110,000
17-19	Los Angeles County	Cesar Chaves Avenue Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (E-W)	\$5,000,000
20-21	Los Angeles County	City Terrace Drive Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (E-W)	\$800,000
22-27	Los Angeles County	Eastern Avenue Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (N-S)	\$1,900,000
28-29	Los Angeles County	Floral Drive Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (E-W)	\$250,000
30-33	Los Angeles County	Ford Boulevard Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (N-S)	\$2,300,000
34-35	Los Angeles County	Indiana Street Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (N-S)	\$110,000
36-38	Los Angeles County	Garfield Avenue Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (N-S)	\$337,000
39-43	Los Angeles County	Arizona Avenue/Monterey Pass Road/Fremont Avenue Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (N-S)	\$7,000,000
44-45	Los Angeles County	Olympic Boulevard Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (E-W)	\$2,500,000
46-47	Los Angeles County	Union Pacific Avenue Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (E-W)	\$170,000
48	Los Angeles County	Whittier Boulevard Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (E-W)	\$2,000,000
49-52	Los Angeles County	1 <sup>st</sup> Street Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (E-W)	\$5,800,000
53-55	Los Angeles County	3 <sup>rd</sup> Street/Pomona Boulevard Traffic Corridor Improvement Project	\$400,000
56	Los Angeles County	County-wide Improvements	\$450,000
57	Los Angeles County	Traffic Signal Control Intersection Upgrade Project	\$30,000
SUBTOTAL			\$104,887,000
<b>PROJECT TYPE 4: Transit Projects</b>			
1	Alhambra	Metrolink Gold Line Shuttle Service Project	TBD
2	Los Angeles City	Modal Connectivity - First/Last Mile Improvements [Northeast LA]	\$20,000,000

<sup>1</sup> All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

<sup>2</sup> This project replaces a similar TSM/TDM project listed in the SR 710 North Final EIR/EIS.

**Link to the December 2018 Board Report:** <https://boardagendas.metro.net/board-report/2018-0513/>

ROUND 1  
MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS  
PROJECT SPONSOR SUBMITTALS

ID#	PROJECT SPONSOR	PROJECT NAME	COST ESTIMATE <sup>1</sup>
3	Los Angeles City	DASH El Sereno / City Terrace Community Route Improvements	\$6,500,000
4	Los Angeles City	DASH Highland Park / Eagle Rock Community Route Improvements	\$6,000,000
5	Los Angeles City	Eastern Avenue Multi-Modal Transportation Improvements	\$15,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
6	Los Angeles City	Eagle Rock Boulevard Multi-Modal Transportation Improvements	\$15,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
7	Los Angeles City	Huntington Drive Bus Rapid Transit [BRT]	\$35,000,000
8	Los Angeles City	Valley Boulevard Bus Rapid Transit [BRT]	\$21,500,000
9	Los Angeles County	El Sol Shuttle Service [w/Zero Emissions (ZE) Vehicles]	\$30,000,000
10	Los Angeles County	Upgrade Existing El Sol Shuttle buses to ZE vehicles	\$26,000,000
11	Los Angeles County	El Sol Free Riding Program	\$300,000
12	Los Angeles County	Wellness Shuttle Route	\$11,000,000
13	Los Angeles County	El Sol Shuttle Service Connected Vehicle	\$2,400,000
14	Pasadena	Rapid Bus Improvements	\$10,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
15	Pasadena	Rose Bowl Shuttles	\$400,000
16	Pasadena	Student Transit Passes	\$200,000
17	Pasadena	Electric Transit Vehicles	\$28,000,000
18	Pasadena	Short Range Transit Plan	\$9,000,000
19	Pasadena	Transportation Operations and Maintenance Facility	\$33,000,000
20	San Gabriel	Transit Service to Light Rail	\$500,000
21	San Gabriel	Local Circulator Bus Service	\$1,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
22	San Gabriel	First-mile/last mile improvements	\$2,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
23	San Gabriel	Valley Boulevard Corridor Bus Rapid Transit [BRT]	\$59,100,000
24	San Gabriel	Multimodal Transit Center and Parking Structure	\$24,000,000
SUBTOTAL			\$335,900,000
<b>PROJECT TYPE 5: Active Transportation Projects</b>			
1	Alhambra	Bike Plan Implementation Project [Citywide]	\$500,000 <sup>2</sup>
2	Los Angeles City	Modal Connectivity - Bike Share [Northeast LA]	\$3,000,000
3	Los Angeles City	El Sereno ATP and Transit-Connectivity Enhancements	\$10,000,000
4	Los Angeles County	East Los Angeles Bike Share	\$600,000
5	Pasadena	Bicycle Transportation Action Plan Projects	\$5,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
6	Pasadena	The Arroyo Link - Bicycle	\$2,000,000
7	Pasadena	Bikeshare Expansion	\$400,000
8	Pasadena	Mobility Hubs	\$10,000,000
9	San Gabriel	Citywide Bicycle Facilities	\$35,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
10	San Marino	Del Mar Avenue Complete Street Improvements	\$2,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
11	San Marino	Huntington Drive Complete Street Improvements	\$2,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
SUBTOTAL			\$70,500,000
<b>PROJECT TYPE 6: Maintenance/Rehabilitation Projects</b>			
1	Alhambra	Railroad Channel/Trench Bridge Rehabilitation Project [Mission Road/Marengo Avenue]	\$2,400,000

<sup>1</sup> All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

<sup>2</sup> This project replaces a similar TSM/TDM project listed in the SR 710 North Final EIR/EIS.

**Link to the December 2018 Board Report:** <https://boardagendas.metro.net/board-report/2018-0513/>

ROUND 1  
MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS  
PROJECT SPONSOR SUBMITTALS

ID#	PROJECT SPONSOR	PROJECT NAME	COST ESTIMATE <sup>1</sup>
2	Alhambra	Railroad Channel/Trench Bridge Rehabilitation Project [Mission Road/Margaruerita Avenue]	\$2,300,000
3	Alhambra	Railroad Channel/Trench Bridge Rehabilitation Project [Mission Road/Atlantic Boulevard]	\$3,200,000
4	Alhambra	Railroad Channel/Trench Bridge Rehabilitation Project [Mission Road/6 <sup>th</sup> Street ]	\$2,000,000
5	Alhambra	Railroad Channel/Trench Bridge Rehabilitation Project [Mission Road/4 <sup>th</sup> Street]	\$2,000,000
6	Alhambra	Railroad Channel/Trench Bridge Rehabilitation Project [Mission Road/Garfield Avenue]	\$3,100,000
7	Alhambra	Railroad Channel/Trench Bridge Rehabilitation Project [Mission Road/Chapel Avenue]	\$2,600,000
8	Alhambra	Front Street Safety Wall Barrier [Fremont Avenue to 6 <sup>th</sup> Street]	\$5,700,000
SUBTOTAL			\$23,300,000
<b>PROJECT TYPE 7: Studies</b>			
1	Los Angeles County	Community Wide Capacity Improvement Study	\$3,000,000
2	Los Angeles County	Intersection Improvement Study [Atlantic, Eastern Telegraph]	\$5,000,000
SUBTOTAL			\$8,000,000
<b>PROJECT TYPE 8: Parking Structures</b>			
1	Los Angeles County	200 Space Parking Structure/Transit Plaza	\$12,000,000
2	Monterey Park	3 - Parking Structures on Garvey	\$60,000,000
3	Rosemead	1 - Parking Structure on Garvey	\$20,000,000
SUBTOTAL			\$92,000,000
TOTAL			\$1,297,808,000

<sup>1</sup>All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

<sup>2</sup>This project replaces a similar TSM/TDM project listed in the SR 710 North Final EIR/EIS.

**Link to the December 2018 Board Report:** <https://boardagendas.metro.net/board-report/2018-0513/>

ROUND 1  
MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS  
RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

ID#	PROJECT SPONSOR	PROJECT NAME	COST ESTIMATE <sup>1</sup>
<b>PROJECT TYPE 1: Local Street/Road and Freeway Local Interchange Mobility and Operational Improvement Projects</b>			
1	Alhambra	I-10/SR-710 Interchange Reconfiguration Project	\$100,000,000
2	Alhambra	I-10/Fremont Avenue On and Off Ramp Reconfiguration Project	\$20,000,000
3	Alhambra	I-10/ Atlantic Blvd On and Off Ramp Reconfiguration Project	\$20,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
4	Alhambra	I-10/ Garfield Avenue On and Off Ramp Reconfiguration Project	\$20,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
6	Los Angeles City	Soto Street Bridge Widening Project [Valley Boulevard and UPRR]	\$4,000,000
7	Los Angeles City	Soto Street Widening Project [Multnomah Street to Mission Road]	\$26,330,000
16	Monterey Park	Ramona Road Capacity Improvements [710 off s/o I-10 Freeway]	\$2,400,000
21	Monterey Park	Garvey Avenue Capacity Improvements [Atlantic to New]	\$26,300,000
22	Monterey Park	Garfield Avenue Capacity Improvements [Hillman to Hilliard]	\$700,000
23	Monterey Park	Atlantic Avenue Capacity Improvements [Hillman to Garvey]	\$1,900,000
30	Pasadena	Gold Line Grade Separation at California Boulevard	\$105,000,000
32	San Gabriel	I-10/San Gabriel Boulevard Improvements [Reversible Lane between I-10 and Valley Boulevard]	\$700,000
36	South Pasadena	Regional Traffic Corridor Improvements [Fremont, Huntington, Fair Oaks]	\$10,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
37	South Pasadena	SR-110/Fair Oaks Ave Interchange Modifications <sup>2</sup>	\$38,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
<b>TYPE 1 SUBTOTAL [14 PROJECTS]</b>			<b>\$375,330,000</b>
<b>PROJECT TYPE 2: Local Street Intersection Improvement Projects</b>			
1	Los Angeles City	Cesar Chavez Avenue/Lorena Street/Indiana Street Roundabout	\$8,000,000
4	San Gabriel	Valley Boulevard and New Avenue Intersection Improvements	\$3,200,000
5	San Gabriel	Mission Drive and Las Tunas Drive Intersection Improvements	\$3,300,000
14	San Marino	Huntington Drive Intersection Capacity Improvements [4 intersections from Atlantic Boulevard to San Gabriel Boulevard]	\$12,000,000 <sup>2,4</sup> <b>REDUCED</b>
15	San Marino	Huntington Drive Capacity Enhancements [segments between Virginia Road and Sunnyslope Drive]	\$6,000,000
16	San Marino	Sierra Madre Boulevard Corridor Capacity Improvements [between Huntington Drive and Del Mar Boulevard]	\$4,000,000 <sup>3</sup> <b>WITHDRAWN</b>
<b>TYPE 2 SUBTOTAL [6 PROJECTS]<sup>5</sup></b>			<b>\$36,500,000<sup>5</sup></b>
<b>PROJECT TYPE 3: Intelligent Transportation Systems [ITS] Projects</b>			
1	Alhambra	Garfield Avenue Traffic Signal Synchronization Project [Huntington Drive to I-10 Freeway]	\$2,000,000 <sup>2</sup>
2	Alhambra	Fremont Avenue Traffic Signal Synchronization Project [Northerly City Limit to Montezuma/I-10 Freeway]	\$1,500,000 <sup>2</sup>
3	Los Angeles City	ITS & Technology - Traffic Signal Upgrades in El Sereno [Huntington	\$10,000,000

<sup>1</sup> All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

<sup>2</sup> This project replaces a similar TSM/TDM project listed in the SR 710 North Final EIR/EIS.

<sup>3</sup> Project and funding declined by Project Sponsor.

<sup>4</sup> Project Sponsor redefined project scope and reduced cost estimate.

<sup>5</sup> This entry reflects the original board action.

Link to the December 2018 Board Report: <https://boardagendas.metro.net/board-report/2018-0513/>

ROUND 1  
MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS  
RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

ID#	PROJECT SPONSOR	PROJECT NAME	COST ESTIMATE <sup>1</sup>
		Drive, Eastern Avenue and Valley Boulevard]	
10	San Gabriel	Adaptive/Traffic Responsive Signal Control Project [on Valley Boulevard and San Gabriel Boulevard]	\$3,130,000
11-14	Los Angeles County <sup>3</sup>	Atlantic Boulevard Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (N-S)	\$3,700,000
39-43	Los Angeles County <sup>3</sup>	Arizona Avenue/Monterey Pass Road/Fremont Avenue Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (N-S)	\$7,000,000
57	Los Angeles County <sup>3</sup>	Traffic Signal Control Intersection Upgrade Project [3 intersections]	\$30,000
30-33	Los Angeles County <sup>3</sup>	Ford Boulevard Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (N-S)	\$2,300,000
22-27	Los Angeles County <sup>3</sup>	Eastern Avenue Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (N-S)	\$1,900,000
20-21	Los Angeles County <sup>3</sup>	City Terrace Drive Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (E-W)	\$800,000
28-29	Los Angeles County <sup>3</sup>	Floral Drive Traffic Corridor Improvement Project (E-W)	\$250,000
65	San Marino	Huntington Drive Traffic Signal Synchronization Project [11 intersections between Atlantic and Rosemead Boulevards]	\$7,000,000 <sup>3</sup> <b>WITHDRAWN</b>
66	San Marino	San Gabriel Boulevard Traffic Signal Synchronization Project [7 intersections between Longden Drive and Colorado Boulevard]	\$3,000,000 <sup>3</sup> <b>WITHDRAWN</b>
TYPE 3 SUBTOTAL [30 PROJECTS] <sup>5</sup>			\$42,610,000 <sup>5</sup>
<b>PROJECT TYPE 8: Parking Structures</b>			
2	Monterey Park	3 - Parking Structures on Garvey	\$60,000,000
TYPE 8 SUBTOTAL [1 PROJECT]			\$60,000,000
<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING [51 PROJECTS]<sup>5</sup></b>			<b>\$514,440,000<sup>5</sup></b>

<sup>1</sup> All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

<sup>2</sup> This project replaces a similar TSM/TDM project listed in the SR 710 North Final EIR/EIS.

<sup>3</sup> Project and funding declined by Project Sponsor.

<sup>4</sup> Project Sponsor redefined project scope and reduced cost estimate.

<sup>5</sup> This entry reflects the original board action.

Link to the December 2018 Board Report: <https://boardagendas.metro.net/board-report/2018-0513/>

ROUND 2  
MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS  
PROJECT SPONSOR SUBMITTALS

ID#	PROJECT SPONSOR	PROJECT NAME	COST ESTIMATE <sup>1</sup>
<b>PROJECT TYPE 1: Local Street/Road and Freeway Local Interchange Mobility and Operational Improvement Projects</b>			
2-1	Alhambra	Fremont Avenue Traffic Improvements [Valley Boulevard to Mission Road]	\$30,000,000
2-2	Alhambra	I-10/New Avenue Freeway Interchange Ramp Reconfiguration Project	\$10,000,000
2-3	Alhambra	Railroad Channel Bridge Widening Project [Mission Road - Atlantic Boulevard]	\$8,400,000
2-4	Alhambra	Railroad Channel Bridge Widening Project [Mission Road - Chapel Street]	\$8,800,000
2-5	Alhambra	Railroad Channel Bridge Widening Project [Mission Road - Garfield Avenue]	\$8,400,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-6	Pasadena	Gold Line Grade Separation at California Boulevard [Right-of-Way Acquisition and Construction]	\$125,500,000 <sup>2</sup>
2-7	Pasadena	St. John Capacity Enhancement Project [Southbound I-210 Freeway to Fair Oaks Avenue and California Boulevard to Northbound I-210 Freeway]	\$2,600,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-8	Rosemead	I-10/Rosemead Boulevard Freeway [Westbound] Ramp Improvements	\$6,000,000
2-9	Rosemead	I-10/ Walnut Grove Avenue Freeway [Westbound] Ramp Improvements	\$6,000,000
2-10	San Gabriel	East Broadway Street Improvements [San Gabriel Boulevard to Muscatel Avenue]	\$11,800,000
2-11	San Gabriel	I-10/Del Mar Avenue Improvements [Reversible lanes between I-10 Freeway and Valley Boulevard]	\$1,300,000
2-12	San Gabriel	I-10/New Avenue Improvements [Reversible lanes between I-10 Freeway and Valley Boulevard]	\$1,300,000
2-13	South Pasadena	Regional Traffic Corridor Improvements [Supporting Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Components]	\$10,000,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-14	South Pasadena	SR-110/Fair Oaks Avenue Interchange Modifications [Right-of-Way Acquisition, Design Improvements and Construction]	\$32,000,000 <sup>3,4</sup>
SUBTOTAL [14 Projects]			\$262,100,000
<b>PROJECT TYPE 2: Local Street Intersection Improvement Projects</b>			
2-1	San Gabriel	Del Mar Avenue/Mission Road/El Monte Street Reconfiguration	\$1,100,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-2	San Gabriel	Mission Road and Junipero Sierra Drive Improvements	\$1,130,000
2-3	San Gabriel	Mission Road and Ramona Street Intersection Improvements	\$400,000
2-4	San Gabriel	San Gabriel Boulevard and Las Tunas Drive Intersection Improvements	\$6,000,000
2-5	San Gabriel	San Gabriel Boulevard and Marshall Street Realignment (SG-11)	\$4,900,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-6	San Gabriel	San Gabriel Boulevard and Valley Boulevard Intersection Improvements	\$4,400,000
2-7	San Gabriel	Valley Boulevard and Abbot Avenue Intersection Improvements	\$971,000
2-8	San Gabriel	Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue Intersection Improvements	\$5,500,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-9	San Gabriel	Walnut Grove and Grand Avenues Intersection Improvements (SG-5)	\$1,100,000
2-10	San Gabriel	Walnut Grove Avenue & Las Tunas Drive Intersection Improvements (SG-5)	\$1,100,000
SUBTOTAL [10 Projects]			\$26,601,000
<b>Project Type 3: Intelligent Transportation System [ITS] Projects</b>			
2-1	Alhambra	Atlantic Boulevard Traffic Signal Synchronization Project – Adaptive Upgrade [Huntington Drive to I-10 Freeway]	\$3,600,000
2-2	Alhambra	Fremont Avenue Traffic Signal Synchronization Project- Adaptive Upgrade [North City Limit to Montezuma/I-10 Freeway]	\$1,400,000 <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

<sup>2</sup> This cost estimate includes an additional \$100,000 to complete the Gold Line Grade Separation Project at California Blvd.

<sup>3</sup> This cost estimate reflects partial funding for the Fair Oaks Interchange Modifications.

<sup>4</sup> This project replaces a similar TSM/TDM project listed in the SR 710 North Final Environmental Document.

ROUND 2  
MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS  
PROJECT SPONSOR SUBMITTALS

ID#	PROJECT SPONSOR	PROJECT NAME	COST ESTIMATE <sup>1</sup>
2-3	Alhambra	Garfield Avenue Traffic Signal Synchronization Project - Adaptive Upgrade [Huntington Drive to I-10 Freeway]	\$2,600,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-4	Alhambra	Main Street Traffic Signal Synchronization Project- Adaptive Upgrade [West City Limit to East City Limit]	\$5,400,000
2-5	Alhambra	Mission Road Traffic Signal Synchronization Project – Adaptive Upgrade [West City Limit to East City Limit]	\$3,000,000
2-6	Alhambra	Valley Boulevard Traffic Signal Synchronization Project– Adaptive Upgrade [West City Limit to East City Limit]	\$4,600,000
2-7	Los Angeles City	Soto Street & Marengo Street Traffic Signal Enhancements	\$2,000,000
2-8	Los Angeles County	1st Street Traffic Signal Synchronization Project and ITS Improvements (E-W)	\$6,200,000
2-9	Los Angeles County	Cesar Chavez Avenue Traffic Signal Synchronization Project and Intelligent Transportation Systems [ITS] Improvements (E-W)	\$5,500,000
2-10	Los Angeles County	East Los Angeles ITS Enhancements	\$800,000
2-11	Los Angeles County	Olympic Boulevard ITS Improvements (E-W)	\$2,900,000
2-12	Los Angeles County	Whittier Boulevard ITS Improvements (E-W)	\$2,200,000
2-13	Monterey Park	Monterey Park Adaptive Traffic/Traffic Responsive Control System Project [Atlantic, Garfield and Garvey Avenues]	\$9,000,000
2-14	Monterey Park	Monterey Park Adaptive Traffic/Traffic Responsive Control System Project [Monterey Pass Road]	\$4,500,000
2-15	Pasadena	Fair Oaks Avenue/Bellevue Drive Signalized Intersections	\$850,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-16	Pasadena	ITS Projects and Traffic Flow Improvements-Within Affected SR-710 Corridors [Orange Grove, Colorado, Green, Holly and Hill]	\$3,800,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-17	Pasadena	Traffic Flow Improvements at Gold Line At-Grade Crossing	\$950,000
2-18	Pasadena	Walnut Street Corridor Signal Improvements	\$4,100,000
2-19	Rosemead	Rosemead Adaptive Traffic/Traffic Responsive Control Project [Garvey, Valley, San Gabriel, Walnut Grove and Rosemead]	\$9,000,000
2-20	Rosemead	Rosemead Traffic Signal Improvements- Various locations [San Gabriel, Walnut Grove at Mission, Rosemead and Valley]	\$6,000,000
2-21	San Gabriel	San Gabriel Traffic Signal Improvements -Various locations [Del Mar Avenue, Las Tunas Drive, San Gabriel Boulevard, Valley Boulevard and Walnut Grove Avenue]	\$700,000
SUBTOTAL [21 Projects]			\$79,100,000
<b>PROJECT TYPE 4: Transit Projects</b>			
2-1	Alhambra	Metro Gold Line Shuttle Service Project	\$750,000
2-2	Los Angeles City	DASH El Sereno / City Terrace Route Expansion & Bus Stop Enhancements	\$2,000,000
2-3	Los Angeles City	DASH Highland Park / Eagle Rock Bus Stop Enhancements	\$1,500,000
2-4	Los Angeles City	Eagle Rock Boulevard Multi-Modal Transportation Improvements	\$16,362,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-5	Los Angeles City	Eastern Avenue Multi-Modal Transportation Improvements	\$16,388,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-6	Los Angeles City	Huntington Drive Multi-Modal Transportation Improvements	\$17,000,000
2-7	Los Angeles City	Valley Boulevard Multi-Modal Transportation Improvements	\$34,100,000

<sup>1</sup> All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

<sup>2</sup> This cost estimate includes an additional \$100,000 to complete the Gold Line Grade Separation Project at California Blvd.

<sup>3</sup> This cost estimate reflects partial funding for the Fair Oaks Interchange Modifications.

<sup>4</sup> This project replaces a similar TSM/TDM project listed in the SR 710 North Final Environmental Document.



**ROUND 2**  
**MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS**  
**PROJECT SPONSOR SUBMITTALS**

<b>ID#</b>	<b>PROJECT SPONSOR</b>	<b>PROJECT NAME</b>	<b>COST ESTIMATE<sup>1</sup></b>
2-8	Los Angeles County	El Sol Shuttle Service Improvements	\$18,185,000
2-9	Los Angeles County	Cesar Chavez Avenue Mobility Improvements	\$7,900,000
2-10	Los Angeles County	Olympic Boulevard Mobility Improvements	\$6,750,000
2-11	Los Angeles County	Wellness Shuttle Fleet Upgrade and Expansion Project	\$9,485,000
2-12	Los Angeles County	Whittier Boulevard Mobility Improvements	\$8,250,000
2-13	San Gabriel	First-mile/last mile improvements (SG-8)	\$2,000,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-14	San Gabriel	Local Circulator Bus Service Project (SG-9)	\$1,000,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-15	San Gabriel	Multimodal Transit Center and Parking Structure Project (SG-6)	\$24,000,000
2-16	San Gabriel	Transit Service to Light Rail Project (SG-7)	\$500,000
2-17	San Gabriel	Valley Boulevard Corridor Bus Rapid Transit [BRT] Project (SG-10)	\$59,000,000
<b>SUBTOTAL [17 Projects]</b>			<b>\$225,170,000</b>
<b>PROJECT TYPE 5: Active Transportation Projects</b>			
2-1	Alhambra	Alhambra Bike Plan Implementation Project	\$650,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-2	Los Angeles City	El Sereno ATP and Transit -Connectivity Enhancements	\$6,000,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-3	Los Angeles City	North East Los Angeles Active Transportation & Transit Connectivity Enhancements	\$5,000,000 <sup>4</sup>
2-4	Los Angeles County	Atlantic Boulevard Mobility Improvements	\$5,000,000
2-5	Los Angeles County	East Los Angeles Mobility Hub Project	\$2,000,000
2-6	Los Angeles County	East Los Angeles Pedestrian Accessibility Improvements	\$2,500,000
2-7	Los Angeles County	East Los Angeles Vision Zero Enhancements	\$10,000,000
2-8	Los Angeles County	Eastern Avenue Mobility Improvements	\$5,000,000
2-9	Los Angeles County	Floral Drive Pedestrian and Roadway Improvements	\$5,000,000
2-10	Los Angeles County	LA County +USC Medical Center Mobility Improvements [Valley Boulevard Multi-Modal Transportation Improvements]	\$30,000,000
2-11	Los Angeles County	Micro-Mobility Program and Infrastructure Improvements	\$2,500,000
2-12	Los Angeles County	Safe Routes to Schools Infrastructure Enhancements	\$2,500,000
2-13	San Gabriel	San Gabriel Citywide Bicycle Facilities Project [SG-4]	\$35,000,000 <sup>4</sup>
<b>SUBTOTAL [13 Projects]</b>			<b>\$111,150,000</b>
<b>PROJECT TYPE 6: Maintenance/Rehabilitation/Safety Projects</b>			
2-1	Alhambra	Front Street Safety Wall Barrier	\$8,000,000
2-2	Alhambra	Railroad Channel/Trench Bridge Rehabilitation Project [Mission – 4 <sup>th</sup> Street]	\$3,300,000
2-3	Alhambra	Railroad Channel/Trench Bridge Rehabilitation Project [Mission – 6 <sup>th</sup> Street]	\$3,300,000
2-4	Alhambra	Railroad Channel/Trench Bridge Rehabilitation Project [Mission - Marengo]	\$3,900,000
2-5	Alhambra	Railroad Channel/Trench Bridge Rehabilitation Project [Mission – Marguerita]	\$3,800,000
2-6	South Pasadena	Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program	\$5,000,000
<b>SUBTOTAL [6 Projects]</b>			<b>\$27,300,000</b>
<b>TOTAL [81 Projects]</b>			<b>\$731,421,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

<sup>2</sup> This cost estimate includes an additional \$100,000 to complete the Gold Line Grade Separation Project at California Blvd.

<sup>3</sup> This cost estimate reflects partial funding for the Fair Oaks Interchange Modifications.

<sup>4</sup> This project replaces a similar TSM/TDM project listed in the SR 710 North Final Environmental Document.

ROUND 2  
RECOMMENDED MOBILITY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS  
SAN GABRIEL VALLEY CITIES PROJECTS

**PROJECT TYPE 1:** Local Street/Road and Freeway Local Interchange Mobility and Operational Improvement Projects

**[Project ID# 2-1] Alhambra- Fremont Avenue Traffic Improvements:** On Fremont Avenue between Valley Boulevard and Mission Road widen structure over the railroad channel/trench; add northbound lane (starting at Front Street and extending to north of Mission Road to the 1<sup>st</sup> traffic signal); add southbound lane; close Front and Shorb Streets; and add westbound lane to Mission Road to improve mobility. Also construct sidewalk, upgrade curb and gutter and street lights; realign east side of Front Street; cul-de-sac westside of Front and Shorb Streets; and sign and stripe roadway. Fremont Avenue is a major arterial and commuter route that is heavily travelled. This project will improve mobility.

**Cost Estimate: \$30,000,000**

**[Project ID# 2-2] Alhambra- I-10/New Avenue Freeway Interchange Ramp Reconfiguration Project:** Reconfigure eastbound and westbound on and off ramps to increase capacity and storage; and improve mobility. Also, close Saxon Street westbound on ramp and convert left turn lane for off ramp; close Saxon Street westbound on ramp and widen ramp for northbound new move onto to ramp; restrict Saxon westbound to new northbound only traffic; signalize Saxon Street; widen the new northbound to westbound on ramp for two lanes; widen infield at new northbound to eastbound on ramp for two lanes; sign and stripe ramp.

**Cost Estimate: \$10,000,000**

**[Project ID# 2-3] Alhambra - Railroad Channel Bridge Widening Project (Mission Road and Atlantic Boulevard):** Widen structure to add one northbound lane between Mission Road and Atlantic Boulevard to improve mobility.

**Cost Estimate: \$8,400,000**

**[Project ID# 2-5] Alhambra- Railroad Channel Bridge Widening Project (Mission Road and Garfield Avenue):** Widen structure to add one northbound lane between Mission Road and Garfield Avenue; upgrade traffic signal on structure; and install new traffic signal at the Park Street and Garfield Avenue intersection to improve mobility.

**Cost Estimate: \$8,400,000**

**[Project ID# 2-6] Pasadena - Gold Line Grade Separation at California Boulevard (Right-Of-Way Acquisition and Construction):** Purchase Right-of-Way for shoe-fly track and construction staging needed to construct the Gold Line Grade Separation Project at California Boulevard Project that was approved for funding at the December 2018 Metro Board meeting.

**NOTE:** All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

## ROUND 2

RECOMMENDED MOBILITY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS  
SAN GABRIEL VALLEY CITIES PROJECTS

The grade separation project includes the segment of the Gold Line that intersects California Boulevard, an east-west arterial street with high traffic volumes, results in substantial delay and congestion. This at-grade crossing also contributes to a lack of pedestrian and bicycle connectivity between neighborhoods east and west of the Gold Line. The Gold Line Grade Separation Project at California Boulevard has a nexus to the I-710 North project since this at-grade crossing is in proximity to the I-710 “Gap” and grade-separating California Boulevard at the Gold Line will greatly improve traffic flow not only in the east-west direction but also in the north-south direction.

**Cost Estimate: \$125,500,000**

**[Project ID# 2-7] Pasadena - St. John Capacity Enhancement Project (Southbound I-210 Freeway to Fair Oaks Avenue and California Boulevard to Northbound I-210 Freeway):** Modify the intersections of the I-210 eastbound off ramp at California Boulevard, and westbound California Boulevard at the St. John Avenue northbound I-210 on ramp to provide dual southbound left turn movements and dual right turn movements which require roadway striping and reconfiguring lanes; resurface a portion of California Boulevard to accommodate roadway striping changes; and modify traffic signals and associated hardware at the intersection of Pasadena Avenue/California Boulevard, and the southbound I-210 off ramp at Californian Boulevard. This project will optimize traffic operations and improve mobility.

**Cost Estimate: \$2,600,000**

**[Project ID# 2-8] Rosemead - I-10/Rosemead Boulevard Freeway [Westbound] Ramp Improvements:** Reconfigure the I-10 westbound on and off ramps at Rosemead Boulevard to increase capacity. Also, provide additional lanes to increase capacity; widen the east side of Rosemead Boulevard to add an exclusive right turn lane from northbound Rosemead to easterly westbound I-10; provide an additional lane for the I-10 westbound off-ramp; add an exclusive right turn lane from westbound Glendon Way to northbound Rosemead; eliminate the left turn lane from I-10 westerly westbound off ramp to westbound Glendon Way; widen the west side of Rosemead Boulevard to provide a wider right turn lane and improve the traffic flow; reconfigure the geometrics [alignment] of west approach on Glendon Way west of Rosemead Boulevard, and provide a left turn lane from WB Glendon Way to the westbound I-10 ramp; and widen the southwest corner of Glendon Way and the I-5 westbound on ramp to accommodate right turn traffic onto the ramps.

Rosemead Boulevard is one of the busiest north-south regional corridors that extends from the 60 Freeway to the 10 Freeway, and from the 10 Freeway to the 210 Freeway. Due to the current geometric constraints and insufficient lane capacities at the Rosemead Boulevard and I-10 freeway westbound on and off ramps, significant delays are experienced throughout the day. This project will improve the traffic flow and mobility.

**Cost Estimate: \$6,000,000**

**[Project ID# 2-9] Rosemead - I-10/Walnut Grove Avenue Freeway [Westbound] Ramp Improvements:** Reconfigure the I-10 westbound on and off ramps at Walnut Grove Avenue; realign the southbound right turn lane from Walnut Grove Avenue to the westbound on ramp, and westbound lanes on the

NOTE: All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

## ROUND 2

RECOMMENDED MOBILITY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS  
SAN GABRIEL VALLEY CITIES PROJECTS

ramp; modify striping on north and south approaches of Walnut Grove Avenue, and install a traffic signal; and realign the westbound on and off ramps at San Gabriel Boulevard, and install a new traffic signal.

Walnut Grove Avenue is a regional corridor that extends from the 60 Freeway to the 10 Freeway, and from the 10 Freeway north, connecting to three east-west regional corridors [Valley Boulevard, Mission Road and Las Tunas Drive]. Due to current geometric constraints, traffic exiting the westbound off ramp onto Walnut Grove Avenue is required to stop and wait for gaps in the north-south traffic before proceeding, which results in delays. This project will improve the traffic flow and mobility.

**Cost Estimate: \$6,000,000**

**[Project ID# 2-14] South Pasadena – SR-110/Fair Oaks Avenue Interchange Modifications (Right-of-Way Acquisition, Design Improvements and Construction):** Purchase the necessary Right of Way and make the necessary design refinements to construct the SR-110/Fair Oaks Avenue Interchange Modifications Project that was approved for funding at the December 2018 board meeting.

The SR-110/Fair Oaks Avenue Interchange Modifications Project includes construction of a new southbound SR-110 "hook" on ramp accessible via eastbound State Street, east of Fair Oaks Avenue; restripe northbound Fair Oaks Avenue between Grevelia Street and State Street to replace northbound left-turn lanes with a right-turn lane continuing onto a new right-turn lane to be built on the south side of State Street; and removal of the existing traffic island at the current SR-110 on-ramp; and on northbound Fair Oaks Avenue [between Hope Street and Grevelia Street] removal of the existing bulb out in order to provide a shared through and right-turn lane, and replacement of the left-turn lane with a through lane. Also, on southbound Fair Oaks Avenue [north of the existing southbound on-ramp] extend the existing right-turn lane to north of Oaklawn Street (this requires removal of the bulb out north of Mound Street); truncate Grevelia Street between Fair Oaks Avenue and Mount Avenue; widen northbound SR-110 off-ramp and restripe for two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one right-turn lane; add a second right-turn lane on westbound Grevelia Street at Fair Oaks Avenue; construct a new southbound SR-110 "hook" on ramp accessible via eastbound State Street, east of Fair Oaks Avenue; remove bulb out on northbound Fair Oaks Avenue prior to the Orchard Supply Hardware shopping center driveway; and relocate current bus stop to the far side of intersection.

**Cost Estimate: \$32,000,000**

**PROJECT TYPE 2:** Local Street Intersection Improvement Projects

**[Project ID# 2-5] San Gabriel – San Gabriel and Marshall Street Realignment Project (Mission Drive and Las Tunas Drive Intersection Improvements):** Modify the existing offset intersection at San Gabriel Boulevard and Marshall Street by realigning the east leg to meet the west leg of Marshall Street. Valley Boulevard is a primary arterial and Marshall Street is a local arterial. The San Gabriel Boulevard and Marshall Street intersection currently operates at LOSC/F and is projected to operate at LOSD/F by 2045

NOTE: All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

## ROUND 2

RECOMMENDED MOBILITY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS  
SAN GABRIEL VALLEY CITIES PROJECTS

without improvements. This intersection has experienced 12 accidents in the past three years. This project will improve traffic flow and mobility.

**Cost Estimate: \$4,900,000**

**[Project ID# 2-6] San Gabriel – San Gabriel and Valley Boulevard Intersection Improvements Project:**

Widen the San Gabriel Boulevard and Valley Boulevard intersection to add a southbound right turn pocket, a southbound right turn lane, peak hour parking restrictions; and an eastbound right turn pocket, a northbound right turn lane and extend the third lane approach. San Gabriel Boulevard and Valley Boulevard are primary arterials that carry significant regional and local traffic. The San Gabriel Boulevard and Valley Boulevard intersection currently operates at LOS F and is projected to operate at LOS F by 2045 without improvements. This intersection has experienced 16 accidents in the past three years. This project will improve traffic flow and mobility.

**Cost Estimate: \$4,400,000**

**[Project ID# 2-8] San Gabriel – Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue Intersection Improvements**

**Project:** At the Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue intersection, widen eastbound Valley Boulevard to add a thru lane and a right turn lane with peak hour parking restrictions. The Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue intersection currently operates at LOS E and is projected to operate at LOS F by 2045 without improvements. This intersection has experienced 19 accidents in the past three years. This project will improve traffic flow and mobility.

**Cost Estimate: \$5,500,000**

PROJECT TYPE 3: Intelligent Transportation Systems [ITS] Projects

**[Project ID# 2-2] Alhambra – Fremont Avenue Traffic Signal Synchronization Project – Adaptive**

**Upgrade [North City Limit to Montezuma/I-10 Freeway]:** Upgrade traffic signals and other hardware on Fremont Avenue at 11 intersections (from the northerly city limits to Montezuma/I-10 Freeway) to optimize traffic signals during peak hours to improve the peak directional flow of traffic based on the arrival of vehicles at an intersection and real-time traffic demand and congested conditions. Fremont Avenue is a major arterial and commuter route. This project will improve mobility along the corridor.

**Cost Estimate: \$1,400,000**

**[Project ID# 2-3] Alhambra – Garfield Avenue Traffic Signal Synchronization Project – Adaptive**

**Upgrade [Huntington Drive to I-10 Freeway]:** Upgrade traffic signals and other hardware on Garfield Avenue at 18 intersections (from Huntington Drive to the I-10 Freeway) to optimize traffic signals during peak hours to improve the peak directional flow of traffic based on the arrival of vehicles at an

NOTE: All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

## ROUND 2

RECOMMENDED MOBILITY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS  
SAN GABRIEL VALLEY CITIES PROJECTS

intersection and real-time traffic demand and congested conditions. Garfield Avenue is a major arterial and commuter route. This project will improve mobility along the corridor.

**Cost Estimate: \$2,600,000**

**[Project ID# 2-1] Alhambra – Atlantic Boulevard Traffic Signal Synchronization Project - Adaptive Upgrade [Huntington Drive to I-10 Freeway]:** Upgrade traffic signals and other hardware on Atlantic Boulevard at 14 intersections (from Huntington Drive to the I-10 Freeway) to optimize traffic signals during peak hours to improve the peak directional flow of traffic based on the arrival of vehicles at an intersection and real-time traffic demand and congested conditions. Atlantic Boulevard is a major arterial and commuter route. This project will improve mobility along the corridor

**Cost Estimate: \$3,600,000**

**[Project ID# 2-4] Alhambra – Main Street Traffic Signal Synchronization Project - Adaptive Upgrade [West City Limit to East City Limit]:** Upgrade traffic signals and other hardware on Main Street at 21 intersections (from the westerly city limits to the easterly city limits) to optimize traffic signals during peak hours to improve the peak directional flow of traffic based on the arrival of vehicles at an intersection and real-time traffic demand and congested conditions. Main Street is a heavily travelled corridor. This project will improve mobility along the corridor

**Cost Estimate: \$5,400,000**

**[Project ID# 2-5] Alhambra – Mission Road Traffic Signal Synchronization Project - Adaptive Upgrade (West City Limit to East City Limit):** Upgrade traffic signals and other hardware on Mission Road at 9 intersections (from the westerly city limits to the easterly city limits) to optimize traffic signals during peak hours to improve the peak directional flow of traffic based on the arrival of vehicles at an intersection and real-time traffic demand and congested conditions. Mission Road is a major arterial that is heavily travelled. This project will improve mobility along the corridor

**Cost Estimate: \$3,000,000**

**[Project ID# 2-6] Alhambra – Valley Boulevard Traffic Signal Synchronization Project (West City Limit to East City Limit):** Upgrade traffic signals and other hardware on Valley Boulevard at 21 intersections (from the westerly city limits to the easterly city limits) to optimize traffic signals during peak hours to improve the peak directional flow of traffic based on the arrival of vehicles at an intersection and real-time traffic demand and congested conditions. Valley Boulevard is a major regional corridor that is heavily traveled. This project will improve mobility along the corridor

**Cost Estimate: \$4,600,000**

NOTE: All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

## ROUND 2

RECOMMENDED MOBILITY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS  
SAN GABRIEL VALLEY CITIES PROJECTS**[Project ID# 2-13] Monterey Park- Adaptive Traffic/Traffic Responsive Control Project:**

Install adaptive traffic/traffic responsive signal control at 34 traffic signal locations throughout Monterey on Atlantic Boulevard [17 intersections], Garfield Avenue [8 intersections] and Garvey Avenue [9 intersections] to optimize traffic signal during peak hours to improve the peak directional flow of traffic based on the arrival of vehicles at an intersection and real-time traffic demand and congested conditions. Atlantic Boulevard and Garfield and Garvey Avenues are major corridors used to bypass heavy freeway traffic on Routes 10, 710 and 60. This project will optimize traffic operations and improve mobility along these regional corridors.

**Cost Estimate: \$9,000,000**

**[Project ID# 2-15] Pasadena- Fair Oaks Avenue/Bellevue Drive Signalized Intersections Project:** Install a new traffic signal at Fair Oaks Avenue and Bellevue Drive and synchronize signals to facilitate platooning of traffic through the intersection. Also, this project includes adjusting adaptive traffic control signals to accommodate the new traffic signal installation and installing requisite ADA compliant curb ramps. This project will improve traffic operations and reduce the potential for pedestrian and vehicular platooning conflicts.

**Cost Estimate: \$850,000**

**[Project ID# 2-18] Pasadena – Walnut Street Corridor Signal Improvements Project:** Replace old traffic signal controller infrastructure and communication equipment along Walnut Street to reduce delay, manage speeds and collect data. Install up to 15 new signal cabinets, traffic signal controllers, video detection equipment, two CCTV cameras and 3 miles of fiber optic communication, associated hardware and software and requisite ADA compliant curb ramps. Walnut Street is used to bypass heavy traffic on the 210 freeway and on Colorado Boulevard. This project will improve traffic operations and mobility throughout the corridor.

**Cost Estimate: \$4,100,000**

**[Project ID# 2-16] Pasadena - ITS Projects and Traffic Flow Improvements Project (Within Affected SR-710 Corridors)]** Upgrade traffic signal controllers and cabinets; install fiber optics communication, dedicated short range communication and signal preemption technology at up to 55 signalized intersections along segments of Orange Grove and Colorado Boulevards, Green and Holly Streets and Hill Avenue. This project will improve traffic operations and complement the corridors in the City of Pasadena that are being updated with adaptive traffic/traffic responsive control system signal technology.

**Cost Estimate: \$3,800,000**

NOTE: All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

ROUND 2  
RECOMMENDED MOBILITY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS  
SAN GABRIEL VALLEY CITIES PROJECTS

**[Project ID# 2-19] Rosemead – Adaptive Traffic/Traffic Responsive Control Project-** Install adaptive traffic/traffic responsive signal control throughout Rosemead on Garvey Avenue [9 intersections], Valley Boulevard [7 intersections], San Gabriel Boulevard [6 intersections], Walnut Grove Avenue [16 intersections] and Rosemead Boulevard [5 intersection] to optimize traffic signal timing during peak hours to improve the directional flow of traffic based on the arrival of vehicles at an intersection and real-time traffic demand and congested conditions. Garvey Avenue and Valley Boulevard are major east-west arterials used to bypass freeway traffic. This project will optimize traffic operations and improve mobility along these regional corridors.

**Cost Estimate: \$9,000,000**

**[Project ID# 2-20] Rosemead – Traffic Signal Improvements (San Gabriel Boulevard, Walnut Grove Avenue, Rosemead Boulevard and Valley Boulevard):** Implement traffic signal improvements to optimize traffic operations and improve mobility on east-west and north-south major arterials that are used to bypass freeway traffic.

San Gabriel Boulevard at four intersections: [\$3,300,000]

1. Hellman Avenue [Location 1.1]- Install eastbound/westbound protective left turn phasing and upgrade the existing traffic signal system. (approximately \$800,000)
2. Garvey Avenue [Location 1.2]- Install south bound/westbound right turn overlap phasing and upgrade the existing traffic signal system. (approximately \$1,500,000)
3. Graves Avenue [Location 1.3]- Install protected/permitted left turn phasing and upgrade the existing traffic signal system. (approximately \$500,000)
4. Rush Street [Location 1.4]- Install northbound/southbound protective left turn phasing; and eastbound/westbound protected/permitted left turn phasing; and upgrade the existing traffic signal system. (approximately \$500,000)

Walnut Grove Avenue at Mission [Location 2.1]: [\$500,000]

1. Install protected/permitted left turn phasing in all directions and upgrade the existing traffic signal system. (approximately \$500,000)

Rosemead Boulevard [Location 3.2]: [\$700,000]

2. Valley Boulevard [Location 3.2]- Install northbound/southbound right turn overlap phasing. (approximately \$700,000)

Valley Boulevard at three intersections: [\$1,500,000]

1. Muscatel Avenue [Location 4.1] - Install eastbound/westbound protected left turn phasing and upgrade the existing traffic signal system. (approximately \$500,000)
2. Ivar Avenue [Location 4.2]- Install eastbound/westbound protected left turn phasing and upgrade the existing traffic signal system. (approximately \$500,000)

NOTE: All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.



## ROUND 2

## RECOMMENDED MOBILITY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

## SAN GABRIEL VALLEY CITIES PROJECTS

3. Mission Drive [Location 4.3]- Install eastbound/westbound protected left turn phasing and upgrade the existing traffic signal system. (approximately \$500,000)

**Cost Estimate: \$6,000,000**

**[Project ID# 2-21] San Gabriel – San Gabriel Traffic Signal Improvements -Various Corridors (Del Mar Avenue, Las Tunas Drive, San Gabriel Boulevard, Valley Boulevard and Walnut Grove Avenue):** Implement traffic signal improvements to optimize traffic flow along major arterials at 30 intersections within the City of San Gabriel that are adversely impacted by the absence of a portion of the SR 710 freeway. The proposed improvements would include installing video detection, wireless traffic signal communication equipment and battery backup to various existing traffic signals. This project will improve mobility and traffic operations on regional corridors.

**Cost Estimate: \$700,000**

NOTE: All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

ROUND 2  
RECOMMENDED MOBILITY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS  
CITY AND COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES PROJECTS

**PROJECT TYPE 3:** Intelligent Transportation Systems [ITS] Projects

**[Project ID# 2-7] Los Angeles City – Soto Street & Marengo Street Traffic Signal Enhancements:**

Upgrade the traffic signal equipment at the Soto Street and Marengo Street intersection overpass and enhance the signal timing to facilitate concurrent left-turn movements onto the freeway ramps, monitor traffic flows, and respond to real-time traffic demand and congested conditions. This intersection currently experiences excessive delays during the morning and afternoon peak periods. This project will improve safety and operational efficiency.

**Cost Estimate: \$2,000,000**

**[Project ID# 2-8] Los Angeles County –1st Street Traffic Signal Synchronization Project and Intelligent Transportation Systems [ITS] Improvements (E-W):** On 1<sup>st</sup> Street, install fiber optics and upgrade traffic signal infrastructure, software, and communications equipment to enhance remote traffic signal monitoring, and management of traffic signals and bus signal priority. This project will improve mobility within the corridor.

**Cost Estimate: \$6,200,000**

**[Project ID# 2-9] Los Angeles County –Cesar Chavez Avenue Traffic Signal Synchronization Project [TSSP] and Intelligent Transportation Systems [ITS] Improvements (E-W):** Synchronize traffic signals on Cesar Chavez Avenue, between Lorena and Vancouver streets; install intersection-level communications to improve traffic flow; implement traffic signal/controller upgrades [as required by federal and state guidelines]; and, if necessary, upgrade countdown pedestrian heads and pedestrian push buttons; install bicycle detection, modify signing and striping of crosswalks and curb ramp; and improve timing along the corridor to improve traffic operations and mobility.

**Cost Estimate: \$5,500,000**

**Project ID# 2-10] Los Angeles County –East Los Angeles Intelligent Transportation Systems [ITS] Enhancements:** At various locations along Beverly Boulevard, Union Pacific Avenue, 3rd Street, Pomona Boulevard, and Garfield Avenue, upgrade 2070 controllers with next generation firmware; install wireless communications equipment, and other related traffic signal infrastructure, software, and CCTV cameras to enhance remote traffic signal monitoring and management of traffic signals. This project will improve mobility within the corridor.

**Cost Estimate: \$800,000**

**NOTES:**

- 1) LA City and LA County may identify other transportation improvements as the scopes of these projects are better refined.
- 2) All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

## ROUND 2

RECOMMENDED MOBILITY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS  
CITY AND COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES PROJECTS

**[Project ID# 2-11] Los Angeles County –Olympic Boulevard ITS Improvements (E-W):** On Olympic Boulevard, from Ditman Avenue to Concourse Avenue, install fiber optics and intersection-level communications; and upgrade 2070 controllers with next generation firmware to enhance traffic signal operations. This project will optimize traffic operations and improve mobility within the corridor.

**Cost Estimate: \$2,900,000**

**[Project ID# 2-12] Los Angeles County –Whittier Boulevard ITS Improvements (E-W):** Install fiber optics on Whittier Boulevard, from Alma Avenue to Saybrook Avenue, to enhance remote traffic signal monitoring, and facilitate connection to the LA County Advanced Transportation Management System. This project will optimize traffic operations and improve mobility within the corridor.

**Cost Estimate: \$2,200,000**

PROJECT TYPE 4: Transit Projects

**[Project ID# 2-2] Los Angeles City - DASH El Sereno /City Terrace Route Expansion & Bus Stop Enhancements:** Expand route to connect to Indiana/3<sup>rd</sup> Metro Station and transit infrastructure improvements and pedestrian access enhancements to El Sereno/City Terrace route to accommodate transit dependent populations. The DASH is a local community shuttle that is heavily utilized by residents for short trips [under 3 miles] reported to be 40% of the trips in several unincorporated East Los Angeles communities. This project will increase transit ridership and connectivity; and improve access to key destinations [employment centers, markets, educational facilities, healthcare facilities, parks and recreational centers].

**Cost Estimate: \$2,000,000**

**[Project ID# 2-3] Los Angeles City - DASH Highland Park / Eagle Rock Bus Stop Enhancements:** Implement transit infrastructure improvements and pedestrian access enhancements to the Highland Park/Eagle Rock route to accommodate transit dependent populations. The DASH is a local community shuttle that is heavily utilized by residents for short trips [under 3 miles] reported to be 40% of the trips in several unincorporated East Los Angeles communities. This project will increase transit ridership and connectivity; and improve access to key destinations [employment centers, markets, educational facilities, healthcare facilities, parks and recreational centers].

**Cost Estimate: \$1,500,000**

**[Project ID# 2-4] Los Angeles City - Eagle Rock Boulevard Multi-Modal Transportation Improvements:** On Eagle Rock Boulevard, between Colorado and York Boulevards, implement mobility and access

NOTES:

- 1) LA City and LA County may identify other transportation improvements as the scopes of these projects are better refined.
- 2) All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

## ROUND 2

RECOMMENDED MOBILITY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS  
CITY AND COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES PROJECTS

improvements; pedestrian access enhancements and transit infrastructure improvements to improve mobility and access to key destinations [employment centers, markets, educational facilities, healthcare facilities, parks and recreational centers], and reduce the potential for vehicle and pedestrian conflicts.

**Cost Estimate: \$16,362,000**

**[Project ID# 2-5] Los Angeles City - Eastern Avenue Multi-Modal Transportation Improvements:** On Eastern Avenue, between Huntington Drive and Valley Boulevard, implement mobility and access improvements; pedestrian access enhancements and transit infrastructure improvements to improve mobility and access to key destinations [employment centers, markets, educational facilities, healthcare facilities, parks and recreational centers], and reduce the potential for vehicle and pedestrian conflicts.

**Cost Estimate: \$16,388,000**

**[Project ID# 2-6] Los Angeles City - Huntington Drive Multi-Modal Transportation Improvements:** On Huntington Drive, between Mission Drive and Kendall Avenue in Los Angeles, implement mobility and access improvements; pedestrian access enhancements; transit infrastructure improvements and a dedicated Bus Rapid Transit route; and reconfigure the intersection of Huntington Drive and Monterey Road to improve mobility, and provide better access to the transit hub near the intersection. This project will increase transit service, connectivity, ridership; and improve access to key destinations [employment centers, markets, educational facilities, healthcare facilities, parks and recreational centers].

**Cost Estimate: \$17,000,000**

**[Project ID# 2-7] Los Angeles City - Valley Boulevard Multi-Modal Transportation Improvements:** Design and construct multimodal corridor improvements along Valley Boulevard which may include a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) route and active transportation safety and accessibility enhancements. On Valley Boulevard, between Soto Street and the 710 Freeway ramps, implement mobility and access improvements; pedestrian access enhancements; transit infrastructure improvements and a dedicated Bus Rapid Transit route [2.4-mile portion] to improve mobility in the corridor and provide better access to and from the hillside communities and beyond. This project will increase transit service, connectivity, ridership; and improve access to key destinations [employment centers, markets, educational facilities, healthcare facilities, parks and recreational centers]. Coordination with Metro and Los Angeles County will be needed to design and construct the project.

**Cost Estimate: \$34,100,000**

NOTES:

- 1) LA City and LA County may identify other transportation improvements as the scopes of these projects are better refined.
- 2) All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

## ROUND 2

RECOMMENDED MOBILITY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS  
CITY AND COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES PROJECTS

**[Project ID# 2-8] Los Angeles County - El Sol Shuttle Service Improvements:** Expand service for El Sol Shuttle by adding and upgrading the existing equipment and fleet. In this area, the demand for transit service exceeds the existing shuttle capacity leaving few options for those without access to alternate means of transportation in this low car ownership community. This project will increase transit capacity and improve service reliability for transit dependent residents in communities that rely on the El Sol Shuttle to reach key destinations [i.e. employment centers, markets, educational facilities, healthcare facilities, parks and recreational centers].

**Cost Estimate: \$18,185,000**

**[Project ID# 2-9] Los Angeles County - Cesar Chavez Avenue Mobility Improvements:** On Cesar Chavez Avenue, in unincorporated East Los Angeles, implement mobility and access improvements which could include pedestrian access enhancements; a pilot program for a dedicated bus lane; and transit infrastructure improvements to increase pedestrian access to transit services, minimize pedestrian and vehicle conflicts, and increase overall transportation mobility through the enhancement of transit services in this transit dependent community.

**Cost Estimate: \$7,900,000**

**[Project ID# 2-10] Los Angeles County - Olympic Boulevard Mobility Improvements:** On Olympic Boulevard, in unincorporated East Los Angeles, implement mobility and access improvements which could include pedestrian access enhancements; a pilot program for a dedicated bus lane; and transit infrastructure improvements to increase pedestrian access to transit services, minimize pedestrian and vehicle conflicts, and increase overall transportation mobility through the enhancement of transit services in this transit dependent community.

**Cost Estimate: \$6,750,000**

**[Project ID# 2-11] Los Angeles County - Wellness Shuttle Fleet Upgrade and Expansion Project:** Expand and upgrade the existing Wellness Shuttle fleet. In this area, the demand for transit service exceeds the existing shuttle capacity leaving few options for those without access to alternate means of transportation in this low car ownership community. This project will increase transit capacity and improve service reliability for transit dependent residents in communities that rely on the Wellness Shuttle to access health and wellness destinations [i.e. medical centers (USC, White Memorial), senior centers and recreational facilities]. This project will also increase transit connectivity to the DASH and the Metro Gold Line Soto Station, further enhancing sub-regional and regional mobility.

**Cost Estimate: \$9,485,000**

**[Project ID# 2-12] Los Angeles County - Whittier Boulevard Mobility Improvements:** On Whittier Boulevard, in unincorporated East Los Angeles, implement mobility and access improvements which could include pedestrian access enhancements; a pilot program for a dedicated bus lane; and transit

NOTES:

- 1) LA City and LA County may identify other transportation improvements as the scopes of these projects are better refined.
- 2) All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

ROUND 2  
RECOMMENDED MOBILITY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS  
CITY AND COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES PROJECTS

infrastructure improvements to increase pedestrian access to transit services, minimize pedestrian and vehicle conflicts, and increase overall transportation mobility through the enhancement of transit services in this transit dependent community.

**Cost Estimate: \$8,250,000**

**PROJECT TYPE 5:** Active Transportation Projects

**[Project ID# 2-2] Los Angeles City - El Sereno Active Transportation Project & Transit Connectivity Enhancements:** Implement mobility and access improvements; pedestrian access enhancements and transit infrastructure improvements or better access to local circulators, Metro [bus service] and the regional transit hub at California State University, Los Angeles along corridors in El Sereno neighborhoods that include Alhambra Avenue [between the city limit and Valley Boulevard], Marianna Avenue [between Valley Boulevard and the City limit], and Huntington Drive south [between Huntington Drive North and Minto Court], and Beatie Place [between Bohlig Road and Lafler Road]. This project will increase transit connectivity, ridership, and access to and from hillside communities and beyond.

**Cost Estimate: \$6,000,000**

**[Project ID# 2-3] Los Angeles City - Northeast Los Angeles Active Transportation & Transit Connectivity Enhancements:** Implement mobility and access improvements and improve active transportation access to transit stops along Marengo Street [Mission Road to Soto Street], North Figueroa Street [York to Colorado Boulevards], York Boulevard [Eagle Rock Boulevard to Pascual Avenue] and Yosemite Drive [Eagle Rock Boulevard to North Figueroa Street], and Arroyo Seco Bike Path [Arroyo Verde Street to Northern City Limit]. This project will increase transit connectivity, ridership, and access to key destinations.

**Cost Estimate: \$5,000,000**

**[Project ID# 2-4] Los Angeles County - Atlantic Boulevard Mobility Improvements:** On Atlantic Boulevard in unincorporated East Los Angeles, between SR 60 and Telegraph Road, implement mobility and access improvements, which could include intersection improvements; lane reconfigurations; and signal timing changes to increase pedestrian accessibility and reduce the potential for vehicle and pedestrian conflicts.

**Cost Estimate: \$5,000,000**

**[Project ID# 2-5] Los Angeles County - East Los Angeles Mobility Hub Project:** At designated locations in unincorporated East Los Angeles, provide rideshare, transit and active transportation user amenities

**NOTES:**

- 1) LA City and LA County may identify other transportation improvements as the scopes of these projects are better refined.
- 2) All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

## ROUND 2

RECOMMENDED MOBILITY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS  
CITY AND COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES PROJECTS

(such as shelters, seating, information displays, wayfinding signage, etc.) and implement mobility and access improvements for users of transit (buses), autos and non-motorized vehicles (bikes, scooters) to improve access to key destinations.

**Cost Estimate: \$2,000,000**

**[Project ID# 2-6] Los Angeles County - East Los Angeles Pedestrian Accessibility Improvements:**

Implement mobility and enhanced pedestrian accessibility on designated corridors and/or intersections to improve access for transit and active transportation users to employment centers, markets, educational facilities, healthcare facilities, and parks and recreational centers.

**Cost Estimate: \$2,500,000**

**[Project ID# 2-7] Los Angeles County - East Los Angeles Vision Zero Enhancements:** Implement access improvements and pedestrian access enhancements on designated corridors and/or intersections which could include 1<sup>st</sup> Street, Arizona Avenue, Atlantic Boulevard, Cesar Chavez Avenue, City Terrace Drive, Eastern Avenue, Ford Boulevard, Indiana Avenue, Olympic Boulevard, Whiteside Street and Whittier Boulevard. These improvements may include, but are not limited to, traffic signal upgrades; protected left turn signal phasing; high-visibility crosswalks; pedestrian signal interval timing enhancements and pedestrian activated warning beacons to reduce pedestrian and vehicle conflicts and increase accessibility to transit services.

**Cost Estimate: \$10,000,000**

**[Project ID# 2-8] Los Angeles County - Eastern Avenue Mobility Improvements:** On Eastern Avenue in unincorporated East Los Angeles, implement mobility and access improvements which could include pedestrian access enhancements; transit amenities; and active transportation programs to increase pedestrian access to transit services, minimize pedestrian and vehicle conflicts, and increase overall transportation mobility through the enhancement of transit services in this transit dependent community.

**Cost Estimate: \$5,000,000**

**Project ID# 2-9] Los Angeles County - Floral Drive Pedestrian and Roadway Improvements:** On Floral Drive, at designated intersections and/or segments of road, implement mobility and access improvements, and active transportation programs to increase pedestrian access to transit services, minimize pedestrian and vehicle conflicts, and increase overall transportation mobility through the enhancement of transit services in this transit dependent community.

**Cost Estimate: \$5,000,000**

**[Project ID# 2-10] Los Angeles County - LA County +USC Medical Center Mobility Improvements**

NOTES:

- 1) LA City and LA County may identify other transportation improvements as the scopes of these projects are better refined.
- 2) All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.

## ROUND 2

RECOMMENDED MOBILITY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS  
CITY AND COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES PROJECTS

**(Valley Boulevard Multi-Modal Transportation Improvements):** Design and construct multimodal corridor improvements along Valley Boulevard which may include a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) route and active transportation safety and accessibility enhancements as well as additional necessary infrastructure upgrades along Valley Boulevard. This would include various improvements to the Los Angeles County + USC Medical Center including enhancements to the Silver Line Bus Stop as well as improvements along Valley Blvd, San Pablo St, Marengo St and other streets in the vicinity. Coordination with Metro and Los Angeles City will be needed to design and construct the project. This project would also include coordinating with UPRR and other stakeholders to process the acquisition of necessary right-of-way to accommodate sidewalks and transit stop amenities; and grade crossing improvements at Boca Avenue, Vineburn Avenue and San Pablo Street.

**Cost Estimate: \$30,000,000**

**[Project ID# 2-11] Los Angeles County - Micro-Mobility Program and Infrastructure Improvements:** At designated locations in unincorporated East Los Angeles, implement mobility and access improvements for communities with low car ownership that rely heavily on active transportation programs to travel.

**Cost Estimate: \$2,500,000**

**[Project ID# 2-12] Los Angeles County - Safe Routes to Schools Infrastructure Enhancements:** Implement mobility, enhanced pedestrian accessibility and signal interval timing at intersections on designated corridors in proximity to schools and neighborhoods to reduce pedestrian and vehicle conflicts and improve access for transit and active transportation users.



**Cost Estimate: \$2,500,000**

NOTES:



- 1) LA City and LA County may identify other transportation improvements as the scopes of these projects are better refined.
- 2) All project cost estimates are subject to reevaluation based on more detailed scopes of work.





RECOMMENDED PROJECTS AND FUNDING ALLOCATIONS SUMMARIES  
BY PROJECT SPONSOR





RECOMMENDED PROJECTS AND FUNDING ALLOCATIONS SUMMARIES  
BY PROJECT SPONSOR



RECOMMENDED PROJECTS AND FUNDING ALLOCATIONS SUMMARIES  
BY PROJECT SPONSOR



RECOMMENDED PROJECTS AND FUNDING ALLOCATIONS SUMMARIES  
BY PROJECT SPONSOR





## Board Report

File #: 2019-0443, File Type: Project

Agenda Number: 10.

### PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE SEPTEMBER 18, 2019

**SUBJECT: LA RIVER PATH**

**ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

CONSIDER:

- A. RECEIVING AND FILING the Conceptual Design Report; and
- B. AUTHORIZING the CEO to initiate the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR).

#### **ISSUE**

The LA River Path is a Measure M project with a projected opening date during the FY 2025-27 period. Currently, \$365 million in Measure M funds are allocated for this project. This project is also included in the Twenty-Eight by '28 Initiative adopted by the Board in January 2018.

To meet the Measure M schedule, a Proposed Project needs to be identified and environmentally cleared. Initiating the environmental review will also support the application for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) required permits. This report includes the findings from the Conceptual Design Phase and a recommendation for what alternatives to advance into environmental review.

#### **BACKGROUND**

The LA River Path is an approximately eight-mile active transportation path (e.g., walking and bicycling) along the Los Angeles River. The study area (Attachment A) extends between Elysian Valley and Maywood through downtown Los Angeles and the City of Vernon. The northern limit of the project area is the terminus of the Los Angeles River Greenway Trail at Riverside Drive and the southern limit is at Atlantic Boulevard where the Los Angeles River Bicycle Path begins in the City of Maywood. The project will close the longest remaining gap in the LA River Path to create a continuous 32-mile path for people walking, rolling and bicycling between the San Fernando Valley and Long Beach.

Many of the neighborhoods in the area surrounding the project corridor are predominately industrial with high volumes of truck traffic, deteriorated roadways, a lack of sidewalks and street lighting, and

---

at-grade rail crossings. Additionally, there are freight and passenger train tracks adjacent to the River along several segments of the corridor. Approximately 1 million people live within three miles of the LA River Path project corridor. Of the 85,000 people who live within ½-mile of the project corridor, 18,000 (21%) working-age people walk, bicycle, or take public transit to work.

In June 2014, the Board passed a motion (Attachment B) which directed staff to study a path, including in-channel options, for this missing segment. In 2016, Metro staff completed a feasibility study for closing this gap, which considered top of bank, channel bottom and other path treatments and found that the project was feasible. This feasibility study was approved by the Metro Board of Directors in September 2016 (Legistar File 2016-0311). In May 2018, the Board authorized the CEO to award and execute Contract #AE4779500 with CH2M Hill, Inc. for technical services to support the LA River Path (Legistar File 2018-0108).

## **DISCUSSION**

Since May 2018, work has been underway to document the corridor's existing conditions, conduct community outreach, and to identify and screen potential alternatives. A Project Steering Committee comprised of a representative from Metro, the Cities of Los Angeles and Vernon, and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works provides overall guidance to this project. The Steering Committee and overall project is supported by two advisory groups: a Project Development Team (PDT) and stakeholder roundtables. The PDT is comprised of Metro, USACE, City of Los Angeles, City of Vernon, Los Angeles County, and the Mountains Recreation & Conservation Authority and provides interagency coordination, technical guidance and problem-solving for the project. The stakeholder roundtables are comprised of local community-based organizations, employers and other local stakeholders who advise the project on community needs and priorities and provide overall project guidance.

The project is driven by six goals that were shaped by community input. These goals are safety, access, efficient and sustainable mobility, equity, user experience and health. The project goals are the basis of the evaluation criteria used to screen and refine potential alternatives during an early alternatives analysis. Metro relied heavily on community input on preferred access points and path types to develop potential alternatives, which were screened using these criteria. The Conceptual Design phase was completed in August 2019, leading to the development of a Conceptual Design Report (Attachment C - Executive Summary) which documents existing conditions, design guidance, community feedback and the results of the early alternatives analysis, which identified three alternatives recommended for further study during environmental review.

### **Community and Stakeholder Outreach**

In addition to the stakeholder engagement through the project advisory committees, Metro staff also conducted an extensive community outreach effort, completing nine community outreach meetings, two online surveys and two informational videos. Additionally, staff attended numerous briefings and attended dozens of pop-up events. Through these efforts, staff obtained 4,600 in-person comments and 3,800 survey responses.

This input included feedback on the LA River Path's goals, potential access points, and preferred path types. Stakeholders and community members indicated a strong desire for a path that was

available for recreation as well as commuting and errands. Comments were categorized around project goals with the most cited themes being user experience, safety and access.

### Access Points

Community input indicated a desire for access points on both banks and prioritized access points that connect neighborhoods to the east and west of the river. Preferred access points included Los Angeles State Historic Park/Main Street, Union Station, 1<sup>st</sup> Street and Washington Boulevard. These preferences were used to develop and refine alternatives.

### Path Types

Because of the constrained nature of the corridor, there are limited places where the path can be located. Four primary path types were analyzed to inform the development of alternatives and Metro collected nearly 3,000 comments on preferences through community meetings and an online survey.

A top-of-bank/cantilevered path utilizes existing at-grade space and/or cantilevers over the channel at grade. This path type was the most popular with community members (40% of responses) as it would be reliably open and less subject to closures due to flooding. This path could accommodate amenities and features such as lighting, security features, landscaping and public art. Top-of-bank options are only feasible in select locations where the existing rail lines and utilities are set back to provide sufficient space for the path.

An elevated path would be above-grade supported by piers and could be utilized for ramping and crossing over roadways and other at-grade obstacles. This was the second most popular path type (32% of responses) as it would also be reliably open and could accommodate lighting, security features and public art.

An incised path cuts the path into the channel embankment and is commonly used when there is insufficient space at-grade for either a top-of-bank or elevated option. It is also utilized to go under bridges and other obstacles. This path type would be subject to closures during heavy rainfall but could utilize existing bridges that it passes under to provide lighting and other amenities. This path type was preferred by 17% of respondents.

The fourth path type evaluated is bottom-of-channel, which would locate the path on the flat bottom of the channel. This path type would not be impacted by adjacent top-of-bank conditions and would place users close to the water in the channel. This option was preferred by 11% of respondents due to its proximity to the water. This path type would be the most at-risk of seasonal flooding, would require the longest access ramps to get on and off the path, and would not be able to provide amenities and features such as lighting, landscaping, and security features as the path would be under water during rain events.

### Best Performing Alternatives

Three alternatives were identified as the best performing options to advance into environmental review. All three alternatives move back and forth across the river to utilize existing space, navigate around obstacles, and provide places to get on and off the path at desired access points. Additionally, each of these utilizes a combination of top-of-bank/cantilevered, elevated and incised path types. A bottom-of-channel option, which would not be reliably open during rain and could not

---

accommodate many of the desired amenities, was not advanced as a primary alternative. However, Metro identified future opportunities to add a secondary path (e.g., “interpretive” nature path) near the water at the bottom of the channel as well as additional access points if additional funding were to become available.

Alternative A (Attachment D) crosses the river six times and adds 10 new access points. Alternative B (Attachment E) crosses the river seven times and adds 12 new access points. Alternative C (Attachment F) crosses the river seven times and adds 11 new access points. These alternatives contain many common access points and path types but identify some opportunities that are unique to each one that can be further evaluated to inform the project.

### Environmental Review

Initiating the DEIR will allow Metro to continue to study, analyze, and seek community input on these alternatives pursuant to CEQA. This project does not anticipate using federal funds. Environmental review pursuant to NEPA will be limited to applying for required permits from USACE. Staff proposes to initiate the CEQA analysis first in order to identify a Proposed Project, thoroughly analyze and document potential impacts, and advance the design of the alternatives in order to streamline the NEPA analysis for USACE.

### Equity Platform

The LA River Path Project will close the largest remaining gap to create a seamless 32-mile grade-separated corridor for walking, biking and rolling along the Los Angeles River and provide improved access to opportunities including jobs, education, and public recreational spaces. This Project is consistent with the Metro Equity Platform and will benefit existing communities, including many equity focus communities (EFC). One million people live within biking distance of the project corridor and 85,000 live within walking distance. Approximately 72% of the population located within ½ mile of the project corridor live in an EFC. Of those within biking distance, 79% of the residents are Hispanic and 29% of the residents are classified as living in poverty (2016, American Community Survey).

The LA River Path project’s three alternatives connect to local communities along the river corridor. EFCs exist along both sides of the project corridor. All three alternatives provide access to key destinations supported by the community such as Los Angeles State Historic Park/Main Street Access, Albion Park/Main Street Access, Mission Road/Cesar Chavez Avenue Access, Union Station Access, Washington Boulevard Access, Bandini-Soto Triangle Access, and Downey Road East Access.

Specifically, this Project will focus on the Equity Pillars of Listen and Learn and Focus and Deliver. During the environmental analysis, Metro will continue to engage the community in order to plan, design and implement a project that improves access to opportunities and reflects the needs of the local communities. During the conceptual design phase, robust community engagement included nine public meetings, numerous stakeholder presentations, community pop-up events, youth-focused activities, surveys and online engagement.

### **DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

These actions will not have any impact on the safety of Metro customers and/or employees because



---

this project is in the planning process phase and no capital or operational impacts result from this Board action.

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The FY20 budget includes \$7.021M for Professional Services in Cost Center 4310 (Mobility Corridors Team 1), Project 474303 (LA River Path). Since this is a multi-year program, the Cost Center manager and Chief Planning Officer will be responsible for budgeting in future years.

#### **Impact to Budget**

The funding sources for the project are Measure M 2% Active Transportation Projects and Measure M 17% Highway Construction. As these funds are earmarked for the LA River Path project, they are not eligible for Metro bus and rail capital and operating expenditures.

### **IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS**

The project will support the goals of the strategic plan by adding a new high-quality mobility option along the LA River that provides outstanding trip experiences and enhances communities and lives through mobility and access to opportunity.

### **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The Metro Board could decide not to take action. This alternative is not recommended, as this would impact commencing the project's environmental clearance process and risk delay of construction, potentially hindering the project's ability to be completed by the Twenty-Eight by '28 Initiative.

### **NEXT STEPS**


Upon Board approval, Metro Staff will initiate the Draft Environmental Impact Report and community engagement.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

- Attachment A - Study Area
- Attachment B - June 2014 Metro Board Motion
- Attachment C - Executive Summary - Conceptual Design Report
- Attachment D - Alternative A
- Attachment E - Alternative B
- Attachment F - Alternative C

Prepared by: Maressa Sah, Principal Transportation Planner, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-2462  
Lauren Cencic, Senior Director, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-7417  
Manjeet Ranu, Senior Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3157

Reviewed by: James de la Loza, Chief Planning Officer, (213) 922-2920



Phillip A. Washington  
Chief Executive Officer

# Los Angeles River Path Project



**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE****MOTION BY:****MAYOR ERIC GARCETTI, SUPERVISOR GLORIA MOLINA,  
AND DIRECTOR MIKE BONIN**

June 18, 2014

**Los Angeles River Bikeway Connection**

The City and County of Los Angeles have devoted significant time and resources in creating a Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan. This Plan incorporates transportation infrastructure as a key element of accessibility and mobility for the LA River, and addresses the need to have a regionally connected bikeway network. The County and many cities in the Los Angeles River Corridor, often with the assistance of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA), have implemented major infrastructure and recreation areas along the river, its tributaries, and connecting surface streets.

In May 2014, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers recommended approval of an ambitious, \$1-billion proposal to restore habitat, widen the river, create wetlands and provide pedestrian access points and bicycle paths along an 11-mile stretch of the LA River north of downtown through Elysian Park. This proposal, known as "Alternative 20," is the starting point for projects that will eventually revitalize all 51 miles of the river, from the San Fernando Valley to Long Beach.

However, the plan does not cover the most significant gap along the Los Angeles River, between the bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the Elysian Valley to the existing LA River Path that connects the City of Maywood to the City of Long Beach. This gap was also identified in MTA's Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan adopted in 2006.

This gap is located in areas where the LA River is surrounded by active train tracks and industrial uses, which make it difficult to acquire the necessary right-of-way for placement of a bike path and pedestrian access on the river banks.

Recently a conceptual technical study was presented to MTA, which focuses on an "In River Channel Bike Path," similar to the bicycle path along the Arroyo Seco in the City of Los Angeles. As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency, MTA is best suited to coordinate regional, countywide bicycle efforts. A study of this nature will require multi-agency stakeholder coordination, and should include a detailed analysis of potential bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections to the LA River facilities.


(CONTINUED)


**WE, THEREFORE, MOVE that the Board direct the Chief Executive Officer to:**

- A. Develop a proposed scope for studying an in-channel bike path design, with logical pedestrian linkages along ingress and egress areas, that connects the missing link from Taylor Yard to the City of Maywood;
- B. Recommend a project timeline and a proposed implementation strategy to advance a comprehensive bike channel study;
- C. Identify and receive input from key stakeholders and study participants;
- D. Report back to the Board in September 2014 on Items A - C and a possible recommendation for implementation.


## Attachment C

[http://libraryarchives.metro.net/DB\\_Attachments/2019-0443\\_Attachment\\_C\\_Executive\\_Summary\\_Conceptual\\_Design\\_Report.pdf](http://libraryarchives.metro.net/DB_Attachments/2019-0443_Attachment_C_Executive_Summary_Conceptual_Design_Report.pdf)









# Next stop: a more connected river path.

## LA RIVER PATH



Metro

Planning and Programming - September 18, 2019  
File # 2019-0443



Consider:

- > RECEIVING AND FILING the Conceptual Design Report; and
- > AUTHORIZING the CEO to initiate the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)


# Project Overview and Study Area



- > **Close 8-mile gap** between Elysian Valley and Maywood
- > **Create 32-mile path** from San Fernando Valley to Long Beach
- > **\$365M** in Measure M funding



# Project Schedule




# Conceptual Design



- > Documented existing conditions
- > Conducted community outreach
  - > Stakeholder Roundtables
  - > Project Development Team
  - > 9 Community meetings
  - > 2 Online surveys
  - > Dozens of community pop-up events
- > Identified and screened potential alternatives
- > Identified three most promising alternatives to advance into environmental review



# Community Input on Path Types




# Alternative A



## Benefits

- + *Equity*: path provides access and links communities.
- + *Health*: potential for community gathering areas.

## Path Type



## Alignment



- Metro Rail Line & Station
- Existing Path
- Existing Access Point

### LA River Path Alignments

- Potential Access Point
- Elevated
- Top of Bank
- Incised
- Elevated Crossing

### Future Opportunity

- Potential Access Point
- Channel Bottom
- Top of Bank
- On-Street

All lines and access point locations are approximate.






# Alternative B




## Benefits

- + *Access:* direct connections to services and job centers in Downtown LA, Little Tokyo, and Vernon
- + *User experience:* minimal grade change and unique vistas from elevated and top of bank paths

## Path Type



## Alignment



- Metro Rail Line & Station
- Existing Path
- Existing Access Point

### LA River Path Alignments

- Potential Access Point
- Elevated
- Top of Bank
- Incised
- Elevated Crossing

### Future Opportunity

- Potential Access Point
- Channel Bottom
- Top of Bank
- On-Street

All lines and access point locations are approximate.




# Alternative C



## Benefits

- + *Equity*: path provides access and links communities.
- + *Efficient and sustainable mobility*: likely to remain open during flood events

## Path Type



## Alignment



- Metro Rail Line & Station
- Existing Path
- Existing Access Point

### LA River Path Alignments

- Potential Access Point
- Elevated
- Top of Bank
- Incised
- Elevated Crossing

### Future Opportunity

- Potential Access Point
- Channel Bottom
- Top of Bank
- On-Street

All lines and access point locations are approximate.



# Proposed Next Steps



- > Advance Alternatives A, B and C and initiate the CEQA analysis in order to:
  - > Identify a Proposed Project
  - > Document potential impacts and complete conceptual design
  - > Streamline the NEPA analysis needed for USACE permits
- > Fall 2019 – Conduct Scoping Meetings and ongoing community outreach



**Board Report**

**File #:** 2019-0553, **File Type:** Contract

**Agenda Number:** 11.

**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 18, 2019**

**SUBJECT: METRO BIKE HUB MANAGEMENT SERVICES CONTRACT EXTENSION**

**ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer to execute Modification No. 6 to Contract No. PS43203266 with Bike Hub to continue management services and optional tasks for Metro Bike Hubs for up to one year in the not-to-exceed amount of \$265,836, increasing the total contract value from \$575,977 to \$841,813.

**ISSUE**

Management services of Metro Bike Hubs are currently under contract with the company, Bike Hub, through September 30, 2019. Staff has initiated the procurement process for a new operator contract that is anticipated to be finalized in early 2020. The contract extension is needed to ensure continued management services without interruption for Metro Bike Hub locations until the procurement process is completed.

**BACKGROUND**

The Metro Bike Hub Program provides 24/7, high-capacity bike parking in a secure, monitored, controlled-access environment at key transit stations for a nominal fee. Other services may include bike repair, retail, rental, and education workshops.

Metro Bike Hubs are located at El Monte Transit, Hollywood/Vine, Union Station, and Culver City stations. A future Metro Bike Hub is planned for Willowbrook/Rosa Parks during this extension period.

**DISCUSSION**

Bike Hub has been the contracted operator of Metro Bike Hubs since 2015. Their scope of services includes tasks related to customer service, account registration, security, facility maintenance, and marketing. These functions are necessary to continue Metro Bike Hub operations and maintain the level of service provided for transit patrons systemwide. This contract extension includes two optional tasks: (1) to provide supplemental staffing resources; and (2) to update existing infrastructure to facilitate walk-up registrations and daily membership options.

On July 1, 2019, Metro issued a Request for Proposal for Bike Hub Operations and Maintenance. Final selection and contract execution are anticipated in early 2020. To accommodate this schedule, staff is proposing to extend the existing contract with Bike Hub to cover the period of operations between when the existing contract expires in September 2019 and when the new contract will be executed in early 2020.

#### Equity Platform

The contract extension will allow for continued customer service, including conducting an Annual Customer Satisfaction Survey consistent with Metro Equity Platform Pillar II: Listen and Learn.

#### **DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

Approval of the Metro Bike Hub Management Services contract extension will improve Metro's safety standards by ensuring the continued operation of secure bike parking facilities.

#### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

Funding of \$585,400 is included in the FY20 Budget for Metro Bike Hub operations under Project 308012 (Bike Lockers Support), Cost Center 4320 (Bike Share Planning and Implementation). Since this is a multiyear project, the Cost Center Manager and Chief Planning Officer will be accountable for budgeting the cost in future years.

#### Impact to Budget

The funding sources are Bike Share Program Revenues and Proposition C 25%, which are not eligible for bus and rail operating and capital expenditures.

#### **IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS**

1. Provide high-quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling;
2. Deliver outstanding trip experiences for all users of the transportation system; and
3. Enhance communities and lives through mobility and access to opportunity.

#### **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The Board could choose not to extend the contract and allow it to expire on September 30, 2019 without replacing the operator. This would discontinue core functions of the Metro Bike Hub program including customer service, regular auditing of the interior bicycle parking area, and responding to door alarm alerts. This would compromise the security of Metro Bike Hub facilities and impact customer experience.

#### **NEXT STEPS**


Upon Board approval, staff will execute Modification 6 to Contract No. PS43203266 with Bike Hub.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A - Procurement Summary  
Attachment B - Contract Modification/Change Order Log  
Attachment C - DEOD Summary

Prepared by: Carolyn Mamaradlo, Manager, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-5529  
Dolores Roybal Saltarelli, Sr. Director, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-3024  
Frank Ching, DEO, Transportation Demand Management, (213) 922-3033  
Holly Rockwell, Sr. Exec. Officer - Real Estate, Transit Oriented Communities and Transportation Demand Management, (213) 922-5585

Reviewed by: James de la Loza, Chief Planning Officer, (213) 922-2920  
Debra Avila, Chief Vendor/Contract Management Officer, (213) 418-3051



---

Phillip A. Washington  
Chief Executive Officer

## PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

## METRO BIKE HUB MANAGEMENT SERVICES/PS43203266

1.	<b>Contract Number:</b> PS43203266		
2.	<b>Contractor:</b> BikeHub		
3.	<b>Mod. Work Description:</b> Continue management services of Metro Bike Hubs for up to one year and optional tasks related to operational efficiencies and an additional location.		
4.	<b>Contract Work Description:</b> Operations and management services of Metro Bike Hubs		
5.	<b>The following data is current as of:</b> August 13, 2019		
6.	<b>Contract Completion Status</b>		<b>Financial Status</b>
	<b>Contract Awarded:</b>	09/15/14	<b>Contract Award Amount:</b> \$476,036
	<b>Notice to Proceed (NTP):</b>	11/03/14	<b>Total of Modifications Approved:</b> \$99,941
	<b>Original Complete Date:</b>	11/02/17	<b>Pending Modifications (including this action):</b> \$265,836
	<b>Current Est. Complete Date:</b>	09/30/19	<b>Current Contract Value (with this action):</b> \$841,813
7.	<b>Contract Administrator:</b> Lily Lopez		<b>Telephone Number:</b> (213) 922-4639
8.	<b>Project Manager:</b> Carolyn Mamaradlo		<b>Telephone Number:</b> (213) 922-5529

**A. Procurement Background**

This Board Action is to approve Contract Modification No. 6 issued to continue management services of Metro Bike Hubs for up to one year and optional tasks related to operational efficiencies and an additional location.

This Contract Modification was processed in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policy and the contract type is firm fixed price. All other terms and conditions remain in effect.

On September 15, 2014, Metro approved award of a three-year, firm fixed price Contract No. PS43203266 to BikeHub (formerly Alameda Bicycle, Inc.) in the amount of \$476,036 to provide management services to support the operations of secure-access group bicycle parking facilities at three Metro locations, inclusive of two one-year options.

Refer to Attachment B – Contract Modification/Change Order Log for modifications issued to date.

**B. Cost Analysis**

The recommended price has been determined to be fair and reasonable based upon an independent cost estimate, cost analysis, and the technical analysis.

The proposed level of effort and associated costs are sufficient to deliver the supplemental scope of work. Metro anticipates authorizing an optional task, if additional staffing is needed, at attended locations (including, but not limited to Culver City, Hollywood/Vine, and Willowbrook/Rosa Parks). Metro also anticipates authorizing another optional task to implement walk-up registrations and short-term usage before the end of the calendar year.

Metro staff successfully negotiated a cost savings of \$30,219 by reducing the duplication of efforts and clarifying the intent of the supplemental scope of work.

<b>Proposal Amount</b>	<b>Metro ICE</b>	<b>Negotiated Amount</b>
\$296,055	\$272,729	\$265,836



## CONTRACT MODIFICATION/CHANGE ORDER LOG

## METRO BIKE HUB MANAGEMENT SERVICES/PS43203266

<b>Mod. No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Status (approved or pending)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>\$ Amount</b>
1	Exercise option year 1	Approved	01/16/16	\$0
2	Exercise option year 2	Approved	03/07/17	\$0
3	Extend period of performance (POP) through 9/21/18.	Approved	01/03/18	\$0
4	Change the operational services at the El Monte Metro Bike Hub to automated self-serve with conducting weekly audits and commissioning the start-up/operations of the Culver City bike hub location and POP extension through 7/22/19.	Approved	09/19/18	\$99,941
5	Extend POP through 9/30/19.	Approved	02/04/19	\$0
6	Continue management services of Metro Bike Hubs for up to one year and optional tasks related to operational efficiencies and an additional location.	Pending	Pending	<b>\$265,836</b>
	<b>Modification Total:</b>			<b>\$365,777</b>
	<b>Original Contract:</b>		09/15/14	<b>\$476,036</b>
	<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$841,813</b>

**DEOD SUMMARY**

**METRO BIKE HUB MANAGEMENT SERVICES/PS43203266**

**A. Small Business Participation**

BikeHub, a Small Business Enterprise (SBE) Prime, made a 95.71% SBE commitment. The project is 96% complete. BikeHub is currently exceeding their commitment with an SBE participation of 98.30%.

<b>Small Business Commitment</b>	<b>95.71% SBE</b>	<b>Small Business Participation</b>	<b>98.30% SBE</b>
----------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------

	<b>SBE Firm</b>	<b>% Committed</b>	<b>Current Participation<sup>1</sup></b>
1.	BikeHub (SBE Prime)	95.71%	98.30%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>95.71%</b>	<b>98.30%</b>

<sup>1</sup>Current Participation = Total Actual amount Paid-to-Date to SBE firms ÷ Total Actual Amount Paid-to-date to Prime.

**B. Living Wage and Service Contract Worker Retention Policy Applicability**

The Living Wage and Service Contract Worker Retention Policy is not applicable to this contract.

**C. Prevailing Wage Applicability**

Prevailing wage is not applicable to this contract.

**D. Project Labor Agreement/Construction Careers Policy**

Project Labor Agreement/Construction Careers Policy is not applicable to this Contract. Project Labor Agreement/Construction Careers Policy is applicable only to construction contracts that have a construction contract value in excess of \$2.5 million.



Board Report

File #: 2019-0560, File Type: Contract

Agenda Number: 12.

**REVISED**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE**  
**SEPTEMBER 18, 2019**

**SUBJECT: PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP (P3) FINANCIAL ADVISORY SERVICES BENCH**

**ACTION: AWARD BENCH CONTRACTS**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to:

- A. AWARD AND EXECUTE five bench Contracts listed below for P3 Financial Advisory Services for a five-year base period in the overall funding amount of \$25 million, subject to resolution of protest(s), if any:
  - 1. Arup Advisory, Inc (PS61431000)
  - 2. Deloitte Transactions and Business Analytics Analysis LLP (PS61431001)
  - 3. Ernst & Young Infrastructure Advisors, LLC (PS61431002)
  - 4. Public Financial Management Financial Advisors LLC (PS61431003)
  - 5. Sperry Capital Inc. (PS61431004)
- B. APPROVE Contract Modification Authority (CMA) in the amount of 20% specific to Contract Nos. PS61431000 through PS61431004 to support the cost of unforeseen issues that may arise during the course of the Contract; and
- C. EXECUTE Task Orders under these Contracts for P3 Financial Advisory Services in a total amount not to exceed \$25 million.

**ISSUE**

LA Metro requires specialized financial consulting services from qualified firms to support the potential use of Public-Private Partnerships (P3) and other alternative delivery models for a variety of transportation-related projects, including but not limited to highway and transit capital, transportation-ancillary facilities, and mobility technology.

The bench of qualified firms shall provide financial expertise and associated resources and deliverables to assist Metro in identifying and evaluating projects where alternative or P3 delivery might offer benefits, advancing these projects through feasibility analysis, pre-procurement and project development phases to procurement, as well as potential post-procurement, implementation,

and administration project phases.

Task orders will be awarded to a contractor from the bench at the completion of a competitive procurement process.

## **BACKGROUND**

Previously, Metro's Planning Department had established a P3 bench involving six disciplines to address a range of financial and technical services that might be required to support P3 or alternative project delivery. Contractors from the P3 advisory bench have been frequently utilized through task orders to support assessments of unsolicited proposals, P3 project development and analysis, support for P3 pre-procurement activities, and development of Metro's P3 program tools.

## **DISCUSSION**

With a shift of P3 program responsibilities to OEI, staff has developed a new approach to identifying and supporting P3 projects whereby various departments utilize both internal and consultant resources to augment a project team, rather than all consulting resources being managed by one group or team. This integrated project team structure has helped to improve collaboration and efficient communication, break down "silos" between various departments, establish greater accountability across the agency for project outcomes, and support a multidisciplinary approach to project planning, development, and delivery.

Since its inception, OEI's role has been to focus specifically on the financial aspects of P3 projects. OEI has utilized the prior P3 advisory bench several times, but only to issue task orders to the financial discipline. Therefore, when the existing bench contract expired in February of 2019, OEI determined with Vendor/Contract Management and other staff involved in P3 projects that a new bench contract should be limited to P3 financial advisory.

In addition to the tasks and deliverables associated with the financial discipline of the previous P3 advisory bench, OEI has expanded the scope of work to incorporate 1) support in the assessment of unsolicited proposals, 2) new types and kinds of innovative transportation projects and facilities, 3) tasks related to contract implementation and administration that would be relevant after a P3 contract award has been approved, and 4) development of programmatic P3 tools such as guidance, methodologies, and other tools that will support broader and more effective P3 literacy within Metro.

## **DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

The approval of this Bench will not have any impact on the safety of our customers and employees.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

Each task order awarded to a contractor will be funded with the source of funds identified for the relevant project. For unsolicited proposal support or programmatic work, OEI will budget from its allocated P3 line item. The FY20 Budget includes funds in account 50316, Project 405701 for P3 consultants. Since this is a multiyear contract, the cost center manager and Chief Innovation Officer

and Deputy Chief Innovation Officer will be responsible for budgeting costs in future years.

### Impact to Budget

The funding for these task orders is dependent upon the specific project. Generally, Propositions A and C, and Measure M funds will be utilized.

## **IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS**

The recommended action supports the following Strategic Plan goals:

### **Goal 1: Provide high-quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling.**

Public-private partnerships and other alternative delivery models have been shown to help deliver projects with more certainty, innovation, and performance, and less risk, cost, and delay. This model, applied thoughtfully, can support Metro's goal to expand the transportation system as responsibly and quickly as possible. A focus on performance based contracting can also help Metro to optimize the speed, reliability, and performance of the system through innovative approaches to revitalizing and upgrading Metro's transit assets. Finally, it can support Metro's effort to experiment with new types and kinds of transit services, such as shared, demand-responsive options, with improved outcomes at a lower level of risk.

### **Goal 2: Deliver outstanding trip experiences for all users of the transportation system.**

P3 financial structures are focused on improving performance outcomes while reducing cost and risk. This performance is "guaranteed" by the financial risk of the P3 partner, improving key customer-facing metrics for transit service. Additionally, as new technologies and approaches are developed, the principles of P3s can be applied to innovative new customer-focused applications to enhance the trip experience. This could include anything from fare payment and toll collection to facilities and infrastructure to support an improved customer experience.

### **Goal 5: Provide responsive, accountable, and trustworthy governance within the Metro organization.**

Metro's P3 program is focused on identifying the best value delivery model for each of Metro projects. This includes balancing cost, feasibility, risk, performance, and schedule to deliver the best mobility improvements to taxpayers and system users as soon as possible.

## **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The Board could choose not to approve the recommendations. This is not recommended as the award of subsequent task orders would then be pursued as separate procurements which, for each task order, could potentially take several months to complete. This would limit our ability to respond quickly to needs and to meet tight project delivery schedule constraints. The Board could also elect not to approve the CEO's authority to award individual task orders. This is not recommended, as this would limit flexibility and increase evaluation timeframes for proposals and projects, due to the wide variety of financial analysis tasks that bench contractors may be asked to perform in an expeditious manner.

## **NEXT STEPS**

Upon Board approval, staff will establish and execute the Bench contracts. As needed, staff will solicit and award individual task orders.


**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A - Procurement Summary

Attachment B - DEOD Summary

Prepared by: Colin Peppard, Senior Director, (213) 418-3434

Reviewed by: Joshua Schank, Chief Innovation Office, (213) 418-3345  
Debra Avila, Chief Vendor/Contract Management Officer, (213) 418-3051



Phillip A. Washington  
Chief Executive Officer

**PROCUREMENT SUMMARY**

**PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP (P3) FINANCIAL ADVISORY SERVICES  
BENCH/PS61431000-PS61431004**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Contract Number: PS61431000 through PS61431004</b>	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Recommended Vendor(s):</b> (1) Arup Advisory, Inc. (2) Deloitte Transactions and Business Analysis <del>Analytics</del> <u>Analytics</u> LLP (3) Ernst & Young Infrastructure Advisors, LLC (4) Public Financial Management Financial Advisors LLC (5) Sperry Capital Inc.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Type of Procurement (check one):</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IFB <input type="checkbox"/> RFP <input type="checkbox"/> RFP-A&E <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Competitive <input type="checkbox"/> Modification <input type="checkbox"/> Task Order <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RFIQ	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Procurement Dates:</b>	
	<b>A. Issued:</b> April 22, 2019	
	<b>B. Advertised/Publicized:</b> April 22, 2019	
	<b>C. Pre-Proposal Conference:</b> May 6, 2019	
	<b>D. Proposals Due:</b> June 3, 2019	
	<b>E. Pre-Qualification Completed:</b> In process	
	<b>F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics:</b> June 3, 2019	
	<b>G. Protest Period End Date:</b> September 20, 2019	
<b>5.</b>	<b>Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded:</b>  93	<b>Bids/Proposals Received:</b>  10
<b>6.</b>	<b>Contract Administrator:</b> Lily Lopez	<b>Telephone Number:</b> (213) 922-4639
<b>7.</b>	<b>Project Manager:</b> Colin Peppard	<b>Telephone Number:</b> (213) 418-3434

**A. Procurement Background**

This Board Action is to approve the award of bench Contract Nos. PS61431000 through PS61431004, issued in support of the Office of Extraordinary Innovation for specialized financial advisory consulting support services for a term of five years, for a cumulative total amount not-to-exceed \$25 million. Board approval of these contract awards are subject to resolution of any properly submitted protest(s).

The Bench is intended to provide financial advisory consulting support services on an as-needed basis to support the potential use of Public-Private Partnerships (P3) and other alternative delivery models for a variety of transportation-related projects, including but not limited to highway and transit capital, transportation-ancillary facilities, and mobility technology. The Bench shall provide financial expertise and associated resources and deliverables necessary for successful project delivery through various types of P3 contracting structures, to assist Metro in identifying and

evaluating potentially viable projects, advancing these projects through feasibility analysis, pre-procurement and project development, procurement, and/or post-procurement, implementation, and administration project phases.

Request for Information and Qualifications (RFIQ) No. PS61431 was issued in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policy and the contract type will be on a firm fixed price task order basis.

Individual task order requests under the Bench Contracts will be issued to all qualified Contractors and will be competed and awarded based the specific scope of work. All task orders awarded will be in compliance with Small Business Enterprise (SBE) and Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) Program requirements.

A Pre-Proposal Conference was held on May 6, 2019, and was attended by 21 participants representing 18 firms. During the solicitation phase, 20 questions were asked and responses were released prior to the proposal due date.

One amendment was issued during the solicitation phase of this RFIQ:

- Amendment No. 1, issued on June 15, 2019, provided material disseminated at the Pre-Proposal Conference.

A total of 93 firms downloaded the RFIQ and were included in the planholders list. A total of ten proposals were received on June 3, 2019 from the following firms:

1. Arup Advisory, Inc (Arup)
2. Deloitte Transactions and Business Analysis **Analytix** LLP (Deloitte)
3. Ernst & Young Infrastructure Advisors, LLC (EYIA)
4. IMG Rebel Advisory, Inc. (IMG Rebel)
5. Infrastructure Advisors LLC
6. Jones Lang LaSalle America, Inc. (JLL)
7. Mercator Advisors LLC (Mercator)
8. Project Finance Advisory Limited (PFAL)
9. Public Financial Management Financial Advisors LLC (PFM Financial Advisors)
10. Sperry Capital Inc. (Sperry Capital)

## **B. Evaluation of Proposals**

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of staff from Metro's Office of Extraordinary Innovation and Finance & Budget was convened and conducted a comprehensive technical evaluation of the proposals received.

The proposals were evaluated based on the following evaluation criteria:

1. Overall Firm Experience 30%



- |   |     |
|---|-----|
| 2. Experience of Project Manager and Team Members | 35% |
| 3. Approach to Performance of Services            | 35% |

The evaluation criteria are appropriate and consistent with criteria developed for other, similar P3 professional services procurements.

During the week of June 24, 2019, the PET completed its independent evaluation of the ten proposals and determined that five were deemed within the competitive range. Of the five recommended firms, one is an SBE prime. The five firms within the competitive range are listed below in alphabetical order:

1. Arup
2. Deloitte
3. EYIA
4. PFM Financial Advisors
5. Sperry Capital

### **Qualifications Summary of Firms within the Competitive Range:**

#### **Arup**

Arup, was established in 1946 and is headquartered in London, United Kingdom, with additional offices and staff located in Los Angeles and worldwide. Arup is a multi-national professional services firm which provides engineering, design, planning, project management and consulting services for all aspects of the built environment. Arup has worked on several Metro projects and has performed satisfactorily.

#### **Deloitte**

Deloitte, was established in 1845 and is headquartered in London, United Kingdom, with additional offices and staff located in Los Angeles and worldwide. Deloitte is a multi-national professional services firm providing audit, tax, consulting, enterprise risk and financial advisory services. Deloitte has worked on several Metro projects and has performed satisfactorily.

#### **EYIA**

EYIA, founded in 1849 and headquartered in London, United Kingdom, is a multinational professional services firm that provides assurance (including financial audit), tax, consulting and advisory services. EY has worked on Metro projects and has performed satisfactorily.

#### **PFM Financial Advisors**

PFM Financial Advisors, founded in 1975 with offices in Los Angeles, California, provides independent financial advice as well as investment advisory, management,

and consulting services. The PFM Group has worked on Metro projects and has performed satisfactorily.

### **Sperry Capital**

Sperry Capital, founded in 1994 and headquartered in Sausalito, California, is an infrastructure and public finance advisory firm and is a Metro certified SBE. Sperry has worked on Metro projects and has performed satisfactorily.

## **C. Cost Analysis**

The RFIQ contained neither price nor a specific statement of work. Each future task order RFP will contain a specific statement of work which will be competed with the firms within the discipline. The Bench contractors will propose according to the requirements in the task order and a cost/price analysis will be performed, as appropriate, on task orders issued.

## **D. Background on Recommended Contractor**

All five firms listed above are recommended for award. These firms have been evaluated and are determined to be responsive and responsible to perform work on Metro assignments on an as-needed, task order basis.

**DEOD SUMMARY**

**PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP (P3) FINANCIAL ADVISORY SERVICES  
BENCH/PS61431000-PS61431004**

**A. Small Business Participation**

The Diversity and Economic Opportunity Department (DEOD) established a 9% Small Business Enterprise (SBE) and 3% Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) goal for this Task Order Contract. Five (5) firms were selected as prime consultants: Arup Advisory, Inc., Deloitte Transactions and Business Analysis **Analytics**, LLP, Ernst & Young Infrastructure Advisors, LLC, Public Financial Management Financial Advisors, LLC, and Sperry Capital, Inc., an SBE Prime. Each firm committed to the 9% SBE and 3% DVBE goals for this Task Order Contract.

In response to a specific Task Order request with a defined scope of work, the prime consultants will be required to identify SBE and DVBE subcontractor activity and actual dollar value commitments for that Task Order. Overall SBE and DVBE achievement in meeting the commitments will be determined based on cumulative SBE and DVBE participation of all Task Orders awarded.

<b>Small Business Goal</b>	<b>9% SBE 3% DVBE</b>	<b>Small Business Commitment</b>	<b>9% SBE 3% DVBE</b>
----------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------

**Prime: Arup Advisory, Inc.**

	<b>SBE Subcontractors</b>	<b>% Committed</b>
1.	BAE Urban Economics	TBD
2.	Madrid Consulting Group	TBD
3.	Morgner Construction Management	TBD
4.	SHA Analytics	TBD
	<b>Total SBE Commitment</b>	<b>9%</b>

	<b>DVBE Subcontractors</b>	<b>% Committed</b>
1.	OCMI	TBD
	<b>Total DVBE Commitment</b>	<b>3%</b>

**Prime: Deloitte Transactions and Business Analysis Analytics, LLP**

	<b>SBE Subcontractors</b>	<b>% Committed</b>
1.	SHA Analytics	TBD
	<b>Total SBE Commitment</b>	<b>9%</b>

	<b>DVBE Subcontractors</b>	<b>% Committed</b>
1.	Ross Infrastructure Development	TBD
	<b>Total DVBE Commitment</b>	<b>3%</b>



**Prime: Ernst & Young Infrastructure Advisors, LLC**

	<b>SBE Subcontractors</b>	<b>% Committed</b>
1.	Backstrom McCarly Berry & Co., LLC	TBD
2.	SHA Analytics	TBD
3.	System Metrics Group	TBD
	<b>Total SBE Commitment</b>	<b>9%</b>

	<b>DVBE Subcontractors</b>	<b>% Committed</b>
1.	Ross Infrastructure Development LLC	TBD
	<b>Total DVBE Commitment</b>	<b>3%</b>

**Prime: Public Financial Management Financial Advisors LLC**

	<b>SBE Subcontractors</b>	<b>% Committed</b>
1.	MARRS Services, Inc.	TBD
2.	Bright Bay Advisors, LLC	TBD
	<b>Total SBE Commitment</b>	<b>9%</b>

	<b>DVBE Subcontractors</b>	<b>% Committed</b>
1.	Academy Securities, Inc.	TBD
	<b>Total DVBE Commitment</b>	<b>3%</b>

**Prime: Sperry Capital, Inc.**

	<b>SBE Subcontractors</b>	<b>% Committed</b>
1.	Sperry Capital Inc. (SBE Prime)	TBD
	<b>Total SBE Commitment</b>	<b>9%</b>

	<b>DVBE Subcontractors</b>	<b>% Committed</b>
1.	Ross Infrastructure Development	TBD
	<b>Total DVBE Commitment</b>	<b>3%</b>

**B. Living Wage and Service Contract Worker Retention Policy Applicability**

The Living Wage and Service Contract Worker Retention Policy is not applicable to this contract.

**C. Prevailing Wage Applicability**

Prevailing wage is not applicable to this contract.

**D. Project Labor Agreement/Construction Careers Policy**

Project Labor Agreement/Construction Careers Policy is not applicable to this Contract. Project Labor Agreement/Construction Careers Policy is applicable only to construction contracts that have a construction contract value in excess of \$2.5 million.



## Board Report

File #: 2019-0462, File Type: Program

Agenda Number: 44.

**REVISED**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE**  
**SEPTEMBER 18, 2019**

**SUBJECT: MEASURE M MULTI-YEAR SUBREGIONAL PROGRAM - SOUTH BAY SUBREGION**

**ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS**

**RECOMMENDATION**

CONSIDER:

A. APPROVING:

1. Programming of ~~\$65,897,857~~ \$79,017,857 in Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) - Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 50);
2. Programming of \$2,950,000 in Measure M MSP - South Bay Highway Operational Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 63)
3. Programming of \$33,694,502 in Measure M MSP - Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 66); and

B. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or his designee to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements for approved projects.

**ISSUE**

Measure M MSPs are included in the Measure M Expenditure Plan. All MSP funds are limited to capital projects. Each subregion is required to develop a MSP five-year plan (Plan) and project list. Based on the amount provided in the Measure M Expenditure Plan, a total amount of \$217,975,355 was forecasted to be available for programming in Fiscal Year (FY) 2017-18 to FY 2022-23, to the South Bay Subregion (Subregion) in three Programs: 1) Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Program (expenditure line 50); 2) South Bay Highway Operational Improvements (expenditure line 63); and 3) Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Program (expenditure line 66). Board approval is necessary to program the funds to these projects and allow Metro to enter into Funding Agreements with the respective implementing agencies.

**DISCUSSION**

In June 2017, the Metro Board of Directors approved the adoption of the Measure M Master Guidelines (Guidelines) with two amendments and five approved motions. Subsequently, the Administrative Procedures for Measure M MSP was signed by the CEO on February 2, 2018.

The Subregion consists of 15 cities and adjacent unincorporated area of Los Angeles County. On May 24, 2018, a Funding Agreement was executed between Metro and the South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) for the Planning Activities (Plan development and updates) for the MSP. The SBCCOG led the Plan development process, which included working with the member agencies along with the public participation process. The SBCCOG Governing Board also adopted Subregional Qualitative Performance Measures including Mobility, Economic Vitality, Accessibility, Safety and Sustainability & Quality of Life, per the Administrative Procedures.

In the last several months, Metro staff worked closely with the SBCCOG and the implementing agencies on project eligibility reviews of the proposed projects. For those proposed projects that are to be programmed in FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21 (near term - first two programming years), Metro required, during staff review, a detailed project scope of work for eligibility and program nexus during the Plan development process, i.e. project location and limits, length, elements, phase(s), total expenses and funding requested, and schedule, etc. This level of detail will ensure timeliness of the execution of the Project Funding Agreements once the Metro Board approves the Plan. For those proposed projects that will have programming funds in FY 2021-22 and beyond, Metro accepted high level (but focused and relevant) project scope of work during the review process. Metro staff will work on the details with the Subregion and the implementing agencies on the details through a future annual update process. Those projects will receive conditional approval as part of this approval process. However, final approval of funds for those projects shall be contingent upon the implementing agency demonstrating the eligibility of each project as required in the Guidelines.

### Equity Platform

Consistent with Metro's Equity Platform, the MSP outreach effort recognizes and acknowledges the need to establish comprehensive, multiple forums to meaningfully engage the community to comment on the proposed projects under all Programs. The SBCCOG along with member agencies and adjacent unincorporated area of Los Angeles County undertook an extensive outreach effort and invited the general public to a series of public workshops and meetings. Metro will continue to work with the Subregion to seek opportunities to reach out to a broader constituency of stakeholders.

### **DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

Programming of Measure M MSP funds to the South Bay Subregion projects will not have any adverse safety impacts on Metro's employees or patrons.

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

In FY 2019-20, \$7.79 million is budgeted in Cost Center 0441 (subsidies budget - Planning) for the Active Transportation Program (Project #474401) and \$1.5 million is budgeted in Cost Center 0442 (Highway Subsidies) for the Transportation System Mobility Improvement Program (Project

---

#475502). Upon approval of this action, staff will use the approved FY 2019-20 budget to reallocate necessary funds to appropriate projects within Cost Centers 0441 and 0442. Since these are multi-year projects, Cost Centers 0441 and 0442 will be responsible for budgeting the cost in future years.

#### Impact to Budget

The sources of funds for these projects are Measure M Highway Construction 17%. These fund sources are not eligible for Metro bus and rail operating and capital expenditures.

#### **IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS**

Recommendation supports the following goals of the Metro Vision 2028 Strategic Plan:

Goal 1: Provide high-quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling by alleviating the current operational deficiencies and improving mobility along the projects.

Goal 4: Transform LA County through regional collaboration by partnering with the Council of Governments and the local jurisdictions to identify the needed improvements and take the lead in development and implementation of their projects.

#### **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The Board could elect not to approve the programming of funds for the Measure M MSP projects for the South Bay Subregion. This is not recommended as the proposed projects are in compliance with the Measure M Ordinance, Guidelines and the Administrative Procedures.

#### **NEXT STEPS**

Upon Board approval, respective implementing agencies will be notified, and Funding Agreements will be executed with those who have funds programmed in FY 2019-20. Staff will continue to work with the SBCCOG and the implementing agencies to identify and implement projects. Annual updates will be provided to the Board.


#### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A - Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Program (expenditure line 50)  
Attachment B - South Bay Highway Operational Improvements Program (expenditure line 63)  
Attachment C - Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Program (expenditure line 66)

Prepared by: Fanny Pan, DEO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3433  
Isidro Panuco, Senior Manager, Highway Programs, (213) 418-3208  
Shawn Atlow, Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3327  
Laurie Lombardi, SEO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3251

Reviewed by: James de la Loza, Chief Planning Officer, (213) 922-2920





Phillip A. Washington  
Chief Executive Officer

## South Bay Subregion

## Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Plan - Transportation System &amp; Mobility Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 50)

	Agency	Project ID No.	Project/Location	Funding Phases	FY2019-20	FY2020-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	Total Program
1	INGLEWOOD	MM5502.02	ITS (GAP) CLOSURE IMPROVEMENTS	CONSTRUCTION	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 7,500,000			\$ 13,500,000
2	INGLEWOOD	MM5502.03	INGLEWOOD INTERMODAL TRANSIT/PARK AND RIDE FACILITY **	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION	\$ 4,596,541	\$ 4,596,541			\$ 9,193,082
3	LA CITY	MM4601.01	SAN PEDRO PEDESTRAIN IMPROVEMENTS	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION	\$ 774,500	\$ 456,155	\$ 1,759,559	\$ 4,255,496	\$ 7,245,710
4	LA CITY	MM4601.02	WILMINGTON NEIGHBORHOOD STREET IMPROVEMENTS	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		175,035	187,538	2,638,027	3,000,600
5	LA CITY	MM4601.03	AVALON PROMENADE AND GATEWAY *	CONSTRUCTION				8,050,000	8,050,000
6	LA COUNTY	MM5502.04	182ND ST/ ALBERTONI ST. TRAFFIC SIGNAL SYNCH PROGRAM *	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION				4,228,500	4,228,500
7	LA COUNTY	MM5502.05 <del>7</del>	DEL AMO BLVD (EAST) TRAFFIC SIGNAL SYCH PROGRAM *	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION				1,324,500	1,324,500
8	LA COUNTY	MM5502.06	VAN NESS TRAFFIC SIGNAL SYCH PROGRAM *	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION				1,702,000	1,702,000
9	LA COUNTY	MM4601.04	WESTMONT/WEST ATJENS PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION	571,200	428,400	2,021,066	3,661,334	6,682,000
10	SBCCOG	MM5502.07 <del>5</del>	SOUTH BAY FIBER NETWORK	CONSTRUCTION	4,165,114	224,251			4,389,365
11	TORRANCE	MM4601.05	TORRANCE SCHOOLS SAFETY AND ACCESSIBILITY PROGRAM	PS&E CONSTRUCTION	51,600	2,406,500	1,839,200	730,500	5,027,800

ATTACHMENT A

	Agency	Project ID No.	Project/Location	Funding Phases	FY2019-20	FY2020-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	Total Program
12	ROLLING HILLS ESTATES	MM5502.08	PALOS VERDES DRIVE NORTH AT DAPPLEYGRAY SCHOOL	PAED, PS&E, ROW, CONSTRUCTION	51,300	63,000	1,440,000		1,554,300
13	<u>INGLEWOOD</u>	<u>MM5502.09</u>	<u>PRAIRIE AVE DYNAMIC LANE CONTROL SYSTEM **</u>	<u>PS&amp;E, CONSTRUCTION</u>	<u>6,560,000</u>	<u>6,560,000</u>			<u>13,120,000</u>
<b>TOTAL PROGRAMMING AMOUNT</b>					<b>\$ 22,770,255</b>	<b>\$ 22,409,882</b>	<b>\$ 7,247,363</b>	<b>\$ 26,590,357</b>	<b>\$ 79,017,857</b>

\* Conditional programming approval as only high level scope of work was developed and reviewed. Future annual update process will reconfirm the programming.

\*\* Final itemized project cost estimate shall be prepared by the City and submitted to Metro for review and approval prior to issuance of a Funding Agreement. Only those costs deemed eligible by Metro will be reimbursed.

South Bay Subregion

Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Plan - South Bay Highway Operational Improvements (Expenditure Line 63)

	Agency	Project ID No.	Project/Location	Funding Phases	FY2019-20	FY2020-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	Total Program
1	HAWTHORNE	MM5507.01	NORTH EAST HAWTHORNE MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT	PSE, ROW, CONSTRUCTION	400,000	800,000	950,000	800,000	2,950,000
<b>TOTAL PROGRAMMING AMOUNT</b>					<b>\$ 400,000</b>	<b>\$ 800,000</b>	<b>\$ 950,000</b>	<b>\$ 800,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,950,000</b>

## South Bay Subregion

## Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Plan - Transportation System &amp; Mobility Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 66)

	Agency	Project ID No.	Project/Location	Funding Phases	FY2019-20	FY2020-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	Total Program
1	BEACH CITIES HEALTH DISTRICT	MM4602.01	DIAMOND ST TO FLAGLER LANE BICYCLE LANE	CONSTRUCTION	1,833,877				1,833,877
2	EL SEGUNDO	MM4602.02	EL SEGUNDO BLVD	PAED, PSE, CONSTRUCTION		\$ 465,000	\$ 3,585,000		\$ 4,050,000
3	HAWTHORNE	MM4602.03	HAWTHORNE MONETA GARDEN MOBILITY IMPROVEMENTS	PSE, ROW, CONSTRUCTION	200,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 1,220,000	\$ 1,100,000	3,320,000
4	LA CITY	MM5508.01	FIVE SIGNAL MODIFICATION AND OPERATIONAL	PAED, PSE, CONSTRUCTION	230,000	240,000	90,000	2,240,000	2,800,000
5	LA CITY	MM4602.04	CROSSING UPGRADES AND PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS	PAED, PSE, CONSTRUCTION	185,531	466,594	1,308,770	1,299,730	3,260,625
6	LA CITY	MM5508.02	ATSAC COMMUNICATION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT IN SAN PEDRO	PSE, CONSTRUCTION	250,000	750,000	1,500,000		2,500,000
7	LA CITY	MM5508.03	ASTAC COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK INTEGRATION WITH LA COUNTY	PAED, PSE, CONSTRUCTION	40,000	160,000	400,000	1,400,000	2,000,000
8	LA COUNTY	MM4602.05	DOMINGUEZ CHANNEL GREENWAY	PAED, PSE, CONSTRUCTION		408,000	259,500	2,932,500	3,600,000
9	MANHATTAN BEACH	MM5508.04	ADVANCED TRAFFIC SIGNAL SYSTEM	PSE, CONSTRUCTION	1,100,000	2,540,000	1,800,000		5,440,000
10	REDONDO BEACH	MM5508.05	REDONDO BEACH TRANSITY CENTER AND PARK AND RIDE	CONSTRUCTION	4,000,000	500,000			4,500,000
11	TORRANCE	MM5508.06	TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	PSE, CONSTRUCTION	30,000	360,000			390,000
<b>TOTAL PROGRAMMING AMOUNT</b>					<b>\$ 7,869,408</b>	<b>\$ 6,689,594</b>	<b>\$ 10,163,270</b>	<b>\$ 8,972,230</b>	<b>\$ 33,694,502</b>