



# DRAFT MINUTES

*MTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)*  
February 5, 2003

## **1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

Renee Berlin (Chair) called the meeting to order at 9:30am. Randy Lamm (MTA) took roll and declared a quorum was present. Ms. Berlin announced that due to scheduling conflicts and the special Board meeting at 11:30 a.m. that item 7: State General Fund Deficit and Potential Impact on Transportation Funding for Los Angeles County was being taken out of order and that Item # 11 on the MTA Systemwide Parking Policy was being deferred to the March 5<sup>th</sup> TAC Meeting.

## **2. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes from the January 8<sup>th</sup> meeting were approved without amendments on a motion by Pat DeChellis (County of LA) and seconded by Mark Maloney (LTSS).

## **3. Agenda Reports by Standing Committees**

### **BOS (Brynn Kernaghan) *handout***

- Met on January 28<sup>th</sup>;
- Received updates on:
  - State and federal legislative items, and State Deficit impacts
  - Supplemental Southeast Bus Restructuring Study
  - ASI Paratransit Plan, and working group status
- Amended prior BOS action regarding using MTA as the designated recipient for Redondo Beach federal funds to prevent forfeiture of federal funds;
- Established a working group to review eligibility guidelines for various funding sources;
- Discussed UFS funding for ASI;
- Reviewed upcoming deadlines;
- Next meeting February 25<sup>th</sup>.

### **LTSS (Joyce Rooney)**

- Met on January 30<sup>th</sup>;
- Action items included:
  - Approval of the minutes
  - Election of 2003 officers -- Joyce Rooney, Chair and Scott Williams, Vice Chair, and nomination for Secretary, Arun Prem of Access Services Inc. (ASI) who is expected to be elected at the February meeting;
- Received reports on:
  - ASI
  - Regional ADA working group efforts
  - Supplemental Southeast Bus Restructuring Study
- Discussed the new TAC subcommittee protocol item and received a presentation on AQMD Rule 1192 regarding alternative fuel vehicles for transit operators;
- Next Meeting February 27<sup>th</sup>.

### **Streets and Freeway (Bill Winter)**

- Met on January 16<sup>th</sup>;
- Election of 2003 officers—Bill Winter, Chair and Haripal Vir, Vice Chair;
- Received a report on the I-710/Port Closure Truck Study, which was completed as a result of the Ports shut down from the labor dispute. Caltrans looked at the truck counts on the freeways, and the data showed a significant drop in truck traffic. The data will increase the understanding of the impact of the ports on traffic in the region;
- Received a report on the jurisdictions who have Surface Transportation Program-Local funds subject to lapsing, at their February 20<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Subcommittee will hear appeals;
- Next meeting February 20<sup>th</sup>.

### **TDM/Air Quality (Mark Yamarone)**

- Met on January 14<sup>th</sup>;
- Discussed the TAC Subcommittee protocol and had a report on the MTA 2003 Call;
- Had a demonstration of the Segway scooters;
- There were no action items;
- Next meeting March 11<sup>th</sup>.

### **4. Chairperson's Report (Renee Berlin)**

*Ms. Berlin provided an abbreviated report due to time constraints.*

- Reminded members to sign-in and have parking validated.

- There are two new TAC members -- Captain Bill Dance will be the primary member for the California Highway Patrol (CHP) and Joseph Loh from Gardena Municipal Bus will be a BOS alternate.
- Ed Schroder from the Gateway Cities has retired and the League of California Cities will be appointing a new alternate for the Gateway Cities TAC representative.
- Ms. Berlin requested that members email any roster changes to MTA staff.
- As a follow-up to a request from TAC at last month's meeting, a sign-up sheet for a Segway Scooter demonstration was distributed. Walt Davis (MTA San Gabriel Valley Area Team) will be coordinating a time and date for the demonstration.
- A question was asked by James Okazaki at the January TAC meeting regarding what shuttles MTA is operating? Ms. Berlin replied that the MTA has a bridge shuttle - Line 45, for the Broadway Metro Rapid line which takes people from 1<sup>st</sup> and Broadway to Huntington/Monterey Road.
- MTA initiated a Night Owl Stop program on January 19<sup>th</sup> which allows for passenger's to request stops at non-designated MTA Bus stops. This is part of MTA's Welfare to Work program and enhanced passenger safety to make non-designated stops to let passengers off closer to home. The service is offered on all MTA buses operating between the hours of 9 p.m. and 5 a.m.
- William Waters has been appointed the new MTA Inspector General.

## **5. TAC Subcommittee Protocol (Renee Berlin)**

In November 2001, the MTA Board adopted the following protocol for the TAC Subcommittees (BOS, LTSS, Streets and Freeways and TDM/Air Quality):

If TAC has taken a position on an item and has a representative present to represent the TAC position, then the Subcommittee representative can address the Board under one of two options:

- Subcommittee members addressing the MTA Board or other groups are to introduce themselves as an individual from their respective agency, not as a representative of their TAC Subcommittee, and present their respective agency's point of view;
- If the Subcommittee has taken a position different from TAC, then the individual can introduce themselves as a Subcommittee representative, must clearly explain the relationship of the Subcommittee to TAC, and explain TAC's position and why the Subcommittee's position differs;

Ms. Berlin stated that the existing protocol addresses instances where TAC has taken a position. However, there is no established protocol for when TAC has not taken a position on an issue. She stated that MTA staff is recommending the following procedures to allow TAC to take positions on items being discussed at the Subcommittee level. Further, she requested that each Subcommittee

discuss the proposal and take appropriate action if necessary. This will be agendized at a later TAC meeting once all the subcommittees have taken action.

## **New Procedures**

To enhance communication between TAC and its Subcommittees, the following is being recommended:

- Subcommittee agendas will be reformatted to be identical to the format used for TAC agendas;
- Subcommittee agenda cover pages will continue to be included in TAC agendas, with the disposition of items (action, discussion or information) clearly denoted. TAC members should review the agenda and inform the TAC Chair if there are items they would like to discuss or items upon which they would like TAC to take action;
- During TAC Subcommittee reports, Subcommittee Chairs will describe their agendas and the disposition of items. If TAC members have a concern with regard to Subcommittee actions, this will be the opportunity to discuss the item and, if appropriate, take action. If a time constraint exists and TAC is unable to make a decision on an item, the Subcommittee can take its position to the MTA Board following the adopted protocol.
- During their respective reports, Subcommittee Chairs should make every effort to inform the TAC of anticipated/planned agenda items for the next several months;
- Should a Subcommittee member submit comments to the MTA on a particular item, the TAC Chair should be copied so that the comments can be included in the TAC agenda;
- The Subcommittee Chair, in coordination with their MTA staff person, is responsible for ensuring that time sensitive items are appropriately scheduled to afford TAC members an opportunity to review the item(s) and take action, if desired.

## **6. Legislative Update (Marisa Yeager)**

Ms. Yeager (MTA Government Relations) reported that the current status of the FY 03 Appropriations is pending the out come of the FY 03 Omnibus bill. Representative Jerry Lewis has been appointed to the Transportation and Treasury Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. This is good news as a California member is now on the Appropriations subcommittee. Committee staff is waiting for passage of the FY 03 Omnibus bill before addressing the FY 04 appropriations, and that will probably not occur until March.

TEA 21 Reauthorization currently has individual deadlines and lead agencies for projects should complete the questionnaire from the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and submit

it to the member representing their projects. Congressman George Miller has asked for a February 12<sup>th</sup> deadline, Congressman David Drier has a February 21<sup>st</sup> deadline, and the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has a deadline of February 28<sup>th</sup>. Anyone needing the materials should contact Ms. Yeager.

Last week MTA staff met with the congressional delegation staff regarding Los Angeles County's transportation projects and needs. A SCAG trip to Washington D.C. to present a unified voice and message is scheduled for February 10<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> with all the CEO's and chairs of the SCAG region Transportation Commissions. The trip will provide an opportunity to convey to delegation staff what the transportation needs are for the SCAG region. As new information becomes available, it will be forwarded to TAC members. In FY 03, the highway dollars were \$28.5 billion and the President is proposing a six percent increase to \$30.2 billion. The amount for transit in FY 03 is \$7.2 billion and the recommendation is the same for FY 04. There was a recent release of the New Starts -- 3J Report and the President recommended a budget of \$1.5 billion for New Starts. Specifically, the Eastside Light Rail project is recommended for \$55 million in the FY 04 Presidential Budget. The Mobility-21 Coalition will be traveling to Washington D.C. April 6<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup>, and anyone interested in attending should contact MTA Government Relations staff or the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

## **7. State General Fund Deficit and Potential Impact on Transportation Funding for LA County (David Yale/Michael Turner)**

David Yale (MTA Regional Planning) provided an update on the State Budget crisis. Mr. Yale stated that he would like to gain input from TAC prior to his presentation at the Special MTA Board meeting being held later in the day. Mr. Yale stated that the purpose of the presentation is to update the Board on the State General Fund deficit and the impact on transportation funding for Los Angeles County. The Governor's mid-year and FY 04 budget proposals include \$1.7 billion in transportation cuts statewide. The budget cuts will affect the following funding programs: Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) -- projects, State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) -- primary source for the MTA's Call for Projects, TCRP subventions to Cities/COUNTIES for streets and roads, and the State Transit Assistance (STA) allocations to transit operators. Additionally, the Governor proposed combining the TCRP projects with the STIP. The combined program would be underfunded by \$1.5 billion and would be administered by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The California Senate and Assembly have not agreed with the Governor, and have deferred making decisions.

Page 2 of Mr. Yale's handout provides an analysis of the Statewide impact which shows that as much as \$9.4 billion is at risk through FY 09. In its first action, the Legislature looked at FY 03 only, and their first proposal to the Governor would protect \$90 million in TCRP street and road funds for the cities and the counties (line 2 of the table on page 2). The \$90 million was not passed to the Conference Committee by the two houses of the legislature, but the \$100 million in TCRP

project cuts for FY 03 was passed. The legislature will consider the \$1.5 billion in the Governor's proposed cuts for FY 04 during the upcoming budget process.

Michael Turner (MTA Government Relations) commented that the Governor indicated he will veto the Legislature's proposal to deal with the budget cuts and specifically the Legislature's proposals to link cuts to increases in Vehicle License Fees (VLF). If the Governor vetoes the Legislature's bill to address the cuts, there will be no implementation of budget cuts, so the Legislature will have to start over with a new proposal. At this point, the only impact on transportation funding for FY 03 is what the legislature will propose with respect to the Governor's proposal to cut the \$100 million in TCRP project commitments. Budget negotiations this spring will deal with whether the TCRP funds that were taken last year will be paid back, and if the counties and cities will lose their FY 04 TCRP funds. Mr. Yale commented that it will be very difficult for the legislature and the Governor to make the Governor's proposed cuts every year because Proposition 42 requires a two-thirds vote to suspend the transfer of the sales tax on gas from the State General Fund to the TCRP.

Mr. Yale explained that page 3 of his update shows that there would be an impact of \$2.3 billion to Los Angeles County if the cuts are made on a "pro-rata" basis. However, there is no requirement that the State make its cuts on a "pro-rata" basis. The pie chart on page 4 shows that there is \$6.5 billion committed in the MTA's Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for FY 03-FY 09, which includes projects from the Regional Transit Alternatives Analysis (RTAA), the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), Call for Projects and Grandfathered STIP projects prior to SB 45. It does not include: MTA's and Muni's Capital Formula funds and Formula Allocation Procedure (FAP) funds, city and county subventions, Caltrans SHOPP, city and county capital improvement programs (Attachment A in the Board report). This \$6.5 billion program of projects could face up to a 22% funding shortfall, which would result in project deferrals beyond FY 09. The Governor's first proposal, which has not yet been approved by the Legislature, is approximately 6% of the total regional program. With the potential 22% cut if TCRP funding is totally lost, about 78% of the total program remains.

The potential loss of TCRP funding requires an action plan. The action plan currently being proposed to the MTA Board for approval is to establish modal project working priorities and criteria for establishing priorities for existing projects, a STIP Amendment to avoid project delays for three major ready-to-go regional projects, evaluate the priorities for the remainder of the Regional Program (RTIP), and pursue legislative policy actions. Staff will need to determine which projects fall within the 78% of funding that is expected to remain available, and which projects will be deferred due to the 22% in funding cuts due to the elimination of TCRP funds. Mr. Yale reviewed the methodology for setting working priorities. The three criteria for transit projects are -- high priority transit projects that are ready to go; those with state funds as a match for significant federal funding which is already approved/earmarked; and projects essential to the bus and rail system, particularly to comply with the Consent Decree. Ms. Berlin commented that these are projects that are not funded through the Call. For Caltrans Highway Projects, the priorities are based on prior funding commitments, readiness, and mobility. The first priority for highway projects

are those that are fully funded and ready-to-go; The second priority is those fully-funded projects prioritized by mobility (2/3 weight) and readiness (1/3 weight). The last priority, are those projects that have partial or no funding. Mr. Okazaki (City of Los Angeles) asked what will happen to projects that are partially funded? Mr. Yale responded that MTA will try to keep the project on schedule by preserving funding for environmental, design and right-of-way, but deferring funding for construction.

The priorities for the past Call for Projects are based on three factors. The first priority is for projects in final audit, under construction, or under contract as of February 5, 2003. The second priority level is for projects in the design or right-of-way phase as of February 5, 2003. The third priority is for all other Call for Projects generally by year of funding and previous Board adopted ranking by mode. Projects ranked low and in the last year of the program will likely be deferred. Mr. Yale commented that MTA staff is encouraging Caltrans to maintain and add ITIP funding to projects for which MTA will have to defer its STIP Regional Improvement Program (RIP) contributions. Mark Bozigian (North LA County) asked how priority setting would apply to a STIP funded project like one he was working on in Lancaster, which has received a CTC allocation vote, and is about to have the construction contract awarded at the next City Council Meeting? Mr. Yale responded that such a project would fit in the first priority for past Call funded projects. If a project had an allocation that is supported by the State Highway Account (SHA), then the position Caltrans is taking is that those allocations should move forward. If the allocation is from the TCRP, then there is a question as to whether the State will honor the allocation. Mr. DeChellis (County of LA) asked what happens when a local project falls between the first and second priority categories, where construction bids have been received, but the sponsor is waiting for an allocation vote before awarding the contract? Mr. Yale responded that this illustrates why working priorities are needed - - so that rational decisions can be made about continuing to make funding available to ready-to go projects, that have a high Call for Projects application score, and to defer those projects that are not ready-to-go, and/or have lower scores. Projects that have low scores in the Call and are in the first year of funding might have to wait before funds are disbursed.

Mr. Yale discussed the STIP Amendment request which addresses three immediate issues: meeting Consent Decree related bus fleet improvement needs; protecting leveraged Federal funding for the Eastside Light Rail Transit Extension; and protecting the low bid and project schedule and avoiding increased costs due to project delays for the San Fernando Valley East-West BRT. MTA has received bids for the Consent Decree related bus acquisitions and without the STIP amendment, MTA can not proceed with awarding a contract. The FTA has pledged \$490 million in federal new start funds for the Eastside Light Rail project and without a STIP amendment the FTA will not execute a full funding Grant Agreement. The San Fernando Valley BRT project is experiencing one day of delay for every day that the STIP funding is withheld. Currently, this project is three weeks late and if it gets more than two months late the bids will expire on May 31, 2003. If that occurs, the bids will have to be renegotiated or re-bid. Page 10 of the update (Attachment B) summarizes the STIP Amendment request and shows the 13 projects that will have some or all of

their STIP funding transferred to the above three immediate Regional priority projects. Additionally, there are two projects that will have some of their CMAQ funding transferred.

Steve Finnegan (Auto Club) asked if the two Route 5 projects' schedules will be maintained from Caltrans perspective? Alberto Angelini (Caltrans) responded that the I-5 without the Right-of-Way component would eventually be delayed, because it would not be concurrent with design, but design work will proceed on schedule. Mr. Yale commented that the State Department of Finance has stated that if a project only has design funding and no construction funding in sight, then it does not make sense to work on those projects. Richard Burt (South Bay Cities) asked if the State budget situation would affect the 2003 Call for Projects? Ms. Berlin answered that sponsors should proceed with their applications until they hear otherwise. She continued by stating that even though there may not be sufficient funding for the 2003 Call, there should still be a prioritized list of projects which can be used to demonstrate to elected officials and the public what could be done with new revenues that may become available. Mr. Yale emphasized that it is still important for local jurisdictions to participate in the 2003 Call for Projects because if Los Angeles County is successful in protecting its transportation funding, then those projects could be delivered. Mr. Burt asked if the last year of the current -- 2001 Call is going to be deferred, then will those projects fall into the years that local jurisdictions are now doing applications for? Sponsors are concerned about spending time and funds to hire consultants needed to prepare the Call for Projects applications. Brad McAllester (MTA Countywide Planning) commented that the MTA Board discussed this issue at length and felt that it is important to send a message to Sacramento that Los Angeles County has transportation needs, and not let its transportation funds be diverted elsewhere. Mr. Burt requested that MTA staff relax some of the requirements for the Call applications. Mr. Okazaki commented that while some local jurisdictions may be waiting to decide whether they should submit applications for the 2003 Call, the City of Los Angeles is currently working to deliver a significant number of applications to MTA by the March 28<sup>th</sup> deadline. Mr. Bozigian reiterated that local jurisdictions make a significant investment in time and money to prepare Call Applications and MTA also spends a significant amount of staff time evaluating them. Mr. DeChellis responded that cities should take this opportunity to go ahead and submit Call applications, because Los Angeles County will be left behind should additional funds become available at a future date. Ms. Berlin responded that these issues have been discussed with the MTA Board. However, it was decided in December to move forward with the 2003 Call for Projects. Mr. Okazaki asked how the ATSAC projects on Attachment B would be funded. Mr. Yale answered that the ATSAC projects will no longer be funded through the STIP and the priority evaluation process will determine when replacement funding from a different source would be made available.

Brynn Kernaghan (BOS) handed out written comments from Long Beach Transit concerning the Priority methodology for Transit projects. Long Beach Transit recommended that bullet point #3 on Attachment A under Transit Projects should be the first bullet because maintaining the existing system should receive the top priority. Also, they would like the word "current" added to bullet point #3 in front of the word "bus". For the current bullet point #1, they recommended to change the word "construction" to "construction or implementation" since not everything related to bus

purchases is related to construction. Ms. Berlin responded that under the first bullet for Call for Projects, when a bus is purchased a contract is entered into and therefore it would be considered to be a first priority. Ms. Kernaghan said it is confusing which Priority methodology on Attachment A covers transit projects? Are they under past Call for Projects or the Transit category? Ms. Kernaghan said that since the Transit Category is unclear at this time, it would make sense to make maintenance of the current system the top priority. Ms. Berlin commented that the Transit Category covers those projects that are not part of the Call for Projects. Those transit projects funded through the Call would be part of the Call for Projects priority criteria. Further, the categories listed on Attachment A do not represent the order of importance for the three categories -- Transit, Highways and past Call for Projects. Mr. Finnegan said that he supported the proposed changes by Ms. Kernaghan.

Mr. Okazaki asked why the terms "state" funds and "federal" funds are not applied to the Highway Projects category under Attachment A in bullet # 2 just like bullet #2 under Transit Projects? Mr. Finnegan commented that this might be relevant to the I-710 projects which received the federal "Rogan" money. Ms. Berlin said that staff will take that under consideration. Mr. Bozigian commented that it is too late to change the Board report now, but instead TAC should be involved when MTA staff ultimately sets priorities for the projects and that Mr. Okazaki's comment can be addressed during the prioritization process. Mr. Okazaki said the comments that TAC is making should be addressed to the MTA Board. Mr. Turner asked Ms. Kernaghan to clarify the definition of maintenance of the existing system? Ms. Kernaghan replied that buying new replacement buses and new replacement bus stops are examples of capital projects which maintain the existing system. Ms. Kernaghan requested that TAC make a motion on her written recommendations and present the resulting motion to the MTA Board during Mr. Yale's presentation.

#### Motion

Ms. Kernaghan made a motion to make projects essential to the current bus and rail system, including complying with the Consent Decree, the highest priority for transit projects, and to ensure that highway and transit projects are treated equally in setting the guidelines for priority setting. Additionally, TAC is to be involved in the priority setting process.

Mr. Finnegan seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously, with one absence.

Mr. Finnegan (Auto Club) asked if a TAC member could be appointed to present the TAC motion to the MTA Board. Mr. Bozigian suggested Ms. Kernaghan and Mr. Okazaki and TAC approved the two representatives unanimously. Mr. Okazaki stated that he would not be able to attend the Board meeting and deferred to Ms. Kernaghan to represent the TAC.

Mr. Turner discussed the third action concerning the State Legislative program related to the State budget in Attachment C of the Board Report. Mr. Turner explained that the legislative program and Los Angeles County's advocacy efforts be guided by the principle that the MTA supports efforts by the State to balance the General Fund deficit without using transportation funding resources.

Proposition 42 allows the TCRP and Proposition 42 funds to be transferred during difficult economic times, but that the Legislature should consider the significant negative economic impacts in terms of job losses and transportation related disruptions to the economy due to project delays.

There are six principals suggested to guide the process for the Legislative program. The first is the long term and immediate preservation of transportation funds including TCRP and Proposition 42 funds. Ensuring the preservation of funds for Los Angeles County transportation projects as opposed to letting the State divert funds to other regions (i.e. Bay Area Seismic Bridge Retrofits) is the second priority. Maintaining the TCRP projects is a high priority because these projects were a high priority for Los Angeles County before the TCRP program was adopted. Mr. Finnegan made the comment that the TCRP projects were slightly different than the priorities set in Mobility-21. Mr. Turner agreed. Another principal is to seek additional revenue including a temporary or permanent increase in the State Gas tax, or authorization for specified local agencies to adopt user fees. MTC has authority for a regional gas tax, but each of their counties needs to vote implement a tax increase. MTA is looking at a similar model to apply in Los Angeles County that could replace the funds lost due to the diversion of Proposition 42 funds. The fifth principle is to support reduction of the vote threshold from 2/3 to 1/2 to pass a local sales tax related to transportation. There are two measures that would reduce the threshold -- ACA 7 (Dutra) is in the Assembly, and SCA 2 (Torlakson) in the Senate would also require that 25% of the funds be used for Smart Growth planning. The sixth principal would be support for legislative and administrative action to support the TCRP projects -- Garvee Bonds, sale of excess Caltrans land, etc. Mike Uyeno (City of Los Angeles) commented that some of the TCRP projects are not eligible to be funded with State Gas Tax funds. Mr. Turner replied yes and said that there are efforts to have some of the TCRP projects made eligible for funding through the gas tax, but currently there is no bill to change the eligibility for TCRP projects. Mr. Turner said that his understanding is that proposals to increase gas tax revenues would be used for both the TCRP projects and local jurisdictions streets and roads needs. Mr. DeChellis commented that the message that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) received was that TCRP projects were the top priorities for Los Angeles County.

## **8. 2003 Call for Projects (Heather Hills)**

*Discussed under Item 7.*

## **9. Short Range Transportation Plan (Brad McAllester)**

Mr. McAllester reported that the Short Range Transportation Plan (SRTP) Third Progress report had previously been transmitted to TAC members. The report incorporates completed modeling analysis on approved projects out to FY 09. The modeled projects performed very well with a resulting 15% increase in speed and in every subregion there were significant improvements over a no-build scenario with the expected one million in additional population.

The current budget crises changes the purpose of the SRTP from a tool to lobby for new additional revenues beyond the six year period, to maintaining State funding needed to complete the six year plan. A draft of the SRTP will be released for review in April and will be presented to the MTA Board in June for adoption.

## **10. MOBILITY-21: Summit Follow-up & Smart Growth Initiative (Warren Whiteaker)**

Mr. Whiteaker reported that on January 22<sup>nd</sup>, the first meeting of the Mobility-21 Coalition was held. The main focus of the meeting was to discuss the State General Fund deficit. The Coalition adopted two resolutions, one for Federal funding and the other on State funding. A copy of the State resolution was distributed to TAC members. On February 25<sup>th</sup> the Coalition will travel to Sacramento. On April 5<sup>th</sup> through 9<sup>th</sup>, the Coalition will travel to Washington, DC. The Smart Growth Initiative is a follow-up from the recommendations made at the MOBILITY-21-Transportation Summit last November that MTA should work with its partners to further explore opportunities to improve the land use/transportation connection. The first meeting of the MOBILITY Smart Growth Partnership Blue Ribbon Committee will be on February 21<sup>st</sup>. The meeting is by invitation only. Brynn Kernaghan asked for a copy of the Federal Resolution and Ms. Berlin stated that a copy would be emailed to all TAC members.

## **11. MTA Regional Transit Plan (Ed Clifford)**

Mr. Clifford (MTA Operations) reported that an Executive Summary of the Los Angeles County Regional Transit Plan was contained in the TAC agenda as Attachment 8. He said the five year Regional Transit plan reviews Los Angeles County's bus service and creates a common agenda for improvements to the regional system. The development of the plan started over a year ago and included the various local operators within the region. The plan development team functioned as a working team of the BOS. During the development process, key transit issues were identified either from the Long Range Plan or through interviews with stake holders -- the muni GM's.

The plan is organized around three key objectives. The first is improving service to the customer. Examples include improved customer information (1-800 commute, and regional signing), and future expansion of the Rapid Bus program to the Municipal Operators. The second objective was improved transit operator coordination. Examples include improving coordination of service change dates. The third objective is using resources wisely. Examples include identifying corridors where there is a lot of service duplication, and joint procurements on a larger scale among multiple operators. The plan was completed last November, and was adopted by the MTA Board in January. This will become the transit element of the Regional SRTP, and will serve as an agenda for future service coordination activities. A full copy of the report is available from Mr. Clifford. Joanna Capelle (SCRRA) requested that the next update should emphasize coordination with Metrolink

## **12. New Business**

Ms. Berlin said she will be emailing out the Mobility-21 Federal resolution to TAC members. Next month the MTA Parking Policy will be on the agenda.

### **13. Adjournment**

The February 5<sup>th</sup> TAC meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m. The next TAC meeting will be held on Wednesday March 5<sup>th</sup> in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Union Station Room starting at 9:30 a.m.