

# Agenda

Los Angeles County  
Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

Los Angeles County MTA Headquarters  
Mulholland Conference Room, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor  
1 Gateway Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Join the meeting: [Click here to join the meeting!](#) (Video, Audio, & Presentation)

Call in **by Phone** (audio only)  
United States: +1 (213) 279-1001  
Conference ID: 188 131 095#

1. Call to Order *1 min* Action (*Erik Zandvliet*)
2. Approval of Minutes *5 min* Action (*Subcommittee*)  
Attachment 1: February 16, 2023, Minutes  
Attachment 2: Attendance Sheet
3. Chair Report *5 min* Information (*Erik Zandvliet*)
4. Metro Report *5 min* Information (*Gary Byrne*)
5. Caltrans Report *5 min* Information (*Steve Novotny*)
6. Florence Avenue Bus Priority Lanes *15 min* Information (*Julia Brown and James Shahamiri*)
7. FY 24 Proposed Annual Budget *15 min* Information (*Giovanna Gogreve and Jason Gravitch*)
8. ATP & CTC Update *10 min* Information (*Shelly Quan*)



Los Angeles County  
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

**Metro**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 9. Shared Mobility Intelligent Transportation System<br>10 min | Information ( <i>Eva Pan Moon and Ed Alegre</i> )         |
| 10. Legislative Update<br>10 min                               | Information ( <i>Raffi Hamparian and Michael Turner</i> ) |
| 11. New Business<br>5 min                                      | All   |
| 12. General Public Comment<br>5 min                            |   |

*Public comment will be taken on each agenda item for a maximum of one minute per comment. Comments on the non-agenda items but within the subject matter jurisdiction of the SFS will be heard at the end of the agenda for a maximum of one minute per comment.*

13. Adjournment

The next meeting for the Streets and Freeways Subcommittee will be held tentatively on Thursday, May 18, 2023 at 9:30 a.m. Please contact Gary Byrne at [ByrneG@metro.net](mailto:ByrneG@metro.net) should you have any questions or comments regarding this or future agendas.

Agendas can be accessed online at: [Streets and Freeways Subcommittee](#).



Los Angeles County  
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

**Metro**

# Attachment 1

## Streets and Freeways Meeting Minutes



Los Angeles County  
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

**Metro**<sup>™</sup>

## LACMTA Streets and Freeways Subcommittee

Thursday, February 16, 2023 9:30am

### Meeting Minutes

**Participants:** Erik Zandvliet (South Bay Cities), Dale Benson (Caltrans), Candice Vander Hyde (North County Transportation Coalition), Ed Norris (Gateway Cities COG), Gary Byrne (Metro), Marco Arroyo (LADOT), Andrew Maximous (Culver City), Shelly Quan (Metro), Marianne Kim (AAA), Peter Merry (Metro), Masashi Tsujii (DPW), Robert Delgadillo (SGV COG), Paul Van Dyk (Long Beach), Adam Benders (California Highway Patrol), Julio Perucho (Metro), Isidro Panuco (Metro), Mercedes Menenes (Metro), Carlos Montez (Metro), Hank Fung (LA County), Annelle Albarran (Metro)

Agenda Item	Major Discussion Points
<b>1. Call to Order/ Roll Call</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Erik Zandvliet called the meeting to order at 9:38 a.m.</li></ul>
<b>2. Approval of Minutes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A motion to approve the minutes from November 2022 was made by Robert Delgadillo and seconded by Marco Arroyo. Minutes were approved as submitted.</li></ul>
<b>3. Chair Report</b> (Erik Zandvliet)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A survey was held in January regarding the subcommittees desire to hold meetings in person. An overwhelming majority of voting members are in favor of continuing meeting virtually. Further meetings will likely need a majority of voting members to be in-person from now on. A satellite location may be possible to make attendance easier for some members, but more information will come once TAC provides additional insight. Additional discussion of future meetings was held at the end of the meeting</li></ul>
<b>4. Metro Report</b> (Gary Byrne)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Highlights from the January 26 Board Meeting:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Status report was heard on End of Line Policy Evaluation and updates were made to the Customer Code of Conduct – details of both can be found in the Board Report</li></ul></li><li>Next Board Meeting is February 23 at 10 AM<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Biggest item of discussion is the transition away from fully virtual meetings on March 1</li></ul></li></ul>
<b>5. Caltrans Report</b> (Dale Benson)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>HSIP Cycle 11 CFP program release date is coming soon. Caltrans is hoping to release next week. As soon as letter is received, you can request allocation funds. Approximately 50% will be federalized (likely HR3 first).</li><li>Cycle 12 will be next April or May of 2024. They are due in September, and results anticipated next December</li></ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the August redistribution – it was recommended to submit RFA packages for federal funds this year before August so they can be obligated and in the queue before system shuts down. If you can't make it, they will work with you to have it ready in early October</li> <li>• Q/A: will there be a streamlined version for federalized HSIP funds? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, but they are not sure.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>6. ATP &amp; CTC Update (Shelly Quan)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CTC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• March 8 – Local Assistance Day Statewide training webinar</li> <li>• March 22-23 – CTC Meeting (At Union Station ticketing hall)</li> <li>• April 20 – Metro/Caltrans Project Delivery Workshop</li> <li>• Highway Bridge Program programmed for FFY 22-23</li> <li>• CPF/CDS earmarks application required</li> <li>• Caltrans Complete Streets Activities – supporting rollout of contactless payment software/hardware; also development of <u>optional</u> contextual design guidance for peds, bikes, and transit facilities on state highway system</li> <li>• Clean Cal Local Grant Prog. Cycle 2 is now open through April 28. \$100m available, max request \$5m</li> <li>• 3 Application Workshops Feb through April</li> </ul> </li> <li>• ATP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CTC adopted statewide awards on December 7, 2022 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ \$853.52 million awarded to 67 projects (1.149 billion total)</li> <li>○ 28.6% went to LA County; next step is getting programmed into FTIP</li> <li>○ Next step: program projects into FTIP</li> <li>○ Next stage of competition is MPO scoring</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Statewide competition awards programmed in FTIP - Feb/June 2023</li> <li>• SCAG adopts regional competition recommendations – April 6, 2023</li> <li>• CTC adopts regional competition awards – June 28/29, 2023</li> <li>• FY 24 ATP funds are available for allocation from July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024</li> <li>• State budget results in a net reduction of \$200 million from the approved 22/23 state budget</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>7. Westbound SR-91 Improvement Project (Carlos Montez)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This project is for the cities of Artesia and Cerritos. Metro is the funding partner and implementer of tech studies and design. Also facilitated through Gateway COG <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SR-91 and I-605 are important freeways, so their interchange has a major bottle neck with existing traffic and configuration</li> <li>• Major issue is the short distances between interchanges</li> <li>• There are numerous safety issues as a result of the congestion</li> <li>• Project goals are to address safety issues, ease congestion, and minimize ROW impacts</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community outreach for the project includes city coordination meetings and meetings with the communities of Artesia and Cerritos <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Community generally supports the project; wants minimal property acquisitions; concerned with noise and air quality; also want evaluation of carpool exits</li> </ul> </li> <li>• ATP, ITS, and safety improvements are a part of the plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Upgrading soundwalls, new wayfinding signs, and on/off ramp designs to limit impacts to non-motorized travel</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Plan focuses on avoiding displacement of residents and businesses</li> <li>• Funded by Measure R and SB1 TCEP</li> <li>• Milestones <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studied in 2013 – Hot Spots Feasibility Study for 91, 605, 405; led to 2014 focused study on this interchange</li> <li>• 2014: Project Initiation Study approved</li> <li>• 2018 DEIR circulated</li> <li>• FEIR approved January 2019</li> <li>• 2023: Design completed this spring</li> <li>• Construction begins in Fall 2024</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Q/A: are there any changes to the on and off ramp on any of the arterial streets? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be a change to Artesia and Norwalk ramp configurations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>8. Metro Complete Streets &amp; Highways Update</b> (Julio Perucho)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major Program Updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Modernizing the Highway Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Board expanded Measure R &amp; M Highway project eligibility to AT &amp; Complete Streets (June 2021)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ CEO Reorganization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Move from Program Management to Countywide Planning &amp; Development (September 2021)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Objectives for Multimodal Highway Investment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Adopted by the Board (June 2022)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• The VMT mitigation program was guided by the VMT working group and state/regional VMT policies, including Caltrans VMT documents</li> <li>• VMT Mitigation Program relates to SB743 and related policies. Define approach to quantify VMT impacts and how to mitigate them.</li> <li>• There are limitations to existing VMT quantification tools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ As a result, this project is identifying a preferred quantification approach to use</li> <li>○ Hoping to have that preferred approach by the next SFS meeting</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Aiming to balance the burdens and benefits of VMT reduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Those who already have low VMT should not have more VMT reduction than those who have significant VMT</li> <li>○ EFC's have lower home-based VMT per capita than non-EFC Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZ's)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• VMT Program Options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Internal Mitigation Program – mitigation actions are for metro projects only</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ VMT Mitigation Exchange – actions can be funded one-by-one, by external developers or project leads</li> <li>○ VMT Mitigation Bank – actions are pre-analyzed to associate a total cost of implementation with a total VMT reduced, producing a \$ per VMT reduced, that could be sold to external developers or project leads</li> <li>• Mitigation Action Selection Criteria: capital investments (less cost effective), operational investments, and program investments (very cost effective)</li> <li>• Timeline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Jun '23 - VMT mitigation quantification tool development</li> <li>○ Sep '23 - VMT mitigation program framework &amp; draft program</li> <li>○ Nov '23 - committee presentations</li> <li>○ Mar '24 - VMT Mitigation Program Adoption</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Q&amp;A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How else besides stakeholder meeting/outreach can cities contribute to the process? – Through COGS there will also be outreach/presentations as a forum for city input. Specific city requests to discuss/present can also be arranged later in the process. Primarily focused on the COGs though. Need framework by March 2024.</li> <li>○ How do you see this dovetailing with larger cities VMT programs? Focus at Metro is to focus on state highway system with its own specific guidance via Caltrans. However, if we have a mitigation bank or exchange, that might be available to local agencies and land use development projects.</li> <li>○ Does your analysis include any validation effort to verify the results or reflect what's happening in reality? Looking at a more programmatic level right now. Keep limits of existing models in mind and adjust methodology accordingly. SCAG model does a good job of calibrating and verifying itself. Also looking at an elasticity-based method to look at long term VMT effects. Balancing act between both approaches to come up with our own LA County methodology.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>9. Shared Mobility Intelligent Transportation System</b> (Eva Pan Moon)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cancelled due to schedule conflicts</li> </ul>
<p><b>10. Legislative Update</b> (Raffi Hamparian and Michael Turner)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cancelled due to schedule conflicts</li> </ul>
<p><b>11. Future Meeting Discussion</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gary Byrne presented the survey results, showing that most responders would like to maintain a virtual option <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ That said, it is likely that this subcommittee is subject to the Brown Act, so we would need a quorum in-person. TAC staff is waiting for clarifications on Brown Act requirements for TAC and the subcommittees and teleconferencing options.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other options: change meeting to an information format or reduce the frequency of meetings to quarterly.</li> <li>• Hank Fung: AB2449 rules require a specific reason and for the committee to “forgive”/”acknowledge” the reason for attending virtually. Since SFS is more of an information sharing/networking committee, quarterly might be better for that.</li> <li>• Marianne Kim: RSVPs might need to be confirmed a week out. If no quorum, can we proceed with only informational items?</li> <li>• Ed Norris: Not averse to quarterly meetings. He is also a member of TAC, along with other members of this subcommittee. TAC has a lot of this information as well so there’s some redundancy. TAC will still be held monthly so this information can be obtained there. Has been attending these meetings for the last 25 years. Can’t remember one instance where this subcommittee made a decision - this subcommittee has been primarily information sharing. If the general public comment item can be removed, then there’s even more justification that the Brown Act rules might not need to apply to the subcommittee.</li> <li>• Annelle Albarran: Had question regarding informational items only/quorum required. Doesn’t know if anything has changed or what legal council will say, but answer at the time TAC was asked was yes, its required.</li> <li>• TAC and subcommittees are subject to Brown Act. Might be difficult for Subcommittee to exempt from BA. TAC is state mandated and so are subcommittees.</li> <li>• Erik Zandvliet: The key is how to arrange meetings to ensure participation necessary for meeting to happen</li> </ul>
<b>12. New Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A comment was made that the SFS membership needs reviewing to ensure that all members are active <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Erik Zandvliet said that some slots are vacant. By next meeting, Erik will provide an update during Chair Report on that.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>13. General Public Comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No public comments were provided</li> </ul>
<b>14. Adjournment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Erik Zandvliet adjourned the meeting at 11:05 AM.</li> </ul>



## Attachment 2

### Streets and Freeways Sign-in/Attendance Sheet



Los Angeles County  
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

**Metro**<sup>™</sup>

