



Metropolitan  
Transportation  
Authority

One Gateway Plaza  
Los Angeles, CA  
90012-2952

**SUBJECT: ACTIONS TO ADDRESS STATE BUDGET IMPACT ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION FUNDING**

**ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- A. Adopt working priorities (Attachment A) indicating those projects that can be funded based on current fund estimates. For those Freeway and Call for Projects projects that are deferred, make them the first priority for the next available funding, i.e., federal reauthorization, 2004 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), etc.;
- B. Adopt the refined project priority setting criteria (Attachment B);
- C. Request MTA's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to hold a meeting to allow Call for Project sponsors an opportunity to comment on their project(s) prioritization;
- D. Approve the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Amendment request (Attachment C);
- E. Advance MTA's 17% commitment to the Alameda Corridor East (ACE) for Phase 1 and pursue existing Transportation Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) commitments through the legislative process;
- F. Direct the Chief Executive Officer to continue to develop ways to advance high priority, immediately "ready-to-go" projects using funds from both deobligated and "not ready-to-go" low priority projects.

**ISSUE**

At the February 5, 2003 Board of Directors' special meeting, staff presented the working priorities for Los Angeles County's multi-modal program of projects for approval. At this meeting, the Board requested that staff review the project working priorities, considering comments received on the priority setting criteria and to continue to work with the MTA's TAC and project sponsors.

MTA has also developed a STIP amendment request needed now to enable high priority highway projects to move forward. The STIP amendment would also

accommodate requests from local projects sponsors who will not be ready for state allocations in FY 04, to move their funding to future years.

The MTA has further refined the criteria and reviewed it along with the STIP amendment request with TAC at their April 9, 2003 meeting.

### **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

The refined working priorities and priority setting criteria shown in Attachments A and B, respectively, for Regional Transit, TCRP (Local and Non-Freeway), Freeway projects, Soundwalls, and the Call for Projects modal categories will provide guidance in deciding on near-term programming for allocations, obligations and expenditures of state, federal and local funds in Los Angeles County. The priorities and criteria will allow the MTA to be better prepared to respond to decisions as they are made in Sacramento to address the severely constrained funding environment and will provide project sponsors with an understanding of the status of their projects, given the existing financial environment.

The STIP Amendment shown in Attachment C defers four projects to later years as requested by the City and County of Los Angeles, respectively. Further, it provides the funding necessary to allow three high priority freeway projects to move forward using funds from two lower priority freeway projects; changes the funding source for the County's Core Rideshare program; and, programs the FY 04 State AB 3090 repayment.

### **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The priority setting criteria were reviewed considering the comments received from both the Board and MTA's TAC on February 5, 2003. Based on the comments received, the criteria were refined and used to re-examine the working priorities. The Board has the options of selecting other criteria, changing the weight of each of the criterion, and/or changing the working priorities. The Board could also decide not to adopt working priorities, not to advance the MTA's 17% contribution to Phase 1 of the ACE project, or not direct the CEO to continue to develop ways to advance high priority, immediately "ready-to-go" projects. These options are not recommended for the following reasons: (1) mobility and project readiness were key factors in establishing the criteria; (2) for the Call for Projects modal categories, previously Board approved project rankings were used; (3) in the current financially constrained environment, direction is needed to provide timely response to decisions as they are being made in Sacramento; and (4) with elements that are ready for implementation, the ACE project is a regionally significant goods movement project that will contribute to the economy of Southern California and the nation.

Regarding the STIP Amendment request, the Board could decide not to advance the high priority freeway projects or could select other projects to defer. Neither of these options is recommended, as the projects that are being deferred have a lower priority than those that are being moved forward. The resulting redistribution generally maintains the relative balance of freeway projects to other modal categories funded through the Call.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The FY 03 MTA Operating Budget includes money for locally funded (Propositions C 10% and 25%) and Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Call for Projects in Cost Center 0441, Project Numbers 410001 through 410010. The proposed FY 04 budget contains funding for those projects that will be continuing as well as those projects that will be coming “on-line”.

## **DISCUSSION**

Over the past several months, the Board has received reports on the State General Fund deficit’s impact on transportation projects in Los Angeles County. In response to these reports, the Board has adopted project priority setting criteria, approved a STIP Amendment to allow three high priority, regional projects to move forward and accepted an AB 3090 State Repayment schedule.

At the February 5, 2003 special meeting, the Board requested that the working project priorities be re-examined and the priority setting criteria be reviewed considering comments received from the Board and the adopted TAC motion. The TAC recommended that projects essential to the current bus and rail system, including complying with the Consent Decree be made the highest priority for transit projects, and that highway and transit projects be treated equally in setting the guidelines for priority setting. Further, TAC requested to be involved in the priority setting process.

As requested, the priorities and criteria have been reviewed. As indicated in Attachment B, the criteria for both transit and highway projects includes those projects having state or local funds that provide a significant match for federally approved or earmarked dollars and previous Board approved Calls for Project rankings. To the best of its ability, the MTA has maintained a balanced program of projects.

To assist in prioritizing, the several hundred non-Freeway Call for Project projects were grouped into six priority rankings. The priority categories are listed on Attachment B. At worst, based on information currently available, the MTA now anticipates that sufficient funds will be available for priorities 1 through 3 (under or ready to start construction through those that are in design or ready for a CTC design allocation by June 2003). Through the annual Call for Projects deobligation and assuming some additional funds through federal reauthorization, etc., projects in priority 4 may be able to move forward. Depending upon the amount of new funds that become available, there is a potential to move forward with those in priorities 5 and 6. Project sponsors whose projects are presently being deferred do not need to reapply for funding as they are in the queue.

It should be noted, however, that for those projects funded with Regional Improvement Program (RIP) funds, it is uncertain exactly what year the CTC will allocate the funding, which the MTA does not directly control. The CTC, which has adopted its own set of project priority rankings, allocates RIP funds. Those projects not meeting the criteria would be deferred by the CTC. It is recommended that all projects programmed for RIP funds in the STIP for FY 04 or prior be allowed to seek allocations or extensions so as to maximize potential state funds to Los Angeles County. It is important for project sponsors to meet the necessary deadlines, so that they may get

in the queue for funds. Therefore, MTA will sign all CTC allocation and extension requests for projects programmed with RIP funds in FY 04.

Similarly, MTA is recommending proceeding with all projects programmed with Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) funds, which includes many bicycle, pedestrian and urban enhancement projects. The State is not reducing the amount of TEA funds. This fund source can only be used for certain eligible projects.

For projects in priorities 4 through 6, except for federal TEA and state RIP funds as previously noted, the MTA may ask sponsors to delay initiating projects until more resources can be identified. Each year, the MTA will reassess how much funding will be available and allow projects in these rankings to begin as much work as the funding level can accommodate.

The Board previously committed to contributing 17% (up to a maximum of \$162 million) toward any fully funded segments of the ACE project. Due to the State budget situation, ACE's TCRP funds may be jeopardized. Due to the significant economic benefit derived from the project and the fact that it has "ready-to-go" segments, staff has determined that it is important to advance MTA's commitment to Phase 1 of the project (up to a maximum of \$74 million) and support ACE staff with their efforts to secure their existing TCRP commitments through the legislative process. Similarly, it is important for the CEO to continue to develop ways to advance other high priority, immediately "ready-to-go" projects.

### **NEXT STEPS**

The MTA will continue to work with the TAC and the CTC to ensure that Los Angeles County's priorities are known and to maximize Los Angeles County's share of state funds. The annual Call for Projects Deobligation/Recertification process will be initiated for Board action. As part of this process, MTA will evaluate the status of each project and recommend deobligating those that are not moving forward per the Board's previously adopted Call for Projects Lapsing policy. The TAC will be consulted prior to returning to the Board in June/July 2003. Further, in cooperation with the TAC, project sponsors will be provided an opportunity to provide comments on their specific project(s) ranking in May/June 2003. Based upon data received and with input from TAC, the MTA will make appropriate changes to the project rankings.

The MTA will transmit letters to those project sponsors where funds cannot be guaranteed to be available at this time. This would include sponsors who have signed Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) who have not yet started work on their projects; sponsors who have signed Letters of Agreement (LOA) for CMAQ or RSTP funds who have not yet had their funds obligated (priority 4); and, those who have not executed their agreements (priorities 5 and 6). The letters will advise project sponsors that they may not want to start work until the MTA can assure that funds are available.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

- A. Working Priorities
- B. Refined Priority Setting Criteria

### C. STIP Amendment

Prepared by: Carol Inge, Deputy Executive Officer, Transportation Development and Implementation  
Renee Berlin, Director-South Bay Area Planning Team  
David Yale, Director-Regional Programming



---

James L. de la Loza  
Executive Officer, Countywide Planning and Development



---

Roger Snoble  
Chief Executive Officer

## LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

## Funding Priority Worksheet - Draft 4/10/03

(\$ in Thousands)

Priority	Agency	Project	Total Project Cost	Total Allocation, Obligation, and Expenditure	Total Not Yet Alloc., Oblig., and or Exp. (Not Including TCRP)	Unallocated State TCRP	Programming Shortfall
<b>Regional Transit Projects</b>							
1	MTA	Eastside Light Rail Transit	\$ 912,700	\$ 50,200	\$ 862,500	\$ -	\$ -
2	MTA	San Fernando Valley Busway/Bikeway	337,582	47,556	290,026	0	0
3	MTA	Rail Cars	91,300	-	91,300	0	0
4	MTA	Metro Rapid Expansion	92,300	-	92,300	0	0
5	MTA	Wilshire Bus Rapid Transit	163,500	6,300	-	157,200	0
6	MTA	Bus Fleet (200 Artic Buses)	27,832	-	27,832	0	0
7	MTA	Exposition LRT Preliminary Engineering - Phase I( Exposition Phase II \$13 million, see #12 below)	11,000	11,000	-	0	0
8	MTA	Crenshaw Rapid Bus/BRT Corridor Incremental Enhancements	10,000	-	-	0	10,000
9	SCRRA	Metrolink Capital Expansion program	45,946	3,615	31,700	0	10,631
10	MTA	San Fernando Valley North/South BRT Phase 1(Two initial Corridors)	20,000	2,000	-	18,000	
11	MTA	Other Transit Corridor Needs (Facilities/Gold Line Extension P.E.)	10,000	-	-		10,000
		<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>1,722,160</b>	<b>120,671</b>	<b>1,395,658</b>	<b>175,200</b>	<b>30,631</b>
12	MTA	Exposition LRT Preliminary Engineering - Phase II *	13,000	-	-	13,000	0
13	MTA	Exposition LRT Construction	632,000	-	-	68,500	563,500
14	MTA	Bus Fleet (Bus Improvement Plan)	122,168	-	-	122,168	0
15	MTA	San Fernando Valley North/South BRT Phase 11	80,000	-	-	80,000	0
		<b>Total Regional Transit Projects</b>	<b>2,569,328</b>	<b>120,671</b>	<b>1,395,658</b>	<b>458,868</b>	<b>594,131</b>
		* Beginning of Phase II Preliminary Engineering will be tied to the Construction start date.					
		Highlighted projects are recommended for deferral, if additional funds can't be secured and the first priority for the next available funding					

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**Funding Priority Worksheet - Draft 4/10/03**

(\$ in Thousands)

Priority	Agency	Project	Total Project Cost	Total Allocation, Obligation, and Expenditure	Total Not Yet Alloc., Oblig., and or Exp. (Not Including TCRP)	Unallocated State TCRP	Programming Shortfall
<b>TCRP Projects (Local &amp; Non-Freeway Projects)</b>							
1	COUNTYWIDE	TCRP Projects fully allocated	70,700	70,700	-	0	0
2	SGVCOG	Alameda Corridor East - Phase I (17% Match)	74,000	30,000	44,000	0	0
		<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>144,700</b>	<b>100,700</b>	<b>44,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
3	SGVCOG	Alameda Corridor East - Phase I (TCRP)	150,000	61,573	-	88,427	0
4	SOUTH PASADENA	Pasadena Gold Line - Utility Relocation - South Pasadena	550	-	-	550	0
5	SOUTH PASADENA	Pasadena Gold Line - Mixed Use Dev - South Pasadena	1,500	808	-	692	0
6	SGVCOG	Alameda Corridor East - Phase II (17% Match)	81,000	-	-	0	81,000
7	<b>Other Local &amp; Non-Freeway Projects:</b>						
	PORT OF LONG BEACH	Construction Interchange in Long Beach at Ocean Blvd. Overpass	18,400	15,674	-	2,726	0
	CALTRANS	Triple Track Intercity Rail Line within Los Angeles County add run through tracks through Union Station	100,000	12,389	-	87,611	0
	LA CITY	Hollywood Intermodal Transportation Center Facility	10,000	350	-	9,650	0
	LA CITY	Olympic & Lemon St. Traffic signal	2,000	1,405	-	595	0
	CALTRANS	Rte 1 at Rte 107. Reconst Intersection at SR - 107	2,000	700	-	1,300	0
		<b>Total - TCRP Projects (Local &amp; Non-Freeway)</b>	<b>510,150</b>	<b>193,599</b>	<b>44,000</b>	<b>191,551</b>	<b>81,000</b>
Highlighted projects are recommended for deferral, if additional funds can't be secured and the first priority for the next available funding							



**LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**Funding Priority Worksheet - Draft 4/10/03**

(\$ in Thousands)

Priority	Agency	Project	Total Project Cost	Total Allocation, Obligation, and Expenditure	Total Not Yet Alloc., Oblig., and or Exp. (Not Including TCRP)	Unallocated State TCRP	Programming Shortfall
<b>Call for Projects - Freeway Category - Previously Fully Programmed</b>							
1	CALTRANS	Freeway Projects In Audit, Under Construction or Contract Awarded by 2/5/03	816,662	603,122	213,541	0	0
2	CALTRANS	US-101 Fwy and Ramp Realignment at Center St	24,256	-	24,256	0	0
3	CALTRANS	I-405 (SB) HOV Waterford St. to I-10	59,462	-	34,462	25,000	0
4	CALTRANS	I-405 HOV SR-90 to I-10	148,353	-	143,711	0	4,642
5	CALTRANS	I-5 HOV SR-118 to SR-14	45,674	2,749	5,499	37,426	0
6	CALTRANS	N/B I-405/US-101 Connector Gap Closure	38,911	8,200	17,911	12,800	0
7	CALTRANS	Rt. 60 I-605 to Brea Canyon Road	72,250	-	72,250	0	0
8	CALTRANS	I-405 HOV (NB) Greenleaf to Burbank	6,237	-	6,237	0	0
9	CALTRANS	I-5 HOV SR-170 to SR-118	150,873	14,098	136,775	0	0
10	CALTRANS	I-5 SR134 to SR170 (Including Empire Access Impr.) Design Only	46,148	6,197	39,951	0	0
11	CALTRANS	I-10 HOV I-605 to Puente Ave.	115,745	12,100	965	77,900	24,780
12A	CALTRANS	I-5 Carmenita Interchange Improvement - Design & ROW Only	56,252	15,380	7,412	33,460	0
13	CALTRANS	I-5 Valley View Interchange Improvement (Part of I-5 605 to OCL)	0	-	-	0	0
14A	CALTRANS	I-5 I-605 (Rosemead) to OCL - Design Only	42,570	6,000	31,574	4,996	0
15A	CALTRANS	I-14 HOV Pearblossom to P-8 - Design Only	1,947	-	1,947	0	0
16	CALTRANS	I-710 Fwy Imp PCH - Downtown Long Beach	6,599	-	6,599	0	0
17A	CALTRANS	I-5/SR-14 HOV Direct Connector (N to/from S) - Design Only	6,738	-	6,738	0	0
		<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>1,638,677</b>	<b>667,846</b>	<b>749,828</b>	<b>191,582</b>	<b>29,422</b>
<b>CONSTRUCTION PHASE</b>							
12B	CALTRANS	I-5 Carmenita Interchange Improvement	37,250	-	-	37,250	0
14B	CALTRANS	I-5 I-605 (Rosemead) to OCL	335,221	-	55,690	98,004	181,527
15B	CALTRANS	I-14 HOV Pearblossom to P-8	38,887	-	38,887	0	0
17B	CALTRANS	I-5/SR-14 HOV Direct Connector (N to/from S)	74,166	-	74,166	0	0
		<b>Total Freeway Projects - Fully Funded</b>	<b>2,124,201</b>	<b>667,846</b>	<b>918,571</b>	<b>326,836</b>	<b>210,949</b>
Highlighted projects are recommended for deferral, if additional funds can't be secured and the first priority for the next available funding							

## LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

## Funding Priority Worksheet - Draft 4/10/03

(\$ in Thousands)

Priority	Agency	Project	Total Project Cost	Total Allocation, Obligation, and Expenditure	Total Not Yet Alloc., Oblig., and or Exp. (Not Including TCRP)	Unallocated State TCRP	Programming Shortfall
<b>Call for Projects - Freeway Category - (Not Previously Fully Funded)</b>							
18	CALTRANS	I-5 SR134 to SR170 (Including Empire Access Impr.) Construction	243,631	15,490	4,361	0	223,780
19	CALTRANS	I-405 HOV I-10 to I-101 Northbound	600,000	15,000	-	75,000	510,000
20	CALTRANS	I-10 HOV Puente Ave to Citrus Ave	106,580	-	2,155	0	104,425
21	CALTRANS	I-5 605 to I-710	1,000,000	-	-	16,000	984,000
22	CALTRANS	I-10 HOV Citrus Ave to SR-57	116,413	-	1,720	0	114,693
23	CALTRANS	I-405 (SB) / US-101 (NB&SB) Connector	115,978	-	2,844	0	113,134
24	CALTRANS	Route 71 Widening/HOV from I-10 to Mission Blvd.	181,542	12,000	1,592	18,200	149,750
		<b>Total Freeway Projects - Partially Funded</b>	<b>2,364,144</b>	<b>42,490</b>	<b>12,672</b>	<b>109,200</b>	<b>2,199,782</b>
		<b>Total Highway Projects</b>	<b>4,488,345</b>	<b>710,336</b>	<b>931,243</b>	<b>436,036</b>	<b>2,410,731</b>
<b>Soundwalls - Project Readiness and Board Adopted</b>							
1	COUNTYWIDE	Soundwalls - P. E Companion, Demonstration and Related Projects <b>(1)</b>	20,890	-	20,890	0	0
2	COUNTYWIDE	Soundwalls - Phase I, Priority I Design	11,460	-	11,460	0	0
3	COUNTYWIDE	Soundwalls - Phase I, Priority 1 Construction (Partial)	29,250	-	29,250	0	0
		<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>61,600</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>61,600</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
4	COUNTYWIDE	Soundwalls - Phase I, Priority 1 Construction (Partial)	62,750	-	26,400	0	36,350
5	COUNTYWIDE	Soundwalls - Phase 1, Priority 2, Design & Construction Cost Estimate	168,000	-	-	0	168,000
		<b>Total - Soundwall Projects</b>	<b>292,350</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>88,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>204,350</b>
<b>(1)</b> P. E. Contract currently underway, Board approved companion wall projects, the I-134 Design Build Demo project, and recent Board approvals of 3 Caltrans walls to accommodate future HOV Lanes.							
Highlighted projects are recommended for deferral, if additional funds can't be secured and the first priority for the next available funding							

## LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

## Funding Priority Worksheet - Draft 4/10/03

(\$ in Thousands)

Priority	Agency	Project	Total Project Cost	Total Allocation, Obligation, and Expenditure	Total Not Yet Alloc., Oblig., and or Exp. (Not Including TCRP)	Unallocated State TCRP	Programming Shortfall
<b>Regional Surface Transportation Improvements Call Projects</b>							
1	COUNTYWIDE	Project in Audit, Construction or Contract Awarded, Bids In 2/05/03	121,817	103,662	18,155	0	0
2	COUNTYWIDE	Designed, R/W Completed; Ready to List or Ready for CTC Construction Allocation	83,258	22,908	60,350	0	0
3B	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with RIP funds programmed in FY 04, not previously ranked higher	21,690	194	21,496		
3	COUNTYWIDE	Projects in PE, Final Design or Ready for CTC Design allocation & or Match for Approved Federal Earmark	292,487	3,549	278,001	0	10,937
4	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with executed LOA/MOU, in environment clearance, no activities or RSTP/CMAQ funds not Obligated as of 4-24-03	34,035	200	33,835	0	0
5	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with MOU/LOA in final review but not yet executed	424	-	424	0	0
6	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with no executed MOU/LOA/LNP	67,863	284	67,579	0	0
<b>Sub Total - RSTI</b>			<b>621,574</b>	<b>130,797</b>	<b>479,840</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10,937</b>
<b>Transit Capital Call Projects</b>							
1	COUNTYWIDE	Project in Audit, Construction or Contract Awarded, Bids In 2/05/03	39,335	14,206	25,129	0	0
2	COUNTYWIDE	Designed, R/W Completed; Ready to List or Ready for CTC Construction Allocation	16,167	4,571	11,596	0	0
3A	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with TEA funds in mode other than Transportation Enhancement Activity Category	4,965	-	4,965	0	0
3	COUNTYWIDE	Projects in PE, Final Design or Ready for CTC Design allocation & or Match for Approved Federal Earmark	20,034	4,640	15,394	0	0
4	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with executed LOA/MOU, in environment clearance, no activities or RSTP/CMAQ funds not Obligated as of 4-24-03	3,221	-	3,221	0	0
5	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with LOA/MOU in final review but not yet executed	7,209	-	7,209	0	0
6	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with no executed MOU/LOA/LNP	17,964	-	17,964	0	0
<b>Sub Total - Transit Capital</b>			<b>108,895</b>	<b>23,418</b>	<b>85,477</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Highlighted projects are recommended for deferral, if additional funds can't be secured and the first priority for the next available funding							
*	City of Pomona Route 71/Mission Blvd construction funds						

## LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

## Funding Priority Worksheet - Draft 4/10/03

(\$ in Thousands)

Priority	Agency	Project	Total Project Cost	Total Allocation, Obligation, and Expenditure	Total Not Yet Alloc., Oblig., and or Exp. (Not Including TCRP)	Unallocated State TCRP	Programming Shortfall	
<b>Transportation Enhancements Call Projects</b>								
1	COUNTYWIDE	Project in Audit, Construction or Contract Awarded, Bids In 2/05/03	2,653	1,811	842	0	0	
2	COUNTYWIDE	Designed, R/W Completed; Ready to List or Ready for CTC Construction Allocation	886	565	321	0	0	
3	COUNTYWIDE	Projects in PE, Final Design or Ready for CTC Design allocation & or Match for Approved Federal Earmark	4,043	1,507	2,536	0	0	
4	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with executed MOU/LOA but with No activities	7,604	87	7,517	0	0	
5	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with LOA/MOU in final review but not yet executed	1,892	-	1,892	0	0	
6	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with no executed MOU/LOA/LNP	3,622	-	3,622	0	0	
		<b>Sub Total - Transportation Enhan.</b>	<b>20,700</b>	<b>3,970</b>	<b>16,730</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Signal Synchronization &amp; Bus Speed Improvements Call Projects</b>								
1	COUNTYWIDE	Project in Audit, Construction or Contract Awarded, Bids In 2/05/03	163,784	61,075	102,708	0	0	
2	COUNTYWIDE	Designed, R/W Completed; Ready to List or Ready for CTC Construction Allocation	6,753	3,057	3,696	0	0	
3	COUNTYWIDE	Projects in PE, Final Design or Ready for CTC Design allocation & or Match for Approved Federal Earmark	87,701	7,473	80,228	0	0	
4	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with executed LOA/MOU, in environment clearance, no activities or RSTP/CMAQ funds not Obligated as of 4-24-03	13,080	-	13,080	0	0	
5	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with LOA/MOU in final review but not yet executed	10,837	-	10,837	0	0	
6	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with no executed MOU/LOA/LNP	84,745	-	25,484	0	59,261	
		<b>Sub Total - Signal Sync</b>	<b>366,900</b>	<b>71,605</b>	<b>236,034</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>59,261</b>	
		Highlighted projects are recommended for deferral, if additional funds can't be secured and the first priority for the next available funding						

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**Funding Priority Worksheet - Draft 4/10/03**

(\$ in Thousands)

Priority	Agency	Project	Total Project Cost	Total Allocation, Obligation, and Expenditure	Total Not Yet Alloc., Oblig., and or Exp. (Not Including TCRP)	Unallocated State TCRP	Programming Shortfall
<b>Bikeway &amp; Pedestrian Improvements Call Projects *</b>					-		
1	COUNTYWIDE	Project in Audit, Construction or Contract Awarded, Bids In 2/05/03	21,587	9,840	11,747	0	0
2	COUNTYWIDE	Designed, R/W Completed; Ready to List or Ready for CTC Construction Allocation	5,441	827	4,614	0	0
3A	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with TEA funds in mode other than Transportation Enhancement Activity Category	25,901	40	25,861	0	0
3B	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with RIP funds programmed in FY 04, not previously ranked higher	1,101	-	1,101		
3	COUNTYWIDE	Projects in PE, Final Design or Ready for CTC Design allocation & or Match for Approved Federal Earmark	36,076	4,890	31,186	0	0
4	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with executed LOA/MOU, in environment clearance, no activities or RSTP/CMAQ funds not Obligated as of 4-24-03	931	-	931	0	0
5	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with LOA/MOU in final review but not yet executed	0	-	-	0	0
6	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with no executed MOU/LOA/LNP	2,728	-	2,728	0	0
<b>Sub Total - Bike &amp; Ped Impr.</b>			<b>93,765</b>	<b>15,597</b>	<b>78,168</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Transportation Demand Management Call Projects</b>					-		
1	COUNTYWIDE	Project in Audit, Construction or Contract Awarded, Bids In 2/05/03	99,991	55,237	44,754	0	0
2	COUNTYWIDE	Designed, R/W Completed; Ready to List or Ready for CTC Construction Allocation	1,112	99	1,013	0	0
3A	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with TEA funds in mode other than Transportation Enhancement Activity Category	1,395	-	1,395	0	0
3	COUNTYWIDE	Projects in PE, Final Design or Ready for CTC Design allocation & or Match for Approved Federal Earmark	6,897	4,328	2,569	0	0
4	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with executed LOA/MOU, in environment clearance, no activities or RSTP/CMAQ funds not Obligated as of 4-24-03	0	-	-	0	0
5	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with LOA/MOU in final review but not yet executed	1,328	-	1,328	0	0
6	COUNTYWIDE	Projects with no executed MOU/LOA/LNP	700	-	700	0	0
<b>Sub Total - TDM</b>			<b>111,423</b>	<b>59,664</b>	<b>51,759</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>9,183,430</b>	<b>1,329,656</b>	<b>3,406,909</b>	<b>1,086,455</b>	<b>3,360,410</b>
* Bikeway and Pedestrian Improvements previously funded with Local Transportation Funds or TEA will move forward							
Highlighted projects are recommended for deferral, if additional funds can't be secured and the first priority for the next available funding							

## LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

## Funding Priority Worksheet - Draft 4/10/03

(\$ in Thousands)

Priority	Agency	Project	Total Project Cost	Total Allocation, Obligation, and Expenditure	Total Not Yet Alloc., Oblig., and or Exp. (Not Including TCRP)	Unallocated State TCRP	Programming Shortfall
<b>CALL FOR PROJECTS SUMMARY</b>							
<b>Priority</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF CALL BY PRIORITY</b>						
<b>1</b>	Project in Audit, Const. or Contract Awarded, Bids In 2/05/03		1,265,829	848,954	416,875	0	0
<b>2</b>	Designed, R/W Completed; Ready to List or Ready for CTC Construction Allocation		113,617	32,027	81,590	0	0
<b>3A</b>	Projects with TEA funds in mode other than Transportation Enhancement Activity Category		32,261	40	32,221	0	0
<b>3B</b>	Projects with RIP funds programmed in FY 04, not previously ranked higher		22,791	194	26,581	0	0
<b>3</b>	Projects in PE, Final Design or Ready for CTC Design allocation & or Match for Approved Federal Earmark <b>(1)</b>		447,238	26,386	409,915	0	10,937
<b>4</b>	Projects with executed LOA/MOU, in environment clearance, no activities or RSTP/CMAQ funds not Obligated as of 4-24-03		58,871	287	58,584	0	0
<b>5</b>	Projects with LOA/MOU in final review but not yet executed		21,690	-	21,690	0	0
<b>6</b>	Projects with no executed MOU/LOA/LNP <b>(1)</b>		177,622	284	118,077	0	59,261
			2,139,919	908,172	1,165,532	0	70,198
<b>Priority 1, 2, 3a, 3b &amp; 3 by Mode</b>							
	Regional Surface Transp. Improvement		519,252	130,313	378,002	-	10,937
	Transit Capital Call Projects		80,501	23,418	57,083	-	-
	Transportation Enhancements Call Projects		20,700	3,970	16,730	-	-
	Signal Syn. & Bus Speed Improvements		258,238	71,605	186,633	-	-
	Bikeway & Pedestrian Improvements		90,106	15,597	74,509	-	-
	Transportation Demand Management		109,395	59,664	49,731	-	-
	<i>Sub Total Priority 1, 2, 3a, 3b &amp; 3</i>		1,078,192	304,567	762,688	-	10,937
<b>Priority 4, 5 &amp; 6 by Mode</b>							
	Regional Surface Transp. Improvement		102,322	484	101,838	-	-
	Transit Capital Call Projects		28,394	-	28,394	-	-
	Signal Syn. & Bus Speed Improvements		108,662	-	49,401	-	59,261
	Bikeway & Pedestrian Improvements		3,659	-	3,659	-	-
	Transportation Demand Management		2,028	-	2,028	-	-
	<i>Sub Total Priority 4, 5 &amp; 6</i>		245,065	484	185,320	-	59,261
<b>OVERALL SUMMARY OF FUNDING</b>							
	Total Projects Cost			9,183,430			
	<b>Less:</b> Program Shortfall & TCRP			(4,446,865)			
	Oblig., Alloc. and Expen. in Highlighted Area			(136,555)			
				4,600,010			
	Regional Transit Projects		1,722,160				
	TCRP Projects (Local & Non-Freeway)		144,700				
	Freeway Category - Fully Programmed		1,638,677				
	Soundwalls - Board Adopted		61,600				
	Priority 1, 2, & 3		1,078,192	4,645,329			
				(45,319)			
<b>(1)</b> The amount in the program shortfall column is the February 5th, 2003 STIP Amendment.							
Highlighted projects are recommended for deferral, if additional funds can't be secured							

**PRIORITY SETTING CRITERIA**

Regional Transit Projects – (1) High priority project ready to go into construction; (2) those having state/local funds as a match for significant federal funding already approved/earmarked; (3) projects essential to the bus and rail system, particularly to comply with the Consent Decree.

TCRP Projects (Local & Non-Freeway) – Fund projects that have previous MTA Board commitment

**CALL FOR PROJECTS:**

Allocation Requests – Concur with all FY 04 or prior year State RIP or federal TEA funding allocation and/or extension requests to maximize funding for Los Angeles County. Place a higher priority on those whose allocations are due in current fiscal year.

Balance - Maintain relative balance among Freeway and Call for Projects categories

Local Transportation Funds– Maintain funding commitment to projects using this fund source, as they are not eligible for other types of funding.

TEA Funds – Maintain MTA funding commitment to Bikeway and Pedestrian projects funded by TEA and other TEA modal category projects as these funds can't be used for other purposes.

Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) – Encourage Caltrans to maintain or add ITIP funding to projects in MTA's Regional Improvement Program.

Freeways – (1) Previously fully funded projects prioritized by mobility (2/3 weight) and readiness (1/3 weight); for deferred projects leave sufficient funding for design and/or right-of-way; (2) projects not previously fully funded.

Soundwalls – Retain 70% of the previous MTA Board committed funding to the Soundwall program.

**Call Categories--Freeway, RSTI, Signal, Transit Capital, Bikeway, Pedestrian, TDM**

- (1) projects in final audit, under construction or under contract or bids received as of March 31, 2003;
- (2) final design completed, right-of-way started/completed, ready to list or due to the CTC for construction allocation in FY 03 and any CTC approved extensions that must be allocated by June 30, 2003;
- (3) those having state/local funds as a match for significant federal funding already approved/earmarked, in PE or final design as of March 31, 2003 or due to the CTC in FY 03 for final design;
  - (3a) TEA funded in modes other than the TEA category;
  - (3b) due to CTC for design allocation in FY 04 or construction allocation in FY 04, if not previously ranked higher;
- (4) have executed LOA/MOU and are in environmental clearance or have no activity or have not had RSTP/CMAQ funds obligated as of March 31, 2003;
- (5) MOU/LOA in final review or signature process for FY 03 or prior year funding by March 31, 2003;
- (6) no MOU/LOA.

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT REQUEST**  
**(\$ IN THOUSANDS)**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Existing</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Change</b>
Caltrans (1)	Route 5: High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes, Rt 118-Rt 14	0	10,210	10,210
Caltrans	Route 5: Rt 5/14 HOV Connector	19,108	6,738	(12,370)
Caltrans	Route 14: HOV lanes, Pearblossom Hwy-Av P-8	29,103	0	(29,103)
Caltrans	Route 405: Auxiliary Lane, Rt 10-Waterford	13,521	38,521	25,000
Caltrans	Route 405: Rt 405/101 Connector, Gap Closure	8,787	21,810	13,023
Los Angeles (2)	First St bridge, Widen Approaches, Replace Railing	3,760	3,760	0
Los Angeles (2)	Riverside Dr, Barclay-SF Rd, widen viaduct	6,225	6,225	0
Los Angeles (2)	Overland Ave Bridge Widening at Route 10	2,799	2,799	0
LA County (2)	Gateway Cities Intersection Improvements	7,551	7,551	0
MTA	AB 3090 Replacement Project	98,000	77,000	(21,000)
MTA (3)	Light Rail Vehicles	30,000	47,500	17,500
MTA	Core Rideshare	3,260	0	(3,260)
	<b>TOTAL STIP CHANGE</b>	222,114	222,114	0
<b>Congestion Management Air Quality (CMAQ)</b>				
Caltrans	Route 5: Rt 5/14 HOV Connector	52,703	0	(52,703)
Caltrans	Route 5: HOV Lanes, Rt 118-Rt 14	0	20,340	20,340
Caltrans (4)	Route 14: HOV Lanes, Pearblossom Hwy-Av P-8	0	29,103	29,103
MTA	Core Rideshare	0	3,260	3,260
	<b>TOTAL CMAQ CHANGE</b>	52,703	52,703	0



**Note**

- (1) Includes \$3.5 million AB 3090 Replacement Project
- (2) Project Sponsor request to defer funds to a later year (Fy 05 or Beyond)
- (3) Replacement Project AB 3090
- (4) Construction funding for this project is now program in FY05