

Revised PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE July 14, 2004

#### 2004 CALL FOR PROJECTS RECERTIFICATION AND SUBJECT: **DEOBLIGATION FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY**

#### **APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS ACTION:**

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- A. Recertify \$61.6 million in existing FY 2004-05 commitments from previous Countywide Call for Projects; authorize the expenditure of funds to meet these commitments, as shown in Attachment A-1; receive and file \$74.3 million worth of time extensions for Los Angeles County projects shown in Attachment A-2 with the staff recommended conditions identified in the report;
- B. Deobligate \$4.3 million of previously approved Call for Projects and Regional Transit Alternatives Analysis (RTAA) Program funding shown in subject to *conditions* in Attachment B;
- C. Authorize staff the Chief Executive Officer to deobligate prior Call for Projects funding commitments during the annual Recertification and Deobligation cycle, if projects are not proceeding according to the MTA's existing lapsing policy;
- D. Revise the MTA lapsing policy as *italicized* in Attachment C effective July 1, 2004, for all locally funded MTA Call for Projects agreements;
- E. Authorize acceleration of a total of \$42.24 million in Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds, of which \$32.4 million in RSTP and \$4.2 million in Proposition C 25% matching funds is for the Route 14 Carpool Lane from Pearblossom to P-8, and \$10.0 million in RSTP is for the Interstate 405 Carpool Lane from Route 90 to Interstate 10 pursuant to the State of California's offer shown in Attachment D;
- F. Approve a change in project priority status from deferred to "ready-to-proceed" for the Wilshire Western Transit Center and Westlake McArthur Community Based Intercept Facility to allow these joint development related projects to move forward; and
- G. Amend the FY 2004-05 MTA Budget, as necessary, to include the 2004 Call for Projects Recertification and Deobligation projects in the FY 2005 Regional Programs budget and to include grant-funded MTA projects in the appropriate cost center budgets.

0311807220

## **ISSUE**

Each year the MTA Board of Directors must recertify funding for the Countywide Call for Projects before releasing the funds to project sponsors. The MTA Board must also approve the deobligation of project funds due to lapsing or savings providing project sponsors have had the opportunity to appeal the MTA staff recommendations to the MTA's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the MTA Board.

In addition, this year, the State of California has notified Regional Transportation Planning Agencies statewide that a special opportunity exists to accelerate federal funds for ready-to-go eligible projects. A copy of the State's offer is found in Attachment D. Since the adoption of the Short Range Transportation Plan (SRTP), the MTA has been seeking a method for funding the \$36.6 million, Route 14 Carpool Lane from Pearblossom to Avenue P-8. Also, construction costs for the Interstate 405 Carpool Lane from Route 90 to Interstate 10 have recently increased by \$19.0 million and such increases would be eligible for additional funding under this program. The State of California's offer is an excellent opportunity to deliver these ready-to-go projects quickly without the need for Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicle (GARVEE) Bond financing or Regional Improvement Program (RIP) funds.

## **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

The 2004 Call for Projects Recertification and Deobligation process implements the MTA's multi-modal programming responsibilities for Los Angeles County, and the MTA Boardadopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The recommendations are consistent with the SRTP and the MTA annual authorization and timely use of funds policies. Specifically, the MTA Board policy calls for recertifying or reconfirming the availability of funding programmed to Call projects. The MTA Board policy also calls for deobligating funding from project sponsors who have not met lapsing deadlines or who have not used the entire grant amount to complete the project (project savings). The recommended recertifications and deobligations implement this policy.

Due to the lack of State funding, the MTA's lapsing policy for locally funded projects needs to be more strict and enforced. To accomplish this goal, staff recommends that the current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) lapsing provision ("*Timely Use of Funds"*) be changed from forty-two (42) months back to the original thirty-six (36) months to expend funds for all locally funded agreements signed after July 1, 2004. In 1999, the MTA changed its policy to 42 months to provide sponsors more time to develop and deliver their projects. It was thought that this additional time would reduce the number of projects that were not meeting the lapsing deadlines. Since that time, we have noted that the additional time has made no impact in expediting delivery. Additionally, reverting back to a 36-month lapsing policy would be more consistent with both the federal and state lapsing policies.

### **OPTIONS**

The MTA Board could cancel all or some of the FY 2004-05 funding commitments rather than recertify their programmed expenditures. This would disregard previous MTA Board

Call for Projects funding commitments and could also disrupt on-going Los Angeles County projects that received multi-year regional funding in the past.

Regarding deobligations, the MTA Board could choose not to deobligate funds from one or more sponsors. This is not recommended, however, as the deobligations represent project savings, projects canceled at the sponsor's request or projects that are not proceeding in a timely manner. More importantly, the MTA needs deobligated funds for use on deferred projects countywide. Further, the Board could choose not to delegate authority to staff to deobligate funds from sponsors, once they have had the opportunity to appeal to the MTA's TAC. This is not recommended as TAC has requested that sponsors only have one opportunity to appeal the deobligation.

The MTA Board could choose not to change the lapsing policy, accelerate the Route 14, provide funding for Interstate 405 Carpool Lane from Route 90 to Interstate 10, and change the priority status of the Wilshire/Western and Westlake Macarthur Community Intercept Facility projects. These are not recommended, as a longer time period to use all transportation funding would not be efficient. Aside from their status as long-standing funding issues before the MTA Board, the Route 14 and Interstate 405 projects are ready-to-go and federally eligible, so they can benefit from the State of California's offer of accelerated federal funding. Finally, in June 2003 and May 2004, respectively, the MTA Board approved joint development agreements for Wilshire/Western and Westlake MacArthur Community Intercept Facility. The priority status changes are consistent with implementing these joint development agreements.

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

Projects approved through the Call for Projects are funded through a variety of federal, state and local grant sources. Proposition C 10% and 25% funds for the 2004 Call for Projects Recertification are included in the FY 2004-05 MTA Subsidies to Others (Cost Center 0441) Budget. For those programmed to the MTA, the funding is included in the appropriate cost center budget.

The Route 14 and Interstate 405 projects' funding would come from a combination of federal funds with a local match. Caltrans administers a statewide pool of federal formula funding for project sponsors on a modified "first come-first serve" basis. As Caltrans is anticipating that statewide Regional Transportation Planning Agency resources will not exceed demand this year, the MTA has an opportunity to utilize the pooled resources without impacting other projects in the Los Angeles County program. The Caltrans letter announcing this possibility is shown in Attachment D.

# BACKGROUND

The MTA is required by federal (Title 23 U.S.C. 134 (g) & (h)) and state (P.U.C. 130303) statutes to prepare a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Los Angeles County. The TIP allocates revenues across all transportation modes based on the planning requirements of the Transportation Equity Act of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21). The MTA accomplishes this mandate, in part, by programming revenues through the Countywide Call for Projects.

#### A. <u>Recertification and Time Extensions</u>

The \$61.6 million in existing FY 2004-05 commitments (Attachment A-1) was MTA Boardapproved and programmed in previous Countywide Calls for Projects. The current action is required to insure that funding continues in FY 2004-05 for those on-going projects for which the MTA previously committed funding. All Call projects not deferred by previous MTA Board action are being recertified to allow them to move forward. Projects that were removed from the 2002 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and re-assigned Proposition C 10% and Proposition 25% funds in the MTA Board's February 2004 action are assumed to be already re-certified and therefore are not included.

During the 2001 Call for Projects Recertification and Deobligation, the MTA Board authorized staff to administratively extend projects based on the following reasons:

- 1) Project delay due to an unforeseen and extraordinary circumstance beyond the control of the project sponsor (federal or state delay, legal challenge, Act of God, etc.);
- 2) Project delay due to an MTA action that results in a change in project scope, schedule, or sponsorship that is mutually agreed upon by MTA and project sponsor prior to the extension request; and
- 3) Project delay due to contractual obligation, however, a time extension is needed to complete construction that is already underway (capital projects only).

Based on the above criteria, extensions totaling \$74.3 million for fifty-five (55) projects shown in (Attachment A-2) are being granted. In some cases, the amount shown in any given year does not represent the entire programmed amount for a project. Some projects have funds programmed in later years, and therefore those years may not be reflected in FY 2004-05. Should these funds not be extended, the funds programmed in any given year may lapse and be deobligated. The rationale for deobligating the project can be found in Attachment C, which states that:

..."If one year of project funding is lapsed, subsequent year(s) funding will also be lapsed, effectively deobligating the entire Project..."

#### B. <u>Deobligations</u>

Attachment B shows the list of previously approved Countywide Call for Projects totaling \$4.3 million that are being recommended for deobligation. This includes \$109,000 in savings, a canceled project for \$378,000, and \$3.9 million in projects that were beyond the lapsing date. All project sponsors have been notified of the MTA's intent to deobligate funds. For those project sponsors who were not in compliance with the MTA's most current lapsing policy, an opportunity was given to appeal to the MTA's TAC on June 2, 2004.

#### C. Deobligation Process

Over the past two years, the MTA's TAC has requested that staff revise the Deobligation appeals process to provide sponsors only one opportunity to appeal the lapse of their funds before TAC. This would be consistent with state guidelines, in that sponsors have one opportunity to request and receive an extension. Staff concurs with this recommendation. Further, it is recommended that during the annual Recertification and Deobligation process, TAC and the MTA Board be apprised of those sponsors who have exercised their one-time appeal opportunity and are being deobligated.

#### D. MOU Lapsing Policy

A revision to the existing lapsing policy is being requested (revisions are *italicized* in Attachment C) for all locally funded agreements signed after July 1, 2004. The current policy allows for the expenditure of the funds within forty-two (42) months from July 1 of the Fiscal Year in which the Funds are programmed. The change would amend the MTA's current MOU lapsing policy (*"Timely Use of Funds"*) from forty-two (42) months to thirty-six (36) months to expend funds. If projects are not progressing, funds could be reprogrammed to deferred projects that are "ready-to-go".

In addition, at the MTA Board's February 18, 2004 meeting, several projects that were originally programmed with State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds were re-programmed with Proposition C 10% and Proposition 25% funds. Consequently, their lapsing dates changed to accommodate this new arrangement. For example, projects that were funded in FY 2002-03, and prior were given sixty (60) months from July 1 instead of forty-two (42) months to expend their funds. Due to State funding shortfalls, these projects were not allocated funds in a timely manner and lost a minimum of one (1) year. This one-time change to the lapsing policy, for these projects, is commensurate with the time lost at the CTC. Projects with funds in FY 2003-04 and beyond will have no changes to the current Board-adopted Proposition C lapsing policy, as they were not delayed in their implementation.

E. <u>Route 14 Carpool Lane from Pearblossom to P-8 and Interstate 405 Carpool Lane from</u> <u>Route 90 to Interstate 10</u>

The Route 14 Carpool Lane from Pearblossom to P-8 project will construct two (2) High Occupancy Lanes (HOV) on Route 14 (one lane in each direction of travel) to help relieve congestion. The project was first funded in the Fast Track Call for Projects (CFP #347) for \$7.0 million in Proposition C 25% funds and \$1.9 million in CMAQ funds. In the 2001 Call for Projects (CFP #8348), the project was given another \$29.1 million in RIP funds and \$42.7 million in RSTP funds for a total of \$40.7 million. A portion of the project, \$29.1 million, was included in the 2002 STIP, but amended out in April 2003, to address the State budget deficit. A GARVEE Bond alternative was proposed to the CTC and rejected in December 2003. In the proposed 2004 STIP, this project was funded with \$36.6 million in FY 2008-09, the only time funding is available. As a result, staff is requesting the advancement of \$32.4 million in RSTP funds and \$4.2 million in Proposition C 25% matching funds for the Route 14 project to ensure that the MTA does not lose its programming capacity in the 2004 STIP.

The Interstate 405 Carpool Lane from Route 90 to Interstate 10 Project was first funded in the 1995 Call for Projects (CFP#2206) to design and construct HOV lanes and Soundwalls on Interstate 405 from Route 90 to Interstate 10. In subsequent years, additional funds were committed to the project including STIP, RIP, CMAQ, RSTP and Proposition C for a total

project cost of \$147.8 million. On June 3, 2004, bids were received for the principal construction contract. The low bid for the work came in at \$113.2 million, which is 19.36% over the Engineer Estimate of \$94.9 million. Caltrans has reviewed the bid results in accordance with State guidelines and has determined that the major reasons that the contractors' bids are higher than the engineer's estimate include: a) shortages of steel, cement and other construction materials have pushed the unit costs much higher in recent months; b) revised standards for pavement imposed by Caltrans headquarters which resulted in increases from \$60/ton to \$105/ton; and c) accelerated time scheduling to complete the project in three (3) years in addition to fuel and transportation costs raised the time-related overhead cost by forty-one percent (41%). Caltrans does not recommend downscoping the work. They further believe that re-bidding the work would not result in a lower bid. Therefore, they have requested that the MTA consider approval of an additional \$10.0 million in RSTP for the Interstate 405 Carpool Lane from Route 90 to Interstate 10 project; thereby increasing the overall project budget from \$147.8 million to \$166.8 million (a 12.8% increase). As a result, staff is requesting the advancement of \$10.0 million in RSTP funds for the Interstate 405 Carpool Lane from Route 90 to Interstate 10 to allow this highly important project to proceed on schedule without delay and without further cost increases.

On April 6, 2004, the Caltran's Division of Local Assistance issued a letter to the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies requesting them to provide a projected use of Obligation Authority (OA) for the remainder of Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2004, and for Assembly Bill 1012 (AB 1012) Cycle Five balances subject to reprogramming on December 29, 2004. Specifically it states:

"...As of February 29, 2004, local delivery is approximately 23 percent, based on the projected FFY 2004 annual OA amount... The OA, up to the local OA balance, is available for local agency use as long as projects are delivered before the deadline for this FFY."

This gives the local agencies the opportunity to advance projects that are federally funded and ready-to-go; thus it presents an opportunity to advance the Route 14 project and to keep the Interstate 405 Carpool Lane from Route 90 to Interstate 10 project on schedule. The state's offer letter is included as Attachment D.

### F. Project Priority Change

#### Wilshire/Western Transit Center Project (CFP Project #4153)

In the 1997 Call for Projects, the MTA programmed \$3.2 million, \$1.2 million of which was deobligated in FY 2003, for a total of \$2.0 million, in Proposition C 10% funds to the City of Los Angeles for the Wilshire/Western Transit Center Project. This project was prioritized as a "4" with the MTA Board action in April 2003 (Board Item #42). In June 2003, the Board approved the exclusive right to negotiate a Joint Development Agreement (JDA). As a result, it is requested that the Wilshire/Western Transit Center's project priority be moved from a (4) to a (3).

<u>Westlake Community Based Intercept Intermodal Facility (CFP #2148, 2445 & 4295)</u> The City of Los Angeles' (later the MTA's) Westlake Community Based Intercept Intermodal Facility was awarded a total of \$5.7 million (\$4.3 million in Proposition C 10% and \$1.4 million in Proposition C 25%) in the 1995 and 1997 Calls for Projects, of which \$1.7 million was deobligated in FY 2003, for a total of \$4.0 million. When staff first began prioritizing projects, this particular project received the lowest of the deferred category (6). In May 2004, the Board approved exclusive rights to negotiate a JDA. As a result, it is being requested that Westlake Community Based Intercept Intermodal Facility's project priority be moved from a (6) to a (3) as well.

#### G. FY 2004-05 Budget

The MTA's Management Audit Services Department (MASD) recommended that,

"Board action to approve the Call- for-Projects should also include authorizing actions to amend budgets when necessary."

As a result, this language will be included in all Countywide Call for Projects and annual Recertification and Deobligation Board reports to ensure inclusion of the projects in the MTA's budget.

#### TAC Appeals

On June 2, 2004, the MTA TAC met to hear sponsor appeals on ten (10) projects. The following lists the TAC recommendations and the MTA responses to them:

CFP#	Project Title	Agency	Deobligated Amount	TAC Recommendation	MTA Staff Response
		City of West Hollywood		Give 2-year extension to June 30, 2006. Sponsor agreed to request no further extensions and agreed that if the Information Exchange Network (IEN) connection portion of the Scope of Work is not done, then the	Concur with caveat that sponsor start construction by June 30, 2005. If construction is not started by June 30, 2005, MTA staff can administratively deobligate funds. Project previously received one 2-year extension. Phase I and II designs are 95% complete and ready for construction. Phase III design is 80% complete, contingent upon IEN software development.
	CULTURAL CRESCENT	City of Los Angeles			Concur. Project previously received one 2-year extension. Design 75% complete; plan check scheduled June 2004; environmental document submittal scheduled October 2004.
	BCH BLVD. TO ARBOR	South Bay Cities Council of Governments	\$3,602,000	Deobligate funds.	Concur. Project received two previous extensions totaling 3 years. Project 3 years from environmental clearance. Insufficient funds exist to complete scope.

		T			
			Deobligated		
CFP#	Project Title			TAC Recommendation	MTA Staff Response
4293	ALAMEDA ST./N. SPRING ST. ARTERIAL REDESIGN	City of Los Angeles	\$2,753,000	Give 2- year extension to June 30, 2006. Sponsor agrees to request no further	Concur with caveat that sponsor award two of the three remaining construction contracts by June 30, 2005. If sponsor does not meet this requirement, MTA staff can administratively deobligate funds. Project previously received 2-year extension. Land use adjacencies (Gold Line and Cornfield State Park) have delayed progress. Implementation of original scope underway.
H295	KEDESIGN	City of Eos / ingeles	\$2,755,000	Sponsor stated that project will be complete	
4248	LA CIENEGA BLVD. BETWEEN THIRD ST. AND SAN VICENTE BLVD.	City of Los Angeles	\$23,857	by June 2004 and no extension is necessary. TAC recommended to deobligate funds if not spent by June 30, 2004 and invoiced by August 2004.	Concur. Project previously received a 1-year extension. Project 99% complete with billing by August 30, 2004.
	VERMONT AVE. SIDEWALK WIDENING			Give 1-year extension to June 30, 2005. Sponsor agrees to request no further	Concur. Project previously received two extensions totaling two years. Phase I of project delayed, resulting in delay to Phase II. Phase I complete with Phase II 95% complete and construction to begin in late 2004
6416	AND TRANSIT AVENIDA	City of Los Angeles	\$441,736	extensions.	with completion by Spring 2005. Concur. Project previously extended
2100	HARBOR TRANSITWAY ARTERIAL HOV TSM CONNECTION ALTERNATIVE W/DOWNTOWN LA	City of Los Angeles	\$1,775,000	Give 1-year extension to June 30, 2005 to complete all work. Sponsor agrees to request no further extensions.	twice totaling 4 years. Project was to enhance connection from Harbor Freeway to Downtown through bus- only lanes on Figueroa and Flower Sts. Figueroa segment completed, but Flower segment dropped from scope as bus-only lanes not warranted. As an alternative, the City has proposed reconfiguring the
4294	101 FREEWAY OVERCROSSING	City of Los Angeles	\$402 339	Deobligate funds.	to June 30, 2005. Subsequent to TAC appeal, City provided evidence that 35% PS&E for a project which complies with the MTA grant will be completed by June 30, 2005. Sponsor agrees to request no further extensions. Project previously extended 2-years.
F4.74	GARGKO33114G	ony of Los Aligeres	w,02,333	- confute version	Concur. Project previously received
4012	REAL TIME TRANSIT TECH PROGRAM	Transportation Foundation of Los Angeles	\$137,000	Give six-month extension to December 31, 2004.	extensions totaling three years. Sponsor reached agreement with alternate college to house program and needs until the start of the school year (September 2004) to complete billings. Concur with caveat that sponsor start
4377	AVTF REGIONWIDE INCIDENT MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES	City of Glendale	\$486,000	Give 2-year extension to June 30, 2006. Sponsor agrees to request no further extensions.	construction by June 30, 2005. If sponsor does not meet this requirement, MTA staff can administratively deobligate funds. Project previously extended two years. Most hardware has been procured and some construction has been completed. City waiting for IEN software development.

In addition, one project, the City of Los Angeles' Highland Avenue Widening at Franklin Avenue (CFP# 4304), was removed from the deobligation list because project funding does not lapse until December 2005. However, it is recommended that the project sponsor be required to award a construction contract by June 30, 2005, and report to the TAC at its June 2005 meeting on project progress. Further, it is recommended that the lapse date be extended to June 2006, to be consistent with the deobligation schedule.

The TAC also heard updates by Los Angeles County project sponsors on the four (4) projects listed below that were given two-year conditional extensions in the 2003 Recertification process. As a condition of their extensions, project sponsors were required to demonstrate that their projects were progressing and would be completed by their revised lapse date of June 30, 2005.

CFP#	Project Title	Agency	Condition of Extension	Project Status
4377	ARROYO/VERDUGO TRANSIT SYSTEMS & STOP IMPROVEMENTS	City of Glendale	Complete 75% of design by April 30, 2004.	Design 80% complete.
2214	PCH TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS	Los Angeles County	Show significant progress toward project completion by June 1, 2004.	Construction started; hard and software procured; project on schedule for completion by June 2005.
231602	ARTERIAL HOV	City of Long Beach	Award construction contract by April 30, 2004.	Construction contract awarded April 30, 2004.
			Show significant progress	Developer has acquired principal outstanding private parcel that will be combined with MTA ground lease. Final agreements are close to completion. Reached agreement on bus layover
4153	WILSHIRE/WESTERN TRANSIT CENTER	City of Los Angeles	toward project approval by June 30, 2004.	design with MTA Operations.

### NEXT STEPS

Upon MTA Board approval, Los Angeles County project sponsors will be notified of the time extensions. Amendments will be executed to any existing Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) and Letters of Agreements (LOAs), as appropriate.

# **ATTACHMENTS**

- A-1. FY 2005 Recertification Projects
- A-2. FY 2004 Recommended Time Extensions
- B. FY 2004 Deobligation Recommendations
- C. MTA Lapsing Policy and Maintenance of Effort (MOE)
- D. State's Offer to Accelerate Federal Funds for Ready-to-Go Projects

#### Prepared by:

Wanda Knight, Mona Jones, and Jon Grace - Countywide Planning and Development

Bradford W. Mu allerton James L. de la Loza fa

Executive Officer, Countywide Planning and Development

Roger Snoble Chief Executive Officer

#### **ATTACHMENT A-1**

LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

#### CALL FOR PROJECTS RECERTIFICATION FY 2004-05 PROJECTS (\$000)

PROJ	AGENCY	PROJECT TITLE	Year	TOTAL
6137LK	CALTRANS	CONSTRUCTION OF HOV LANES ON RTE 60 FROM AZUSA AVE TO BREA CANYON PHASE I, PROJECT LINKED WITH # : (4262, 358 AND 6137)	2005	28,378
8393	CLAREMONT	CLAREMONT VILLAGE EXPANSION PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS	2005	788
8003	INGLEWOOD	WIDENING OF LA CIENEGA BLVD - VESTA STREET TO INDUSTRIAL AVENUE	2005	121
8135	INGLEWOOD	INGLEWOOD ITS DEPLOYMENT AND INTEGRATION PROJECT	2005	563
8058	LA CITY	LA TIJERA BRIDGE WIDENING OVER I-405 FREEWAY	2005	365
8164	LA CITY	EXPOSITION BLVD RIGHT-OF-WAY BIKE PATH - WESTSIDE EXTENSION	2005	1,739
8165	LA CITY	LA RIVER BIKE PATH - PHASE IIIA CONSTRUCTION	2005	878
8166	LA CITY	SAN FERNANDO ROAD METROLINK BIKE PATH PHASE III DESIGN	2005	338
8193	LA CITY	NORTHEAST LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY LINKAGES PHASE III	2005	563
8251	LA CITY	CRENSHAW BLVD. PED LINKAGE NORTH EXTEN, EXPOSITION TO WILSHIRE	2005	169
8256	LA CITY	TRANSPORTATION CONTAMINANTS REDUCTION PROJECT	2005	282
8292	LA CITY	SUN VALLEY-SUNLAND BLVD BETWEEN SAN FERNANDO & STRATHERN	2005	56
8376A	LA CITY	LANI BUS STOP AND PEDESTRIAN ENHANCEMENTS	2005	177
8150	LA COUNTY	SAN JOSE CREEK BICYCLE TRAIL - PHASE II	2005	1,243
8297	LA COUNTY	HARBOR BLVD WILDLIFE UNDERCROSSING	2005	901
8102	LANCASTER	SR-14 FREEWAY/AVENUE I INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS	2005	5,351
8177	LANCASTER	PEDESTRIAN ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM	2005	495
8157	LONG BEACH	LONG BEACH EAST/WEST BIKEWAY CONNECT & BIKE SIGNAGE PROG	2005	63
8163	LONG BEACH	P.E. RIGHT-OF-WAY BIKEWAY AND PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS	2005	365
8203	LONG BEACH	PROMENADE STREETSCAPE/SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS	2005	507
8204	MALIBU	CROSS CREEK ROAD PEDESTRIAN AND PARKING IMPROVEMENTS	2005	563
8114	МТА	LOS ANGELES COUNTY RIDESHARE SERVICES	2005	5,289
8170	MTA (FORMERLY LA CITY)	SAN FERNANDO VALLEY EAST - WEST BIKE PATH	2005	557
8255	PALMDALE	SIERRA CORRIDOR LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS	2005	169
8190	PASADENA	PASADENA CIVIC CENTER/MID-TOWN PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT	2005	580
8191	PASADENA	PLAYHOUSE DISTRICT STREETCAPES, WALKWAYS AND ALLEYS PROJECT	2005	464
8260	PASADENA	RESTORATION OF THE HISTORICAL FLINT WASH TRAIL CROSSING	2005	174
8096	SANTA CLARITA	CROSS VALLEY CONNECTOR GAP CLOSURE - I -5 TO COPPER HILL DRIVE	2005	6,204
8130	SANTA CLARITA	INCIDENT MANAGEMENT - TRAVELER INFORMATION SUBSYSTEM	2005	950
8276	WEST COVINA	SOUTH AZUSA AVENUE MEDIAN LANDSCAPING PHASE II	2005	116
8161	WHITTIER	WHITTIER GREENWAY TRAIL/SEG 1 DVLMNT, SEG 3 ACQUISITION & DEVELOPMENT	2005	3,239
		ΤΟΤΑL	1	\$ 61,647

#### ATTACHMENT A-2

# LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY CALL FOR PROJECTS PROJECT REQUIRING EXTENSIONS - RECOMMENDED BY MTA STAFF FY 1995-96 - FY 2003-04

785

5. S. C. S. S. S. S.

de Category reeway/HOV Transportation Improvements

5- Transit Security

6- Signal Synchronization and Bus Speed Improvements
7- Bikeways and Pedestrian Improvements

8- Transportation Demand Management

ransit Capital tation Enhancements

	SPONSOR	FUND	DESCRIPTION	FIS/OBLIG/ALL				(\$000's)				Funds Subject to Lapse	Time Ext. (#YRS)	New Lapse Date
PROJ. #	SPUNSOR	TYPE		oc	96-99	00	01	02	03	04	TOTAL	to Lapse	(#11(3)	
6343	AGOURA HILLS	PC25	U.S. 101 FWY/KANAN RD. INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS	3,825				9,014	1,465		10,479	5,189	6 mo's	6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
6337	ALHAMBRA	PC25	RECONSTRUCT AND WIDEN MISSION RD.	0				333			333	333	6 moʻs	6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
7056	BURBANK	PC25	BURBANK MEDIA DISTRICT ITS PHASE   & II	32			165				165	133	6 mo's	6/30/2005(1)
6323	CALABASAS	PC25	CALABASAS REGIONAL TRAFFIC CENTER	236				291	38		329	55	6 moʻs	6/30/2005(1)
6297	COMPTON	PC25	COMPTON TMOC & RETROFIT OF CITY TRAFFIC SIGNAL SYSTEM					149	223	_183	555	149	6 mo's	6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
6329	CULVER CITY	PC25	VIDEO SURVEILLANCE INTEGRATION GAP CLOSURE	0				1,302			1,302	1,302	6 moʻs	6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
6321	GLENDALE	PC25	SAN FERNANDO CORRIDOR ITS	2,483				2,879	2,598		5,477	396	6 mo's	6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
4311	LA CITY	PC25	ARBOR VITAE ST./I-405 INTERCHANGE (SOUTHERN HALF) (\$11,085 WAS RIP)	0				4,100			4,100	4,100	<u>6 mo's</u>	6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
6299		PC25	WESTCHESTER TRANSPORTATION MGMT. ENHANCEMENTS (ATCS)	0				1,120	884		2,004	1,120	<u>6 mo's</u>	6/30/2005(1)
6300	LA CITY	PC25	CITY/COUNTY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT INTEGRATION	46				743	586		1,329	697	6 mo's	6/30/2005(1)
6302	LA CITY	PC25	INTERCONNECT GAP CLOSURE-CITYWIDE	C				509	788	109	1,406	509	<u>6 mo's</u>	6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
6303	LA CITY	PC25	SAN DIEGO FWY CORRIDOR PHASE II ATSAC	882				1,741	3,515		5,256	859	6 mo's	s 6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
6310		PC25	EXPOSITION PARK TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN (ATSC)	<u> </u>			<u> </u>	1,206	927		2,133	1,206	6 mo's	s 6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
6427	LA CITY	PC25	VALLEY BLVD. GRADE SEPARATION PHASE II	c				7,105	4,099	6,329	17,533	7,105	<u>6 mo's</u>	s 6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
6284	LA COUNTY	PC25	EL SEGUNDO AREA ITS	163				2,558			2,558	2,395	6 mo's	s 6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
6292	LA COUNTY	PC25	SB FORUM TRAFFIC SIGNAL CORRIDORS	97	,		ļ	2,050	2,014	2,563	6,627	1,953	6 mo'	s 6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
6294	LA COUNTY	PC25	SG FORUM TRAFFIC SIGNAL CORRIDORS	11				2,445	3,669	2,910	9,024	2,434	6 mo'	s 6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
6295	LA COUNTY	PC25	GATEWAY TRAFFIC SIGNAL CORRIDORS PHASE III	97	,			2,307	3,545	3,680	9,532	2,210	6 mo'	s 6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
6369	LONG BEACH		TERMINAL ISLAND FREEWAY/OCEAN BLVD. INTERCHANGE		)			3,699	1,565		5,264	3,699	<u>6 mo'</u>	s 6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
6355	MALIBU	PC25	PACIFIC COAST HWY. & ZUMIREZ DR. ROADWAY	15	5			450			450	435	6 mo'	s 6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
6500	МТА	PC25	SIGNAL SYSTEM TECHNICAL TRAINING					143	143	214	500	143	6 mo'	s 6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
	PALMDALE	PC25	NORTH COUNTY/ANTELOPE VALLEY TRAFFIC	5	3			1,928			1,928	3 1,875	5 <u>6 mo</u> '	s 6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
6282	SANTA CLARITA	PC25	REGIONAL CENTER CORRIDOR/GAP CLOSURE SIGNAL INTERCONNECT		5			340	363		70:	3 33	5 6 mo'	s 6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
6283	SANTA CLARITA	PC25	AUTOMATED INCIDENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	603	3			635	291	279	1,20	5 33	2 6 mo	s 6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
	SANTA MONICA	PC25	OCEAN AVE. SIGNAL SYSTEM		D			337	7		33	7 33	7 6 mo	s 6/30/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>
L				0.54			0 16	5 47,384	4 26,71	16,26	7 90,52	9 39,00	1	
			SUBTOTAL	8,54		4	Y10;	J 47,30	1 20,11	1 10,201	1 30,52	-100	<b>.</b>	

#### ATTACHMENT A-2

#### LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY CALL FOR PROJECTS PROJECT REQUIRING EXTENSIONS - RECOMMENDED BY MTA STAFF FY 1995-96 - FY 2003-04

eeway/H ranspor ansit Ca	tation Improvem			kentan ti di≩uli s		#10138866.98633 *	**** *	5 6 7	- Transi - Signal - Bikewa	Synchro Synchro ays and l	y onization an Pedestrian	d Bus Spee Improveme Ianagemen	ed Improv ints	
		FUND		FIS/OBLIG/ALL			(\$	000's)			F	unds Subject	Time Ext.	New Lapse Dat
PROJ. #	SPONSOR	TYPE	DESCRIPTION	oc	96-99	00	01	02	03	04	TOTAL	to Lapse	(#YRS)	
4320	EL SEGUNDO	PC25	SEPULVEDA BLVD/STATE HWY RT 1 WIDEN BETWN 22ND& GRAND AVE	1,697		1,800					1,800	1,250	1	6/30/2005 <sup>(2</sup>
4377	GLENDALE	PC25	AVTF REGION WIDE INCIDENT MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES	122		608					608	486	2	6/30/2005(2
4383	GLENDALE	PC25	ARROYO VERDUGO TRAFFIC FORUM ATIS KIOSKS			333					333	281	1	6/30/2005 <sup>(2</sup>
4319	INGLEWOOD (SB COG)	PC25	INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM	461	850	670					1,520	1,059	1	6/30/2005 <sup>(2</sup>
4304	LA CITY	PC25	HIGHLAND AVENUE WIDENING AT FRANKLIN AVENUE		654	561					1,215	1,063	6 mo's	6/30/2005 <sup>0</sup>
4293	LA CITY	PC25	ALAMEDA ST./N. SPRING ST. ARTERIAL REDESIGN	847		243	3,357				3,600	2,753	2	6/30/2005 <sup>0</sup>
4294		PC25	101 FREEWAY OVERCROSSING	435	424	426					<b>8</b> 50	402	1	6/30/0
6019	LA CITY	PC10	CULTURAL CRESCENT BLUE LINE FACILITY	о		15	17	11			43	43	1	6/30/2005 <sup>(</sup>
6416	LA CITY	PC25	VERMONT AVE. SIDEWALK WIDENING AND TRANSIT AVENIDA	1,247			1,689				1,689	442	2	6/30/2005
		PC25	HARBOR TRANSITWAY	2,349	4,124						4,124	1,775	1	6/30/2005
2100		PC25	GLENDALE BLVD. CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS	0	3,197						3,197	3,197	1	6/30/2005
				96	1,132	~					1,132	1,036	1	6/30/2005
2076	LA CITY	PC25 PC25	SAN FERNANDO ROAD METROLINK BIKE PATH, PHASE I VICTORY/OXNARD BUS PRIORITY TREATMENTS	1,585	1,152	2,036		_			2,036	451	1	6/30/2005
			NORTHEAST TRANSIT CENTERS	1,110	1,591	1,591					3,182	2,072	1	6/30/2005
4193	LACITY	PC25	MAJOR LINE BUS ON-TIME PERFORMANCE	960	1,001	1,001	493	537			1,030	70		6/30/2005
4231		PC25 PC25	IMPROVEMENT PROG. ARTERIAL INCIDENT DETECTION ALGORITHM PROJECT	355			265	274			539	184		s 6/30/2005
4251		PC25	VALLEY BLVD GRADE SEPARATION AT EAST AVE PH. 1	1,413	2,967	1,093	200				4,060	2,647		2 6/30/2005
4333 6015	LA CITY	PC10	EAST LA/MID-CITY CORRIDOR BUS STOP IMPROVEMENTS					523	898		1,421	517		1 6/30/2005
6015		PC10	W, LOS ANGELES TRANSIT HUBS	40			219	226			445	405		1 6/30/200
		1	SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT HUBS	35			164	169			333	298		1 6/30/2005
6105	LA CITY	PC25	DOWNTOWN WAYFINDING/TRANSIT CONNECTION PROGRAM	370		313	261				574	204		1 6/30/2005
6205		PC10	LANKERSHIM SOUTHERN PACIFIC RAILROAD STA. REHAB	0			197	620			817	817		2 6/30/2005
2321	LA COUNTY	PC 25	DOMINGUEZ CHANNEL BIKEWAY	C		765					765	765	6 mo'	s 6/30/200
2322	LA COUNTY	СМАQ	THOMPSON CREEK BICYCLE TRAIL (623)	362	614						614	252		1 6/30/200
4094	МТА	PC10	EL PUEBLO PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS/ANGELS WALK	1,200	1,342	404					1,746	546		1 6/30/200
4012	MTA (Transportation Foundation)	PC25	REAL TIME TRANSIT TECH PROGRAM	238	375						375	137		s 6/30/200
4386	PALMDALE	PC25	AVENUE S INTERCONNECT	98			575				575			1 6/30/200
6036	SCRRA	PC10	SIDING IN THE I-10 CORRIDOR & EAST LA RIVER SIDINGS	1,514	<u> </u>	3,523		0.007			3,523			s 6/30/200
4314	TORRANCE WEST	PC25	DEL AMO BOULEVARD EXTENSION (GRADE SEPARATION)				6,576	2,237			8,813			2 6/30/200
4246	HOLLYWOOD	PC25	NORTH-SOUTH ARTERIAL CORRIDOR PROJECT	123 16,791		544 14,925	581 14,394	4,597	898	3	0 52,084			
				25,340	······································	14,925	14,559	51,981	07.04	1 16,26	7 142,613	74,325	]	

FOOTNOTES:

(i) Administratively extended from 12/31/04 to 06/30/05 to be in aligned with lapsing policy.

TAC recommended projects for lapse date extension with staff concurrence.

Ω	
н	
Z	
ш	
$\geq$	
エ	
9	
FI.	

# REVISED

# LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY DEOBLIGATION RECOMMENDATIONS FY 1995-96 - FY 2003-04 CALL FOR PROJECTS

	5- Transit Security	6- Signal Synchronization and Bus Speed Improvements	7- Bikeways and Pedestrian Improvements
Mode Category	1- Freeway/HOV	2- Regional Surface Transportation Improvements	3- Transit Capital

4- Transportation Enhancements

8- Transportation Demand Management

					(\$000's)	0's)			
				οα	DOLLARS PROGRAMMED AND FISCAL YEAR	ED AND FISCAL Y	EAR	TOTAL DFOR	REASON
PKOJ. #	SPONSOR	FUNDITE		66-96	8	10	02,03		
N/A	COMMERCE*	CMAQ	RTAA BOS FY 2002-03 UFS ALLOCATION				378	378	* PROJECT CANCELED
4120	GATEWAY CITIES	PC25	GATEWAY CITIES MOBILITY AND GOODS MOVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE		179			3	PROJECT SAVINGS
4248	LA CITY**	PC25	LA CIENEGA BLVD. BETWEEN THIRD ST. AND SAN VICENTE BLVD.		42	105		24	** PROJECT LAPSED
4158	SB COG	PC25	SB TRANSIT STOP IMPROVEMENTS	75				10	PROJECT SAVINGS
2343	SB JPA	PC25	AVIATION BLVD./MANHATTAN BCH BLVD. TO ARBOR VITAE ST.	3602				3,602	PROJECT LAPSED
6082	SCAG***	CMAQ	WEB-ACCESSIBLE VANPOOL INFORMATION SYSTEM		101			101	PROJECT LAPSED
6083	SCAG***	СМАQ	COMMUTER CHANNEL		101	29		130	PROJECT LAPSED
6078	WEST COVINA	PC40	WEST COVINA SHUTTLE EXPANSION, SOUTH END		112	218		80	PROJECT SAVINGS
4059	WEST HOLLYWOOD	PC10	WEST HOLLYWOOD COMMUTE CENTER	108				16	PROJECT SAVINGS
			TOTAL	\$ 3,785	\$ 634	\$ 352	\$ 378		

Conditions

\* The City of Commerce sent letter requesting project cancellation.

TOTAL DEOBLIGATION RECOMMENDATION

\*\* The Sponsor stated at TAC appeal of 06/02/04 that project would be completed by 06/30/04 and invoiced by 08/04, therefore any balance may be deobligated at this time administratively. \*\*\* The Sponsor will appeal to Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in an attempt to obtain the funds.

After 6 months, the MTA will lapse the funds if the appeal is not successful.

4.344

#### ATTACHMENT C TIMELY USE OF FUNDS – MOU MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT - MOE

#### 8. <u>TIMELY USE OF FUNDS / REPROGRAMMING OF FUNDS</u>:-

- 8.1 Grantee must demonstrate timely use of the Funds by:
- (i) executing this MOU within ninety (90) days of receiving formal transmittal of the MOU from MTA, or by December 31 of the first Fiscal Year in which the Funds are programmed, whichever date is later; and
- (ii) meeting the Project milestones due dates as agreed upon by the MTA and Grantee in Attachment C (Scope of Work) of this MOU. Contracts for construction or capital purchase shall be executed within nine (9) months from the date of completion of design. Project design (preliminary engineering) must begin within six (6) months from the identified milestone start date. Funds programmed by the MTA for Project development or right-of-way costs must be expended by the end of the second fiscal year following the year the Funds were first programmed; and
- (iii) submitting the Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report as described in Part II, Section 5.1 of this MOU; and
- (iv) expending the Funds granted under this MOU for allowable costs within 42 months 36 months from July 1 of the Fiscal Year in which the Funds are programmed, unless otherwise stated in this MOU. All Funds programmed for [INSERT YEAR (S) OF PROGRAMMED FUNDS] are subject to lapse by [SEE W:\MTA forms\Project Management (CP&D)\Current MOU and LOA Agreements for DRIVE LAPSING TABLE FOR LAPSING DEADLINE DATE].

If the Grantee fails to meet any of the above conditions, the Project shall be considered lapsed and will be submitted to the MTA Board for deobligation. Expenses that are not invoiced within 60 days after the lapsing date are not eligible for reimbursement.

8.2 In the event that the timely use of the Funds is not demonstrated as described in Part II, Section 8.1 of this MOU, the Project will be reevaluated by the MTA as part of its annual Call for Projects Recertification/ Deobligation process and the Funds may be deobligated and reprogrammed to another project by the MTA Board. If one year of project funding is lapsed, subsequent year(s) funding will also be lapsed, effectively deobligating the entire Project. In the event that all the Funds are reprogrammed, this MOU shall automatically terminate.

#### MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT – MOE

The MTA Board reinstated a Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirement on September 26, 2002, for Proposition 10%, and 25% funds. The reinstated requirement was consistent with the California Streets and Highways Code 2182.1(b)

#### ATTACHMENT C TIMELY USE OF FUNDS – MOU MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT - MOE

which states that before receipt of any Call for Projects funds, Grantee must expend from its General Funds an amount not less than the annual average of its General Funds during the Fiscal Year (FY) 2000-01, 2001-01, 2001-02 for street, road, and highway purposes, as reported to the Controller pursuant to Section 2151. In the event that the State of California suspends the MOE requirement, the MTA will also suspend this requirement. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DIVISION OF LOCAL ASSISTANCE - M.S. 1 1120 N STREET P. O. BOX 942873 SACRAMENTO, CA 94273-0001 PHONE (916) 653-1776 FAX (916) 654-2409 TTY (916) 653-4086



Flex your power! Be energy efficient!

April 6, 2004

#### METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCIES LOCAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSIONS

Dear Executive Directors:

Subject: Request for Additional Obligation Information Regarding Local Assistance Funds

The purpose of this letter is to request submittal of planned use of Obligation Authority (OA) by local agencies for the remainder of Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2004, and for Assembly Bill 1012 (AB 1012) Cycle Five balances subject to reprogramming on December 29, 2004. Projects using State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ), Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), and/or Regional Transportation Enhancement Activity (R-TEA) funds must be included. As stated in the AB 1012 Cycle Five Notification, obligation plans are due by May 1, 2004.

Streets and Highways Code Section 182.6(f) and 182.7(e) require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies to notify the California Department of Transportation (Department) of the projected amount of OA they intend to use for the remainder of the FFY. We are now requesting this information be included with the AB 1012 Cycle Five obligation plans. The information will be used to determine obligation authority need, prioritize and track projects, and plan workload. The Department's program coordinators for the local bridge and safety program will provide the ÓA information needed for projects using those types of funds.

Please provide us with your delivery plan by May 1, 2004. It is critical that you specify the date and fund type of each project you will obligate keeping in mind that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requires a few weeks before the end of the FFY to complete all transactions. We are requesting that your agencies work with their respective District Local Assistance Engineer (DLAE) to determine the exact date of obligation that allows enough time for district and headquarters action to meet the FHWA deadline. We also ask that you ensure that projects identified in your obligation plan are programmed in the Federal Transportation Improvement Program appropriately, or an amendment will need to be processed prior to obligation. The requested information is needed for obligations occurring May 1, 2004, and later.

Metropolitan Planning Organizations Regional Transportation Planning Agencies Local Transportation Commissions April 6, 2004 Page 2

Enclosed is a spreadsheet that contains the fields that need to be completed by you. We will use this information to evaluate OA needs and usage. An electronic copy is available at <u>www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms</u>. Please do not modify the format; we need to merge all plans into one spreadsheet. Please submit your plan to:

Denix Anbiah, Division of Local Assistance, MS #1 P.O. Box 942874 Sacramento, CA 94274-0001 E-Mail: Denix\_Anbiah@dot.ca.gov

It is anticipated that delivery of the State's share of FFY 2004 OA will be 100 percent. As of February 29, 2004, local delivery is approximately 23 percent, based on the projected FFY 2004 annual OA amount. This is less than the local delivery in the two previous years. Project delivery should not be delayed due to a perceived lack of available OA. The OA, up to the local OA balance, is available for local agency use as long as projects are delivered before the deadline for this FFY.

If you have any specific concerns regarding this request for additional information, please contact Denix Anbiah at (916) 653-3581.

Sincerely WIL ANBIAH

Son Chief Division of Local Assistance

Enclosures

c: District Directors District Division Chiefs for Local Assistance District Local Assistance Engineers DLA Office Chiefs DLA Area Engineers Fardad Falakfarsa, OFR John Taylor, OFR Tracey Frost, OFR Denix Anbiah

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"