

# PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE October 19, 2005

SUBJECT: METRO ARTERIAL MASTER PLAN

ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Receive and file this progress report on the Metro Arterial Master Plan.

### **ISSUE**

This report provides an update on the status of Metro's Arterial Master Plan. The development of this Plan was directed as part of the Metro Board of Director's approval of the 2003 Short Range Plan. The Master Plan has two major elements – developing and defining the regional arterial network and measuring and monitoring the network's performance.

### **BACKGROUND**

The arterials are a major component of Los Angeles County's multi-modal transportation network. The focus of the Arterial Master Plan is to establish a regional network of arterials for planning purposes that will assist in the development of multi-modal policies in the Long and Short Range Transportation Plans; assist in further refining the criteria for evaluating projects in the Regional Surface Transportation Improvements (RSTI) and Signal Synchronization and Bus Speed Improvements (Signal Synch) modal categories of Metro's Call for Projects; establish performance criteria to assist in determining how well the regional arterial network is functioning; and, establish a process for updating the regional network and performance monitoring data.

The completed Master Plan will contain the following information and documentation:

- 1. Definition of criteria used to determine an arterial's inclusion in the regional network;
- 2. Methodology for future addition or deletion of arterials;
- 3. Methodology for measuring and monitoring performance of the regional network of arterials; and,

4. A Geographical Information System (GIS) to display the regional arterial network, funded/programmed arterial improvements and performance monitoring data.

### **DISCUSSION**

The consultant contract was awarded in November 2004 and will be completed by November 2006. Since the execution of the consultant contract, a Working Group has been formed consisting of representatives from the City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, Arroyo Verdugo Council of Governments (COG), Gateway Cities COG, Las Virgenes Malibu COG, North County Transportation Coalition, San Gabriel Valley COG, and the South Bay Cities COG. The Working Group meets bi-monthly. Over the last nine (9) months, the Working Group has met four (4) times to develop criteria that will determine which arterials will be included as part of the regional network. The draft criteria are shown in Attachment A.

The development of the criteria has been an iterative process that started with 4,804 lane miles of arterials and has been reduced to 2,610 lane miles. The Project Team expects that over the next few months, as it continues to define the network, the number of arterial lane miles will be reduced even further.

Staff is also working to create a database of all arterial projects that have been programmed and/or funded since 1993. This database of arterial projects will include both Metro and non-Metro funding sources for the projects.

#### **NEXT STEPS**

Sub-regional outreach meetings will take place during the month of September and then the regional arterial network will be determined. As the regional arterial network is being defined, the Project Team and the Working Group will begin developing the methodology for measuring and monitoring the network's performance. In addition, during the next eight (8) months staff will complete the database of programmed/funded regional arterial improvements. It is anticipated that the network will be periodically reviewed and arterials added or deleted as conditions change. The Metro Board of Directors will be updated on a periodic basis as the Plan evolves.

### ATTACHMENT

A. Draft Criteria For Selection of Regionally Significant Arterials

Prepared by: Kathleen McCune, Project Manager, South Bay Area Planning Team

Metro Arterial Master Plan Page 2

Carol Inge

Carol Inge Interim Chief Planning Officer

Roger Snoble Chief Executive Officer

Metro Arterial Master Plan Page 3



Updated: July 21, 2005

**Criteria for Selection of Regionally Significant Arterials** 

<b>持順視5</b> ~~3	Criteria for Selection			
#	Baseline Criteria	Data Source	Discussion/Example ###	Tier
1	FHWA/Caltrans Functional	Caltrans	All Principal (Urban and	⋖
	Classification		Rural) Arterials in FHWA	Ħ
			System	CRITERIA
2	CMP Roadways	Metro	All non-freeway CMP routes	
			to be included	
3	Regional Transit Routes	Metro	Certain level and above (e.g.	
			20,000+ boardings)	Z
4	Traffic Volumes	Local	All arterials with a volume	9
		agencies/	threshold of at least 25,000	E
•		HPMS	ADT	) 
5	Goods Movement Significance	Metro/Cities	Designated truck routes and	SELECTION
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	arterials with heavy duty	<b>1</b> 2
			truck volumes over 1,000	
			and 4% of total ADT	A
6	Number of Lanes	Local	All arterials with a minimum	FINAL
		agencies	of 3-lanes in each direction	
7	Direct Access to Freeways	Caltrans	All routes with Freeway	
			Interchanges or grade	
			separations	
8	Traffic Operations and	Metro/	Part of "smart corridor", on	
	Significance in ITS Master Plan	City of LA/	ATSAC/ATCS system, above	<b>—</b>
-		LA County	a certain signal density, part	Z
		D' Courtey	of IEN- Information	Ш
			Exchange Network Traffic	2
	* .		Forums, etc.	
9	Multi-jurisdictional Connectivity	Metro	Number of cities crossed and	REFINEMENT
	and Continuity	T ICLI O	longer than a certain defined	<u> </u>
	in and containally		length	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
10	Use as a Freeway Alternate	Visual	Continuity and proximity,	
	ose as a receivaly rate made	Y ISAAI	congestion	2
11	Multimodal Corridors	Metro	LRT, BRT, Busway, express	STEM
	. idisiirioddi Corridoro	1 IGG O		S
12	Major Activity Centers	GIS/Land Use	bus routes, bikeways Major access route to	SY
		SIO/ Laria USC	airports, sea ports, regional	
		7 m 1 m 1 m 1 m 1 m 1 m 1 m 1 m 1 m 1 m	employment centers, transit	K
			centers, visitor/tourist	ပ္ပ
			centers	
13	Network Spacing Needs	Visual	To maintain a certain	CRITERIA FOR
	Traction opacing Necus	v isuai	minimum spacing between	~
			designated routes	Ш
14	Gap Closures	Visual		F
- I	Cup Ciosuics	visual	Completes gaps between	2
15	Connectivity with Adjacent	Visual	Other designated routes	U <sub>i</sub>
10	Counties With Adjacent	visuai	Routes that provide major	
	Counties		connections with adjacent	
		4	counties and their CMP	
:			system	