

Metro

*Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
3rd Floor Board Room*



Metro

Agenda - Final

Wednesday, June 15, 2016

1:00 PM

**One Gateway Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90012,
3rd Floor, Metro Board Room**

Finance, Budget and Audit Committee

Paul Krekorian, Chair

James Butts, Vice Chair

Diane DuBois

Mark Ridley-Thomas

Hilda Solis

Carrie Bowen, non-voting member

Phillip A. Washington, Chief Executive Officer

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY BOARD RULES (ALSO APPLIES TO BOARD COMMITTEES)

PUBLIC INPUT

A member of the public may address the Board on agenda items, before or during the Board or Committee's consideration of the item for one (1) minute per item, or at the discretion of the Chair. A request to address the Board should be submitted in person at the meeting to the Board Secretary. Individuals requesting to speak on more than three (3) agenda items will be allowed to speak up to a maximum of three (3) minutes per meeting. For individuals requiring translation service, time allowed will be doubled.

The public may also address the Board on non-agenda items within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board during the public comment period, which will be held at the beginning and/or end of each meeting. Each person will be allowed to speak for up to three (3) minutes per meeting and may speak no more than once during the Public Comment period. Speakers will be called according to the order in which the speaker request forms are received. Elected officials, not their staff or deputies, may be called out of order and prior to the Board's consideration of the relevant item.

In accordance with State Law (Brown Act), all matters to be acted on by the MTA Board must be posted at least 72 hours prior to the Board meeting. In case of emergency, or when a subject matter arises subsequent to the posting of the agenda, upon making certain findings, the Board may act on an item that is not on the posted agenda.

CONDUCT IN THE BOARD ROOM - The following rules pertain to conduct at Metropolitan Transportation Authority meetings:

REMOVAL FROM THE BOARD ROOM The Chair shall order removed from the Board Room any person who commits the following acts with respect to any meeting of the MTA Board:

- a. Disorderly behavior toward the Board or any member of the staff thereof, tending to interrupt the due and orderly course of said meeting.
- b. A breach of the peace, boisterous conduct or violent disturbance, tending to interrupt the due and orderly course of said meeting.
- c. Disobedience of any lawful order of the Chair, which shall include an order to be seated or to refrain from addressing the Board; and
- d. Any other unlawful interference with the due and orderly course of said meeting.

INFORMATION RELATING TO AGENDAS AND ACTIONS OF THE BOARD

Agendas for the Regular MTA Board meetings are prepared by the Board Secretary and are available prior to the meeting in the MTA Records Management Department and on the Internet. Every meeting of the MTA Board of Directors is recorded on CD's and as MP3's and can be made available for a nominal charge.

DISCLOSURE OF CONTRIBUTIONS

The State Political Reform Act (Government Code Section 84308) requires that a party to a proceeding before an agency involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use, including all contracts (other than competitively bid, labor, or personal employment contracts), shall disclose on the record of the proceeding any contributions in an amount of more than \$250 made within the preceding 12 months by the party, or his or her agent, to any officer of the agency, additionally PUC Code Sec. 130051.20 requires that no member accept a contribution of over ten dollars (\$10) in value or amount from a construction company, engineering firm, consultant, legal firm, or any company, vendor, or business entity that has contracted with the authority in the preceding four years. Persons required to make this disclosure shall do so by filling out a "Disclosure of Contribution" form which is available at the LACMTA Board and Committee Meetings. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in the assessment of civil or criminal penalties.

ADA REQUIREMENTS

Upon request, sign language interpretation, materials in alternative formats and other accommodations are available to the public for MTA-sponsored meetings and events. All requests for reasonable accommodations must be made at least three working days (72 hours) in advance of the scheduled meeting date. Please telephone (213) 922-4600 between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. Our TDD line is (800) 252-9040.

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

A Spanish language interpreter is available at all Board Meetings. Interpreters for Committee meetings and all other languages must be requested 72 hours in advance of the meeting by calling (213) 922-4600 or (323) 466-3876.



323.466.3876 x2

Español

323.466.3876 x3

한국어	日本語
中文	русский
Հայերէն	ภาษาไทย
Tiếng Việt	ភាសាខ្មែរ

HELPFUL PHONE NUMBERS

Copies of Agendas/Record of Board Action/Recordings of Meetings - (213) 922-4880 (Records Management Department)
General Information/Rules of the Board - (213) 922-4600
Internet Access to Agendas - www.metro.net
TDD line (800) 252-9040

NOTE: ACTION MAY BE TAKEN ON ANY ITEM IDENTIFIED ON THE AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

12. APPROVE Consent Calendar Items: 13, 14 and 15.

Consent Calendar items are approved by one motion unless held by a Director for discussion and/or separate action.

CONSENT CALENDAR

13. RECEIVE AND FILE the: [2016-0308](#)

- A. Fiscal Year (FY) 2013-2015 **Triennial Performance Review of Los Angeles County Transit Operators and Metro Operations**, summarized in Attachment A; and
- B. FY 2013-2015 Triennial Performance Review of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) as the Regional Transportation Agency (RTPA), summarized in Attachment B.

Attachments: [Attachment A - FY2013-2015 Performance Review, Executive Summary of Trar](#)
[Attachment B - FY2013-2015 Performance Review, Executive Summary of LAC](#)

14. ADOPT: [2016-0318](#)

- A. Findings and Recommendations (Attachment A) for **allocating fiscal year (FY) 2016-17 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 funds estimated at \$25,188,543** as follows:
 - 1. In the City of Avalon there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, therefore TDA Article 8 funds (Attachment B) in the amount of \$150,107 may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects, as described in Attachment A;
 - 2. In the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, transit needs are met using other funding sources, such as Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return. Therefore, TDA Article 8 funds in the amount of \$6,285,096 and \$6,137,530 (Lancaster and Palmdale, respectively) may be used for street and road

purposes and/or transit, as long as their transit needs continue to be met;

3. In the City of Santa Clarita, transit needs are met with other funding sources, such as Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return. Therefore, TDA Article 8 funds in the amount of \$8,335,265 for the City of Santa Clarita may be used for street and road and/or transit, as long as their transit needs continue to be met;
4. In the Los Angeles County Unincorporated areas of North County, the areas encompassing both the Antelope Valley and the Santa Clarita Valley, transit needs are met with other funding sources, such as Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return. Therefore, TDA Article 8 funds in the amount of \$4,280,545 may be used for street and road purposes and/or transit, as long as their transit needs continue to be met; and

- B. A resolution (Attachment C) making a determination of unmet public transportation needs in the areas of Los Angeles County outside the Metro service area.

Attachments: [A- FY17proposedfindingsandrecommendations](#)
[B- TDA8ApportionmentAttachmentB](#)
[C- FY2016-17TDAarticle8resolutionC](#)
[D- HistoryanddefinitionsTDA8D](#)
[E - TDA Article 8 Public HearingprocessE](#)
[F- Summary of Comments](#)
[G - City Letters](#)
[H - ProposedRecommendationofSSTAC](#)

15. CONSIDER:

[2016-0454](#)

- A. **APPROVING \$1.8 billion in FY2017 Transit Fund Allocations for Los Angeles County jurisdictions, transit operators and Metro operations** as shown in Attachment A. These allocations comply with federal and state regulations and LACMTA Board policies and guidelines.

1. Planning and Administrative allocations of Transportation Development Act (TDA), Proposition A, Proposition C and Measure R in the amount of \$73.4 million as shown in Attachment A, page 2 Line 37.
2. Bus Transit Subsidies of State and Local funds in the amount of \$934.9 million as shown in Attachment A, page 3.

3. Allocation of Federal Formula Grants in the amount of \$349.1 million as shown in Attachment A, pages 12-13.
 4. Proposition A Incentive Programs in the amount of \$15.3 million as shown in Attachment A, pages 19-21.
 5. Proposition A Local Return, Proposition C Local Return, Measure R Local Return, TDA Article 3 (Pedestrian and Bikeways) and TDA Article 8 (Streets and Highways) for \$496.4 million as shown in Attachment A, pages 22-24.
- B. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer to adjust FY2017 Federal Section 5307 (Urbanized Formula), Section 5339 (Bus and Bus Facilities) and Section 5337 (State of Good Repair) allocations upon receipt of final apportionment from the Federal Transit Authority and amend FY2017 budget as necessary to reflect the aforementioned adjustment.
- C. APPROVING fund exchange in the amount of \$6 million of Santa Monica's Big Blue Bus' FY2017 Federal Section 5307 formula share allocation with Metro's TDA Article 4 allocation.
- D. APPROVING fund exchange of Federal Section 5307 discretionary fund awarded to the Southern California Regional Transit Training Consortium (SCR TTC) through Long Beach Transit in the amount of \$250,000 with Metro's TDA Article 4 allocation.
- E. APPROVING fund exchanges in the amount totaling \$11.5 million of Metro's share of Federal Section 5307 with municipal operators' shares of Federal Sections 5339 and 5337.
- F. ADOPTING a resolution designating Transportation Development Act (TDA) and State Transit Assistance (STA) fund allocations in compliance to the terms and conditions of the allocation (Attachment C); and
- G. Upon approval, AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements to implement the above funding programs.

Attachments: [Attachment A - FY 2017 Transit Fund Allocations](#)
[Attachment B- Summary of Significant Information, Methodologies and Assump](#)
[Attachment C - TDA and STA Resolution](#)

NON-CONSENT

16. AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements between Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) and the Cities for their Capital Reserve Accounts as approved; and: [2016-0254](#)

- A. ESTABLISH **Measure R Local Return funded Capital Reserve Account for the City of Beverly Hills**, as described in Attachment A;
- B. ESTABLISH **Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return funded Capital Reserve Account for the City of Burbank**, as described in Attachment A;
- C. APPROVE three year extension of **Proposition C Local Return Capital Reserve Account for the Cities of Beverly Hills, El Monte, Lynwood and Manhattan Beach**, as described in Attachment A.

Attachments: [ATTACHMENT A](#)

17. AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer to **negotiate and award excess liability insurance policies** with up to \$300 million in limits at a cost not to exceed \$4.25 million for the 12-month period effective August 1, 2016 to August 1, 2017. [2016-0406](#)

Attachments: [Attachment A - Freight Railroads Shared Use Agreement.pdf](#)
[Attachment B - Options, Premiums and Loss History.pdf](#)

18. CONSIDER: [2016-0433](#)

- A. APPROVING the **Southern California Regional Rail Authority's (SCRRA) FY 2016-17 (FY17) Annual Work Program** pursuant to their April 29, 2016, budget transmittal (Attachment A).
- B. APPROVING the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's (LACMTA) share of SCRRA FY17 Metrolink funding totaling \$88,825,701 for programs detailed in Table 1.
- C. EXTENDING the lapsing dates for funds previously allocated to SCRRA for the Rehabilitation and Renovation Program as follows:

FY 2010-11 from June 30, 2016 to June 30, 2017 - \$1,774,223
FY 2011-12 from June 30, 2016 to June 30, 2017 - \$2,830,282
FY 2012-13 from June 30, 2016 to June 30, 2017 - \$5,024,401

- D. APPROVING the FY17 Transfers to Other Operators payment rate of \$1.10 per boarding to LACMTA and an EZ Pass reimbursement cap to LACMTA of \$5,592,000.
- E. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements between LACMTA and the SCRRRA for the approved funding.
- F. RECEIVING AND FILING update to March 24, 2016 Board Motion 40.1 on Equitable Governance on Southern California Regional Rail Authority.

Attachments: [Transmittal to Member Agencies for FY17 Budget - dated 04.29.16 \(6\)](#)

19. APPROVE local funding request for **Access Services** (Access) in an amount not to exceed \$84,124,902 for FY17. This amount includes:

[2016-0449](#)

- A. \$74M in Operating and Capital funds from Proposition C 40% Discretionary (PC 40%);
- B. \$8M in Operating and Capital unspent carry-over PC 40% funds from FY16; and
- C. \$2.1M in funds paid directly to Metrolink for its participation in Access' Free Fare Program from Proposition C 10% Commuter Rail (PC 10%)

Attachments: [ATTACHMENT A - Metro Board Item-AccessFY17Budget](#)

Adjournment

Consideration of items not on the posted agenda, including: items to be presented and (if requested) referred to staff; items to be placed on the agenda for action at a future meeting of the Committee or Board; and/or items requiring immediate action because of an emergency situation or where the need to take immediate action came to the attention of the Committee subsequent to the posting of the agenda.



Board Report

File #: 2016-0308, File Type: Informational Report

Agenda Number: 13.

FINANCE, BUDGET AND AUDIT COMMITTEE JUNE 15, 2016

SUBJECT: FISCAL YEAR 2013-2015 TRIENNIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW REPORT

ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE FISCAL YEAR 2013-2015 TRIENNIAL REVIEW REPORT

RECOMMENDATION

RECEIVE AND FILE the:

- A. Fiscal Year (FY) 2013-2015 **Triennial Performance Review of Los Angeles County Transit Operators and Metro Operations**, summarized in Attachment A; and
- B. FY 2013-2015 Triennial Performance Review of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) as the Regional Transportation Agency (RTPA), summarized in Attachment B.

ISSUE

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) requires Triennial Performance Reviews of Transit Operators and RTPAs and a certification of completion to be submitted to the State by June 30, 2016. The FY 2013-2015 Triennial Performance Review Report is completed and the report presents the results of the review.

DISCUSSION

The California Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 99246, included in the Transportation Development Act (TDA), requires LACMTA to conduct an independent performance review of all Los Angeles County Transit Operators receiving TDA Article 4 funds, as well as operators receiving Proposition A funds in lieu of TDA funds. The TDA also requires that regional transportation planning agencies (RTPAs) undergo an independent performance review, focusing particularly on the planning roles. The review is conducted every three years, and the LACMTA must send a Certificate of Completion to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), so that the LACMTA may receive and allocate TDA and State Transit Assistance (STA) funds for Los Angeles County.

Under contract to the LACMTA, the firm of Lin Ma & Associates, Inc. independently conducted the FY

2013-2015 Performance Review of the Transit Operators, Metro Operations and the LACMTA, as the RTPA for Los Angeles County. The following Section 1, describes the scope of the review for Los Angeles County transit operators and Metro operations and a summary of the Findings:

1. REVIEW OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSIT OPERATORS AND METRO OPERATIONS

The following Los Angeles County transit operators were included in this review:

- City of Arcadia
- City of Claremont
- City of Commerce
- City of Culver City
- City of Gardena
- City of La Mirada
- Long Beach Public Transportation Company
- City of Montebello
- City of Norwalk
- City of Redondo Beach
- City of Santa Monica
- City of Torrance
- Foothill Transit
- Antelope Valley Transit Authority
- City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation
- City of Santa Clarita
- Metro Operations

Also, for the first time, included are the Tier 2 operators as follows:

- City of Burbank
- City of Glendale
- City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation - Community DASH Services
- City of Pasadena

The FY 2013-2015 Performance Audit included all State-mandated elements:

- Verification of TDA data collection and reporting requirements;
- Compliance with (PUC) requirements;
- Progress in implementing prior review recommendations;
- Review of TDA performance indicator trend analysis; and
- High level functional area performance review.

In addition, the audit reviewed operators' data submitted for the LACMTA's Transit Performance Measurement Program (TPM). The LACMTA uses the TPM data to allocate transit subsidy funds to

Los Angeles County Transit Operators, including Metro Operations.

1.1 Findings

All Transit Operators, including Metro Operations, are in full or partial compliance with TDA requirements for Transit Operators. Transit Operators have addressed the majority of recommendations included within the prior performance review. A summary of the Operator audits is provided in Attachment A.

2. REVIEW OF THE MTA AS THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (RTPA)

The review of the LACMTA as the RTPA included:

- Progress on implementing prior cycle review recommendations;
- Compliance with PUC requirements; and
- Performance results for the LACMTA as the RTPA

2.1 Findings:

Progress on Implementing Prior Cycle Review Recommendations

The prior review of the LACMTA as the RTPA offered four recommendations for LACMTA's consideration. Three recommendations have been implemented. The fourth recommendation is carried forward as an element of the current review.

Compliance with PUC Requirements

The LACMTA is in full compliance with the fifteen PUC requirements for RTPA's that apply specifically to the LACMTA.

Performance results for the LACMTA as the RTPA

According to the review, the LACMTA has performed its TDA responsibilities effectively. Notable accomplishments cited in the FY13-FY15 review include:

- Opening of ExpressLanes on the I-110 and I-10 freeways.
- Metro Rail began locking turnstiles in an effort to address lost fare revenue.
- Began construction of the new Division 13 Bus Maintenance and Operations facility across from Union Station
- Metro was named a Top Achiever in Supplier Diversity by the Black EOE Journal.
- The EZ Transit Pass fully transitioned to the TAP program.
- Celebration of the 75th anniversary of Union Station.
- Opening of Online Metro Store and launch of the Go511 app for iPhone, iPad, and Android.
- The Metro Board approved continuation of the ExpressLanes project following its one-year

demonstration period.

- Broke ground on its Crenshaw/LAX Transit Project.
- Metro Motion won an Emmy award for its Union Station 75th Anniversary TV show.
- Metro CEO Art Leahy's departure was announced and new CEO Phillip Washington was hired.
- Metro's Complete Streets Policy was recognized by Smart Growth America's National Complete Streets Coalition.
- Metro introduced new online and real-time technology.

This review also identified areas and opportunities to make the LACMTA, as the RTPA, more efficient and effective. The review offers the following recommendation, which was carried forward from the prior review:

- Enhance coordination between the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and Planning departments.

A summary of the key findings of the FY 2013-2015 Triennial Performance Review of LACMTA as the RTPA are summarized in Attachment B.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

There are no financial or budget impacts.

NEXT STEPS

As required by PUC §99246, staff will transmit the FY 2013-2015 Triennial Performance Review to the State Department of Transportation. Copies of the report are available upon request. Staff will report on the progress of the recommendations to the LACMTA Board annually.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - FY 2013-2015 Performance Review, Executive Summary of Transit Operators and Metro Operation

Attachment B - FY 2013-2015 Performance Review, Executive Summary of LACMTA as the RTPA

Prepared by: Kelly Hines, Deputy Executive Officer, (213) 922-2369
Armineh Saint, Transportation Planning Manager, (213) 922-2369

Reviewed by: Nalini Ahuja, Executive Director, (213) 922-3088



Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer



**Municipal Operators and Metro Operations
FY 2012/13 – FY 2014/15 Triennial
Performance Review
Executive Summary
June 2016**

Legislative Mandate

The State of California mandates LACMTA hire an independent firm to review 14 operators receiving TDA Article 4 funds. Three additional operators do not receive TDA Article 4 funds but receive their equivalent under Metro's Formula Allocation Program (FAP). In addition, four Tier Two operators were included in the current review process. These operators commit to meeting the same mandated compliance requirements as those receiving TDA funds. The mandate includes the following assessments:

- Progress implementing prior recommendations;
- Compliance with PUC requirements; and
- Efficiency, effectiveness, and productivity.

This Triennial Performance Review covers the three-year period ending June 30, 2015.

Municipal Operators

Findings

Municipal operators are generally in compliance with PUC requirements. The majority of findings relate to the following issues:

- Issues related to Full-time Equivalent metric reporting,
- Submitting State Controller reports past TDA-established deadlines,
- Achieving an unaided farebox recovery ratio of at least 20 percent, and
- Consistency in data reporting.

Many prior recommendations have been implemented. Those that have not have been carried forward as recommendations as part of this review.

Challenges

Challenges faced by municipal operators during the review period included the following:

- Achieving ridership growth while reducing operating costs,
- Accommodating increased need with fewer resources, and
- Increasing fare revenue to the point where minimum farebox recovery can be met without relying on additional local subsidies.

Accomplishments

While each operator faced its own challenges and celebrated its own accomplishments during the review period, some of the more notable accomplishments are listed below.

- Region-wide: Continued implementation and integration of the TAP universal fare program.
- AVTA: Received the California Transit Association's 2012 Small Operators Transit Excellence Award, launched a successful electric bus demonstration project, and implemented its Track-It Intelligent Transportation System.
- Arcadia: Conducted a Transit Needs Assessment and prepared to launch its two-tiered service concurrent with the opening of the Metro Gold Line Extension in 2016.
- Burbank: Launched its first all-day service, the NoHo-Airport Route, offering service between the NoHo Red Line Station and Burbank Bob Hope Airport.
- Claremont: Transitioned to a new operations contractor and prepared to conduct an assessment of its Dial-A-Ride program.
- Commerce: Upgraded its CNG/LNG fueling station, made bus stop improvements, and launched TransTrack.
- Culver City: Took over operations of the City's Dial-A-Ride van service, began implementing real-time technology, and adjusted service to connect to Metro's Expo Line.
- Foothill Transit: Began using in-house management staff rather than contracting out all employees and launched Line 495, a pilot project connecting the San Gabriel Valley with downtown Los Angeles.
- Gardena: Rebranded its transit program as GTrans, with new bus graphics, signage, logo, and website.
- Glendale: Began participating in the regional TAP universal fare program.
- La Mirada: Began working toward implementation of the regional TAP universal fare program.
- LADOT: Opened the LADOT Transit Store in the LA Mall adjacent to City Hall and completed the installation of new bus stop signage in downtown Los Angeles.
- Montebello: Launched its Avail project and real-time bus tracker.
- Norwalk: Completed construction on a \$2.6 million CNG refueling station.
- Pasadena: Launched its Transit Vehicle Arrival Information System and rebranded the service as Pasadena Transit.
- Santa Clarita: Opened its McBean Transit Center Park and Ride Facility.
- Santa Monica: Eliminated its charter bus program and restructured staffing to improve service delivery and customer communications.
- Torrance: Left the MAX program and expanded its fixed-route service to 11 routes.

Metro Operations

Findings

Metro Operations is in compliance with the TDA in all aspects. However, a functional finding regarding the calculation of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) employees was set forth. Given Metro Operations' unique challenges in calculating FTE for the State Controller's Report due to the lack of availability of audited data at the time the report is prepared, we find a need for additional documentation of discussions with the State Controller's Office to be incorporated into future such reviews.

Of the two prior recommendations, both were found to be no longer relevant. The recommendations dealt with the calculation of FTE and its reporting on the State Controller's Report. Given the additional information provided during the course of this review, both were found to be invalid.

Challenges

Challenges faced by Metro Operations during the review period included the following:

- A change in executive leadership, and
- Aging fleet and infrastructure.

Accomplishments

Some of Metro's more notable operational accomplishments are listed below.

- Metro Rail began locking turnstiles in an effort to reduce lost fare revenue.
- Metro began construction of the new Division 13 Bus Maintenance and Operations facility across from Union Station.
- The EZ Transit Pass was fully transitioned to the TAP program.
- Metro opened its online Metro Store and launched the Go511 app for iPhone, iPad, and Android.
- Metro broke ground on its Crenshaw/LAX Transit Project.

Recommendations


- Provide documentation of the alternative FTE calculation method approved by the State Controller when audited work hour data is not yet available prior to the next Triennial Performance Review.

Countywide Performance¹

Exhibits on the following pages compare aggregate and average performance metrics of the municipal operators to Metro Operations. Overall, the municipal operators and Metro exhibited similar trends throughout the current and prior review periods. A six-year period (FY 2009/10 through FY 2014/15) is used to better illustrate trends.

Ridership

Overall, municipal ridership declined during the six-year period. At the end of the review period, aggregate ridership had dropped 5.7 percent since FY 2009/10, but was up 0.9 percent from its lowest point in FY 2011/12. Metro ridership saw its lowest point in FY 2010/11 and rose through FY 2014/15, at which time it dropped back down to near-FY 2010/11 levels. By contrast, national transit ridership rose steadily between FY 2009/10 and FY 2014/15, increasing by a net 5.5 percent before dropping 1.3 percent in FY 2014/15.²




¹ Note: FY 2009/10 – FY 2011/12 data does not include metrics for the cities of Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena.

² National ridership trend data from the American Public Transportation Association.


Vehicle Service Hours (VSH)

Metro VSH dropped a net 0.8 percent across the six-year period, characterized by a decrease of 5.6 percent between FY 2009/10 and FY 2011/12 followed by a steady increase. Municipal operators saw experienced a similar pattern with decreases during the first three years followed by increases during the current review period. Municipal operators experienced a net 0.1 percent decline across the six-year period.




Cost per Vehicle Service Hour

Cost/VSH rose steadily for both Metro and the municipal operators. Metro’s Cost/VSH increased 16.6 percent across the six-year period, while the municipal operators saw an aggregate increase of 10.7 percent.




Cost per Passenger

Cost/passenger also rose during the six-year period. Municipal operators' cost/passenger saw its lowest point in FY 2012/13 before peaking at a six-year high in FY 2014/15 (a net increase of 6.6 percent). Metro saw a 17.2 percent net increase, steady except for a slight dip in FY 2011/12.




Passengers per Vehicle Service Hour

Metro's Passengers/VSH increased through FY 2012/13, but saw a net decline of 0.4 percent across the six-year period. Municipal operators saw a net decrease of 5.6 percent, which happened gradually between FY 2011/12 and FY 2014/15.



Farebox Recovery Ratio³

Metro’s farebox recovery fluctuated as much as 7.3 percent during the six-year period, ultimately ending the period 2.7 percent lower than it began. Municipal operators experienced similar trends but noted an overall net increase of 4.8 percent across the six-year period.



³ Note: Local subsidies were not included in the calculations used for this graphic. As such, the average farebox recovery ratio for municipal operators for FY 2009/10 is below 20 percent. All operators were found to be in compliance with TDA after local subsidies were taken into account.

Summary of TDA Compliance Findings

The following matrix summarized the TDA compliance findings for each of the transit operators. Those with no columns marked had no compliance findings.

	On-time State Controller Reports	Calculation of FTE metric
AVTA		
Arcadia		
Burbank		
Claremont	X	X
Commerce		
Culver City		
Foothill Transit		
Gardena		
Glendale		
LADOT		
La Mirada		
Long Beach		
Metro Operations		
Montebello		
Norwalk		
Pasadena	X	
Redondo Beach		
Santa Clarita		X
Santa Monica		
Torrance		X

Summary of Functional Findings

The following matrix summarized the functional findings for each of the transit operators. Functional findings addressed issues not relevant to TDA compliance identified through the functional review process. Those with no columns marked had no functional findings.

	Did not implement one or more prior recommendations	Unsubsidized farebox below 20 percent ⁴	Inconsistent data reporting	Incorrect reporting on State Controller Report	Other
AVTA					
Arcadia	X	X			
Burbank		X		X	
Claremont	X	X			
Commerce	X				
Culver City			X	X	
Foothill Transit					X
Gardena		X	X	X	
Glendale		X			X
LADOT		X	X		
La Mirada	X	X	X		
Long Beach					
Metro Operations					X
Montebello		X			X
Norwalk	X	X	X		
Pasadena		X	X		
Redondo Beach		X			
Santa Clarita					
Santa Monica					
Torrance		X			

⁴ The industry standard for urbanized transit program is generally considered to be 20 percent. All operators are in compliance with the TDA through the use of local subsidies. This functional finding examines the operators' farebox recovery ratios without the addition of local subsidies to assess the productivity of the transit program.

Legislative Mandate

The State of California mandates LACMTA hire an independent firm to review its role as a Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA). The mandate includes the following assessments:

- Progress implementing prior recommendations;
- Compliance with PUC requirements; and
- Efficiency, effectiveness, and productivity.

This Triennial Performance Review covers the three-year period ending June 30, 2015.

Findings

The RTPA is in full compliance with PUC requirements.

Of the four prior recommendations, three were implemented. The one remaining recommendation, which called for enhanced coordination between the Office of Management and Budget and the Planning Department, was carried forward to this review.

Challenges

Challenges faced by Metro as the RTPA during the review period included the following:

- A change in executive leadership,
- An agency-wide lack of succession planning, and
- Effective coordination and communication between departments.

Accomplishments

- Opening of ExpressLanes on the I-110 and I-10 freeways.
- Metro Rail began locking turnstiles in an effort to address lost fare revenue.
- Began construction of the new Division 13 Bus Maintenance and Operations facility across from Union Station.
- Metro was named a Top Achiever in Supplier Diversity by the Black EOE Journal.
- The EZ Transit Pass fully transitioned to the TAP program.
- Los Angeles Mayor and Metro Board Member Antonio Villaraigosa received APTA's 2012 Distinguished Service Award for his contributions to the public transportation industry through policy, legislative initiative, and leadership.
- Celebration of the 75th anniversary of Union Station.
- Opening of online Metro Store and launch of the Go511 app for iPhone, iPad,

- and Android.
- The Metro Board approved continuation of the ExpressLanes project following its one-year demonstration period.
- Broke ground on its Crenshaw/LAX Transit Project.
- Metro Motion won an Emmy award for its Union Station 75th Anniversary TV show.
- Metro's Complete Streets Policy was recognized by Smart Growth America's National Complete Streets Coalition.
- Metro introduced new online and real-time technology.

Recommendations

Metro functioning as the RTPA had no compliance recommendations.

Functional Recommendations

- Enhance coordination between the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and Planning departments.

**Board Report**

File #: 2016-0318, **File Type:** Resolution

Agenda Number: 14

**FINANCE, BUDGET AND AUDIT COMMITTEE
JUNE 15, 2016**

SUBJECT: TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ARTICLE 8 FUND PROGRAM

**ACTION: ADOPT FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESOLUTION FOR FY 2016-17
TDA ARTICLE 8 UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS**

RECOMMENDATION

ADOPT:

- A. Findings and Recommendations (Attachment A) for **allocating fiscal year (FY) 2016-17 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 funds estimated at \$25,188,543** as follows:
1. In the City of Avalon there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, therefore TDA Article 8 funds (Attachment B) in the amount of \$150,107 may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects, as described in Attachment A;
 2. In the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, transit needs are met using other funding sources, such as Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return. Therefore, TDA Article 8 funds in the amount of \$6,285,096 and \$6,137,530 (Lancaster and Palmdale, respectively) may be used for street and road purposes and/or transit, as long as their transit needs continue to be met;
 3. In the City of Santa Clarita, transit needs are met with other funding sources, such as Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return. Therefore, TDA Article 8 funds in the amount of \$8,335,265 for the City of Santa Clarita may be used for street and road and/or transit, as long as their transit needs continue to be met;
 4. In the Los Angeles County Unincorporated areas of North County, the areas encompassing both the Antelope Valley and the Santa Clarita Valley, transit needs are met with other funding sources, such as Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return. Therefore, TDA Article 8 funds in the amount of \$4,280,545 may be used for street and road purposes and/or transit, as long as their transit needs continue to be met; and

-
- B. A resolution (Attachment C) making a determination of unmet public transportation needs in the areas of Los Angeles County outside the Metro service area.

ISSUE

State law requires that the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) make findings regarding unmet transit needs in areas outside Metro's service area. If there are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, then these needs must be met before TDA Article 8 funds may be allocated for street and road purposes.

DISCUSSION

Under the State of California TDA Article 8 statute, state transportation funds are allocated to the portions of Los Angeles County outside Metro's service area. These funds are for "unmet transit needs that may be reasonable to meet". However, if no such needs exist, the funds can be spent for street and road purposes. See Attachment D for a brief summary of the history of TDA Article 8 and definitions of unmet transit needs.

Before allocating TDA Article 8 funds, the Act requires Metro to conduct a public hearing process (Attachment E). If there are determinations that there are unmet transit needs, which are reasonable to meet and we adopt such a finding, then these needs must be met before TDA Article 8 funds can be used for street and road purposes. By law, we must adopt a resolution annually that states our findings regarding unmet transit needs. Attachment C is the FY 2016-17 resolution. The proposed findings and recommendations are based on public testimony (Attachment F) and the recommendations of the SSTAC and the Hearing Board.

POLICY IMPLICATION

Staff has followed state law in conducting public hearings and obtaining input from the Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) regarding unmet transit needs. The SSTAC is comprised of social service providers and other interested parties in the North County areas. Attachment G summarizes the recommendations made and actions taken during FY 2015-16 (for the FY 2016-17 allocation estimates) and Attachment H is the proposed recommendations of the FY16-17 SSTAC. On April 1, 2016, the TDA Article 8 Hearing Board was convened on behalf of the Board of Directors to conduct the required public hearing process. The Hearing Board developed findings and made recommendations for using TDA Article 8 funds based on the input from the SSTAC and the public hearing process.

Upon transmittal of the Board-adopted findings and documentation of the hearings process to Caltrans Headquarters, and upon Caltrans approval, funds will be released for allocation to the eligible jurisdictions. Delay in adopting the findings, recommendations and the resolution contained in Attachments A and C would delay the allocation of \$25,188,543 in TDA Article 8 funds to the recipient local jurisdictions.

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

Approval of this project will have no impact on Safety.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The TDA Article 8 funds for FY 2016-17 are estimated at \$25,188,543 (Attachment B). The funding for this action is included in the FY17 Proposed Budget in cost center 0443, project number 410059 TDA Subsidies - Article 8.

TDA Article 8 funds are state sales tax revenues that state law designates for use by Los Angeles County local jurisdictions outside of Metro's service area. Metro allocates TDA Article 8 funds based on population and disburse them monthly, once each jurisdiction's claim form is received, reviewed and approved.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board of Directors could adopt findings or conditions other than those developed in consultation with the Hearing Board, with input from the state-required SSTAC (Attachment H) and through the public hearing process. However, this is not recommended because adopting the proposed findings and recommendations made by the SSTAC and adopted by the Hearing Board have been developed through a public hearing process, as described in Attachment E, and in accordance with the TDA statutory requirements.

NEXT STEPS


Once Caltrans reviews and approves the Board-adopted resolution and documentation of the hearing process, we will receive TDA Article 8 funds to allocate to the recipient local jurisdictions.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. FY17 Proposed Findings and Recommended Actions
- B. TDA Article 8 Apportionments: Estimates for FY2016-17
- C. FY2016-17 TDA Article 8 Resolution
- D. History of TDA Article 8 and Definitions of Unmet Transit Needs
- E. TDA Article 8 Public Hearing Process
- F. FY17 Comment Summary Sheet - TDA Article 8 Unmet Transit Needs Public Testimony and Written Comments
- G. Summary of Recommendations and Actions Taken
- H. Proposed Recommendations of the FY2016-17 SSTAC

Prepared by: Kelly Hines, Deputy Executive Officer, Finance (213)-922-4569
Armineh Saint, Program Manager, Local Programming (213) 922- 2369

Reviewed by: Nalini Ahuja, Executive Director, Finance and Budget, (213) 922-3088



Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer

FY 2016-17 TDA ARTICLE 8

PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

CATALINA ISLAND AREA

- Proposed Findings - In the City of Avalon, there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet; therefore TDA Article 8 funds may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects.
- Recommended Actions - City of Avalon address the following and implement if reasonable to meet: 1) maintain funding sources for transit services.

ANTELOPE VALLEY AREA

- Proposed Findings – There are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet; in the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale and the unincorporated portions of North Los Angeles County, existing transit needs can be met through using other existing funding sources. Therefore, TDA Article 8 funds may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects.
- Recommended Actions – Antelope Valley Transit Authority (AVTA) address the following: 1) continue to evaluate funding opportunities for transit services.

SANTA CLARITA VALLEY AREA

- Proposed Findings - There are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet; in the City of Santa Clarita, and the unincorporated portions of the Santa Clarita Valley, existing transit needs can be met through the recommended actions using other funding sources. Therefore, TDA Article 8 funds may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects.
- Recommended Actions - Santa Clarita Transit address the following: 1) continue to evaluate funding opportunities for transit services.

ATTACHMENT B

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
FY 2017 TDA ARTICLE 8 APPORTIONMENTS
 (Transit/Streets & Highways)

AGENCY	POPULATION [1]	ARTICLE 8 PERCENTAGE	ALLOCATION OF TDA ARTICLE 8 REVENUE
Avalon	3,840	0.60%	\$ 150,107
Lancaster	160,784	24.95%	6,285,096
Palmdale	157,009	24.37%	6,137,530
Santa Clarita	213,231	33.09%	8,335,265
LA County [2]	<u>109,504</u>	<u>16.99%</u>	<u>4,280,545</u>
Unincorporated			
Total	644,368	100.00%	\$ 25,188,543
		Estimated Revenues: \$	25,188,543

[1] Population estimates are based on State of California Department of Finance census 2014 data-report

[2] The Unincorporated Population figure is based on 2007 estimates by Urban Research minus annexation figures from Santa Clarita increased population of 26,518 (2012 annexation)

**RESOLUTION OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION
AUTHORITY MAKING A DETERMINATION AS TO
UNMET PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION NEEDS IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016-17**

WHEREAS, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) is the designated Transportation Planning agency for the County of Los Angeles and is, therefore, responsible for the administration of the Transportation Development Act, Public Utilities Code Section 99200 et seq.; and

WHEREAS, under Sections 99238, 99238.5, 99401.5 and 99401.6, of the Public Utilities Code, before any allocations are made for local street and road use, a public hearing must be held and from a review of the testimony and written comments received and the adopted Regional Transportation Plan, make a finding that 1) there are no unmet transit needs; 2) there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet; or 3) there are unmet transit needs, including needs that are reasonable to meet; and

WHEREAS, at its meetings of June 25, 1998 and June 24, 1999, the Board of Directors approved definitions of unmet transit need and reasonable to meet transit need; and

WHEREAS, public hearings were held by LACMTA in Los Angeles County in Avalon on February 16, 2016, Santa Clarita on February 24, 2016 Palmdale on February 24, 2016, Lancaster on February 24, 2016, after sufficient public notice of intent was given, at which time public testimony was received; and

WHEREAS, a Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) was formed by LACMTA and has recommended actions to meet the transit needs in the areas outside the LACMTA service area; and

WHEREAS, a Hearing Board was appointed by LACMTA, and has considered the public hearing comments and the recommendations of the SSTAC; and

WHEREAS, the SSTAC and Hearing Board reaffirmed the definitions of unmet transit need and reasonable to meet transit need; and

WHEREAS, staff in consultation with the Hearing Board recommends the finding that in the City of Avalon there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet; therefore TDA Article 8 funds may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects; and

ATTACHMENT C

(Page 2 of 3)

WHEREAS, staff in consultation with the Hearing Board recommends the finding that in the City of Santa Clarita, and the unincorporated portions of the Santa Clarita Valley, there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet. In the City of Santa Clarita, and the unincorporated portions of the Santa Clarita Valley, existing transit needs can be met through the recommended actions using other funding sources. Therefore, TDA Article 8 funds may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects.

WHEREAS, staff in consultation with the Hearing Board recommends the finding that there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet. In the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale and the unincorporated portions of North Los Angeles County, existing transit needs can be met through using other existing funding sources. Therefore, TDA Article 8 funds may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects.

NOW THEREFORE,

- 1.0 The Board of Directors approves on an on-going basis the definition of Unmet Transit Needs as any transportation need, identified through the public hearing process, which could be met through the implementation or improvement of transit or paratransit services; and the definition of Reasonable to Meet Transit Need as any unmet transit needs that can be met, in whole or in part, through the allocation of available transit revenue and be operated in a cost efficient and service effective manner, without negatively impacting existing public and private transit options.
- 2.0 The Board hereby finds that, in the City of Avalon, there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet; therefore TDA Article 8 funds may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects.
- 3.0 The Board hereby finds that in the City of Santa Clarita, and the unincorporated portions of the Santa Clarita Valley, there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet. In the City of Santa Clarita, and the unincorporated portions of the Santa Clarita Valley, existing transit needs can be met through the recommended actions using other funding sources. Therefore, TDA Article 8 funds may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects.
- 4.0 The Board hereby finds that in the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale and the unincorporated portions of North Los Angeles County, there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet. In the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale and the unincorporated portions of North Los Angeles County, existing transit needs can be met through using other existing funding sources. Therefore, TDA Article 8 funds may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects.

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned, duly qualified and acting as the Board Secretary of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, certifies that the foregoing is a true and correct representation of the Resolution adopted at a legally convened meeting of the Board of Directors of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority held on Thursday, June 23, 2016.

MICHELE JACKSON
LACMTA Board Secretary

DATED: June 23, 2016

History of Transportation Development Act (TDA) 8

The Mills-Alquist-Deddeh act, better known as the Transportation Development Act (SB325), was enacted in 1971 to provide funding for transit or non-transit related purposes that comply with regional transportation plans. Funding for Article 8 was included in the original bill.

In 1992, after the consolidation of SCRTD and LACTC, AB1136 (Knight) was enacted to continue the flow of TDA 8 funds to outlying cities which were outside of the SCRTD's service area.

Permanent Adoption of Unmet Transit Needs Definitions

Definitions of Unmet Transit Need and Reasonable to meet transit needs were originally developed by the SSTAC and Hearing Board and adopted by Metro Board Resolution in May, 1997 as follows:

- Unmet Transit Need- any transportation need, identified through the public hearing process, that could be met through the implementation or improvement of transit or paratransit services.
- Reasonable to Meet Transit Need - any unmet transit need that can be met, in whole or in part, through the allocation of additional transit revenue and be operated in a cost-efficient and service-effective manner, without negatively impacting existing public and private transit options.

Based on discussions with and recommendations from Caltrans Headquarters' staff, these definitions have been adopted on an ongoing basis by the resolution. The Metro Board did approve the definitions of unmet transit need and reasonable to meet transit need at its meetings June 25, 1998 and June 24, 1999.

These definitions will continue to be used each year until further action by the Metro Board.

ATTACHMENT E

TDA ARTICLE 8 PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS

Article 8 of the California Transportation Development Act (TDA) requires annual public hearings in those portions of the County that are not within the Metro transit service area. The purpose of the hearings is to determine whether there are unmet transit needs which are reasonable to meet. We established a Hearing Board to conduct the hearings on its behalf in locations convenient to the residents of the affected local jurisdictions. The Hearing Board, in consultation with staff, also makes recommendations to the Board of Directors for adoption: 1) a finding regarding whether there are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet; and 2) recommended actions to meet the unmet transit needs, if any.

In addition to public hearing testimony, the Hearing Board received input from the Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC), created by state law and appointed by us, to review public hearing testimony and written comments and, from this information, identify unmet transit needs in the jurisdictions.

Hearing Board

Staff secured the following representation on the FY 2016-17 Hearing Board:

- A representative from Supervisor Michael Antonovich's office for the North Los Angeles County, appointed by Supervisor Antonovich;
- A representative from Supervisor Donald Knabe's office, representing Santa Catalina Island, appointed by Supervisor Knabe; and
- Two representatives from two of the three cities in the North County

For the FY 2016-17 Hearing Board: Steve Hofbauer, Mayor Pro Tem, City of Palmdale; Angela Underwood-Jacobs, Council member, City of Lancaster, represented the North County; Michael Cano represented Supervisor Antonovich; and Julie Moore, appointed representative for Supervisor Knabe, with LACMTA staff representing Ms. Moore as needed.

Also, membership was formed on the FY 2017 Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) per requisite of the *Transportation Development Act Statutes and California Code of Regulations*. Staff had adequate representation of the local service providers and represented jurisdictions, therefore the SSTAC meeting convened with proposed recommendations as included in Attachment G.

Hearing and Meeting Dates

The Hearing Board held public hearings in Avalon on February 16, Santa Clarita on February 24, Palmdale on February 24, and Lancaster on February 24, 2016. A summary sheet of the public testimony received at the hearings and the written comments received within two weeks after the hearings is included in Attachment F.

The SSTAC met on March 15, 2016. Attachment H contains the SSTAC's recommendations, which were considered by the Hearing Board at its April 1, 2016 meeting.

ATTACHMENT F

FY2016-17 TDA ARTICLE 8 UNMET NEEDS PUBLIC TESTIMONY AND WRITTEN COMMENTS
SUMMARY TABULATION SHEET - ALL HEARINGS

		Santa Clarita	Antelope Valley	Avalon
1	Overcrowding/Service Frequency			
1.1	AVTA Line 1 Buses are overcrowded and frequently unable to pick up extra passengers, forcing riders to wait long periods of time for subsequent buses to arrive.		5	
2	Scheduling Issues			
2.1	Buses on AVTA Lines 1,11 and 15 are usually late, up to 15 minutes.		1	
2.2	Existing services to ferry are unreliable and don't run on a schedule. Any new transportation services on the island should involve easier transportation to/from the ferry, and something that ideally runs on a schedule.			1
3	Service/Route Adjustments			
3.1	With route changes, trips between Palmdale and Lancaster that could be done with one bus ride now take 2 or 3 bus rides to complete, leading to far longer travel times.		2	
3.2	AVTA service to/from the Palmdale Metrolink station stops at 9:30 PM while Metrolink runs later, and those who arrive after AVTA that time have to walk their last mile or use expensive taxi/rideshare service, and its dangerous to walk the streets at that time, especially for children. Better connections with Metrolink also needed during weekends and holidays.		1	
3.3	Although ridership to areas such as Lake Los Angeles and Pearblossom may be lacking, routes to places like these allow residents in those areas to keep jobs in Palmdale/Lancaster and have freedom of movement if they don't own a car.		3	
3.4	AVTA lacks the capacity/funding to properly address all the transit needs of the area. Having Metro provide services to and within these areas would address these shortcomings.		1	
3.5	Even within Palmdale and Lancaster, it gets difficult moving around because of the lack of cohesion of the routes. Ms. Tarbora discussed how she was unable to take a job at the Red Cross in Palmdale because of a lack of transit servicing the area.		1	
3.6	Suggests the possibility of a limited service that would service the Palmdale Metrolink station to cut down on travel times.	1		
3.7	To get home on Sunday evenings, riders must depart from their starting locations much earlier than usual because evening service on Sundays is limited. For example, the last 6 bus from the Santa Clarita Transit Center leaves at about 7:50, and riders would benefit from service that lasts until maybe 10 or 11 pm.	1		
3.8	Inquired if the Santa Clarita Transit has any plans to reinstate the Commuter Express bus going to and from Van Nuys.	1		
3.9	On weekends when transferring from the route 6 to a Metrolink train I most often have to wait for up to an hour before I catch the train. My suggestion is to bring the line 6 trip that departs Shadow Pines at 9:10AM into service on weekends so that commuters will have less wait time at the Metrolink station - the train leaves toward Los Angeles at 10AM from the Santa Clarita station.	1		
3.99	Have a local route that runs when Metrolink is limited, between the McBean Transit Hub and Sylmar Station. Perhaps mid-morning, late evening, and late night. Not everyone (including Mr. Winner) wish to ride the commuter bus all the way to North Hollywood when our destination is somewhere in the north San Fernando Valley. He understands this was done in the past; perhaps it could be brought back as a pilot route.	1		

ATTACHMENT F

4	On-board Safety/Cleanliness/Conditions			
4.1	AVTA buses need to be cleared of trash and grime. Kids see certain things on the buses that children shouldn't be exposed to.		1	
4.2	Drivers seem exasperated in dealing with disabled riders. Having private citizens assist drivers in strapping in wheelchair-bound passengers is a liability issue. Drivers need to remind riders not to play loud music, interfere/stand too close to wheelchair-bound riders, etc.		1	
4.3	Some AVTA buses have skipped wheelchair-bound riders waiting at bus stops.		1	
4.4	Driver dropped rider off in a flower bed instead of on a concrete/flat area, causing damage to the rider's wheels. Another time, the bus' lifting mechanism damaged the rider's wheelchair battery.		1	
5	Metrolink Issues			
5.1	Lack of fencing along Metrolink tracks allows for people to easily access those tracks, and people who trespass and jump in front of trains cause serious delays.		1	
6	Transit Stop Conditions			
6.1	Palmdale 82nd street bus stop is unsafe and should be moved or reformatted.		1	
6.2	With summer coming, waiting without shade for the bus to come becomes unbearable. More shaded areas/shelters at the bus stops would provide much-needed relief from the heat, especially for children and the elderly.		1	
7	On-board Tech Issues			
7.1	Either the automatic stop announcement doesn't work or malfunctions and announces stops at the wrong times.		1	
7.2	Visually-impaired riders can have trouble hearing the audio announcements, and Santa Clarita's LED screens simply announce a stop ahead, while other agencies (such as BBB) are able to announce the actual stops in real time.	1		
8	TVM Issues			
8.1	Passengers would benefit from there being TVMs at Lancaster City Park and Palmdale Transit.		1	
9	Phone Applications			
9.1	Moovit has been integrated into SCT, but "Transit App" has helped in LA with accurate arrival times, connection times, and destination info.	1		
10	Taxi Services			
10.1	Don't take away our affordable, wonderful taxi transportation away. For years, these \$1.50 purple tickets to eligible residents, seniors, handicapped, etc. has been the best possible system. We call the taxi at 510-2500 and they arrive within a few minutes. From 7AM to late at night they take my husband to the Avalon Medical Center, to the "mole" where we board the boat to go to Long Beach or San Pedro, and to the casino building for low-cost matinee on Tuesdays. Since we don't have mail delivery to our homes, we make daily trips to the post office. Even when we have heavy groceries, friendly taxi drivers help us up our 34 steps to our home.			1
11	Transit Infrastructure			
11.1	Lack of bike paths in Lancaster. The City would do well to install more bike paths.		1	
Sub-total:			7	24
				2

ATTACHMENT F

TDA ARTICLE 8 UNMET NEEDS PUBLIC TESTIMONY

FY 17 - CODED COMMENTS - ANTELOPE VALLEY

No.	Comment	City/County	Name or Agency	Written / Verbal Comments
1	Overcrowding/Service Frequencies			
	Line 1 Buses are overcrowded and frequently unable to pick up extra passengers, forcing riders to wait long periods of time for subsequent buses to arrive.	Antelope Valley	William Hunter/ Melissa Corkern/ Leonard Mason/ Concetta Tarbora/ Guadalupe Raymundo	Verbal/ Written
2	Scheduling Issues			
	Buses on AVTA Lines 1,11 and 15 are usually late, up to 15 minutes.	Antelope Valley	Melissa Corkern	Written
3	Service/Route Adjustments			
	With route changes, trips between Palmdale and Lancaster that could be done with one bus ride now take 2 or 3 bus rides to complete, leading to far longer travel times.	Antelope Valley	Concetta Tarbora/ Melissa Corkern	Verbal/ Written
	AVTA service to/from the Palmdale Metrolink station stops at 9:30 PM while Metrolink runs later, and those who arrive after AVTA that time have to walk their last mile or use expensive taxi/rideshare service, and its dangerous to walk the streets at that time, especially for children. Better connections with Metrolink also needed during weekends and holidays.	Antelope Valley	Guadalupe Raymundo	Verbal
	Although the speakers acknowledge that ridership to these areas may be lacking, routes to places like these allow residents in those areas to keep jobs in Palmdale/ Lancaster and have freedom of movement if they don't own a car.	Antelope Valley	Guadalupe Raymundo/ Jerel Arbaugh/ Concetta Tarbora	Verbal
	Even within Palmdale and Lancaster, it gets difficult moving around because of the lack of cohesion of the routes. Ms. Tarbora discussed how she was unable to take a job at the Red Cross in Palmdale because of a lack of transit servicing the area.	Antelope Valley	Concetta Tarbora	Verbal
	AVTA lacks the capacity/funding to properly address all the transit needs of the area. Having Metro provide services to and within these areas would address these shortcomings.	Antelope Valley	Guadalupe Raymundo	Verbal
4	On-board Safety/Cleanliness/Conditions			
	Buses need to be cleared of trash and grime. Kids see certain things on the buses that children shouldn't be exposed to.	Antelope Valley	Guadalupe Raymundo	Verbal
	Drivers seem exasperated in dealing with disabled riders. Having private citizens assist drivers in strapping in wheelchair-bound passengers is a liability issue. Drivers need to remind riders not to play loud music, interfere/stand too close to wheelchair-bound riders, etc.	Antelope Valley	Thomas Filippi Sr.	Verbal
	Some AVTA buses have skipped wheelchair-bound riders waiting at bus stops.	Antelope Valley	Thomas Filippi Sr.	Verbal
	Driver dropped rider off in a flower bed instead of on a concrete/flat area, causing damage to the rider's wheels. Another time, the bus' lifting mechanism damaged the rider's wheelchair battery.	Antelope Valley	Thomas Filippi Sr.	Verbal
5	Metrolink Issues			
	Lack of fencing along Metrolink tracks allows for people to easily access those tracks, and people who trespass and jump in front of trains cause serious delays	Antelope Valley	William Hunter	Verbal
6	Transit Stop Conditions			
	82nd street bus stop is unsafe and should be moved or reformatted.	Antelope Valley	Jerel Arbaugh	Verbal
	With summer coming, waiting without shade for the bus to come becomes unbearable. More shaded areas/shelters at the bus stops would provide much-needed relief from the heat, especially for children and the elderly.	Antelope Valley	Guadalupe Raymundo	Verbal
7	On-board Tech Issues			
	Either the automatic stop announcement doesn't work or malfunctions and announces stops at the wrong times.	Antelope Valley	Jerel Arbaugh	Verbal
8	TVM Issues			
	Passengers would benefit from there being TVMs at Lancaster City Park and Palmdale Transit.	Antelope Valley	Guadalupe Raymundo	Verbal
9	Smartphone Applications			
	none			
10	Taxi Services			
	none			
11	Transit Infrastructure			
	Lack of bike paths in Lancaster. The City would do well to install more bike paths.	Antelope Valley	William Hunter	Verbal

ATTACHMENT F

TDA ARTICLE 8 UNMET NEEDS PUBLIC TESTIMONY

FY 17 - CODED COMMENTS - SANTA CLARITA VALLEY/AVALON

<u>No.</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>City/County</u>	<u>Name or Agency</u>	<u>Written/ Verbal Comments</u>
1	Overcrowding/Service Frequencies			
	none			
2	Scheduling Issues			
	Existing services to ferry are unreliable and don't run on a schedule. Any new transportation services on the island should involve easier transportation to/from the ferry, and something that ideally runs on a schedule.	Avalon	Patricia Moore	Verbal
3	Service/Route Adjustments			
	Suggests the possibility of a limited service that would service the Metrolink station to cut down on travel times.	Santa Clarita	Matt Winner	Verbal
	To get home on Sunday evenings, riders must depart from their starting locations much earlier than usual because evening service on Sundays is limited. For example, the last 6 bus from the Santa Clarita Transit Center leaves at about 7:50, and riders would benefit from service that lasts until maybe 10 or 11 pm.	Santa Clarita	Matt Winner	Verbal
	Inquired if the Santa Clarita Transit has any plans to reinstate the Commuter Express bus going to and from Van Nuys.	Santa Clarita	Susan Stewart	Written
	On weekends when transferring from the route 6 to a Metrolink train I most often have to wait for up to an hour before I catch the train. My suggestion is to bring the line 6 trip that departs Shadow Pines at 9:10AM into service on weekends so that commuters will have less wait time at the Metrolink station - the train leaves toward Los Angeles at 10AM from the Santa Clarita station.	Santa Clarita	Matt Winner	Written
	Have a local route that runs when Metrolink is limited, between the McBean Transit Hub and Sylmar Station. Perhaps mid-morning, late evening, and late night. Not everyone (including Mr. Winner) wish to ride the commuter bus all the way to North Hollywood when our destination is somewhere in the north San Fernando Valley. He understands this was done in the past; perhaps it could be brought back as a pilot route.	Santa Clarita	Matt Winner	Written
4	On-board Safety/Cleanliness/Conditions			
	none			
5	Metrolink Issues			
	none			
6	Transit Stop Conditions			
	none			
7	On-board Tech Issues			
	Visually-impaired riders can have trouble hearing the audio announcements, and Santa Clarita's LED screens simply announce a stop ahead, while other agencies (such as BBB) are able to announce the actual stops in real time.	Santa Clarita	Matt Winner	Verbal
8	TVM Issues			
	none			
9	Smartphone Applications			
	Moovit has been integrated into SCT, but "Transit App" has helped in LA with accurate arrival times, connection times, and destination info.	Santa Clarita	Matt Winner	Verbal
10	Taxi Services			
	Don't take away our affordable, wonderful taxi transportation away. For years, these \$1.50 purple tickets to eligible residents, seniors, handicapped, etc. has been the best possible system. We call the taxi at 510-2500 and they arrive within a few minutes. From 7AM to late at night they take my husband to the Avalon Medical Center, to the "mole" where we board the boat to go to Long Beach or San Pedro, and to the casino building for low-cost matinee on Tuesdays. Since we don't have mail delivery to our homes, we make daily trips to the post office. Even when we have heavy groceries, friendly taxi drivers help us up our 34 steps to our home.	Avalon	Patricia Meister	Written
11	Transit Infrastructure			
	none			



City of
SANTA CLARITA
TRANSIT

Santa Clarita Valley Area
TDA Article 8 Hearings
February 24, 2016
Presented by Cindy Valdivia, Administrative Analyst

Over the past 12 months, the City of Santa Clarita has continued to make enhancements with regards to capital improvements, technology and service reliability. As a result, last years' TDA Article 8 hearings produced just one recommended action:

1. Continue to evaluate funding opportunities for transit services.

As a general practice, the City of Santa Clarita explores all potential funding opportunities. 2015 was no exception as we were awarded \$3.3 million for the construction of the future Vista Canyon Metrolink Station. These funds represent the City's ongoing efforts to ensure transit services meet the demands of our growing community.

Since the last TDA Article 8 Hearings, Santa Clarita Transit's local fleet has become 100% CNG fueled and our commuter fleet now includes five first-of-their-kind CNG fueled coaches. The continued shift toward a fleet of clean burning and cost-effective alternative fuel vehicles represents our agency's commitment to our future, but more importantly our commitment to providing the most effective service possible to our patrons. Additionally, improvements to 25 local stops were completed in an effort to improve passenger comfort and accessibility at bus stops throughout the city. Finally, in 2015 the City awarded the design contract for its much-anticipated Vista Canyon transit center project.

Service changes since the last hearing were primarily focused on commuter routes to account for changing traffic patterns outside of Santa Clarita. Such adjustments included updated travel times for some commuter routes as well as a modest realignment within Century City. Said changes provide passengers with more accurate service schedules.

Santa Clarita Transit actively reviews the latest transit technology via trade shows and media outlets. This past year, with the encouragement of local patrons and the assistance of transit app development firm Moovit, Santa Clarita Transit joined the ranks of operators offering real-time trip planning with the needs of visually impaired



City of
SANTA CLARITA
TRANSIT

passengers in mind. The Moovit app provides easy to read trip instructions along with auditory cues based on real-time GPS data. The app utilizes data from our existing Transit Information Network and has proven successful locally with ongoing developer support and improvements.

The City strongly believes that in order to provide the most effective and efficient service possible, it must actively partner with local and regional stakeholders. As such, Santa Clarita Transit regularly communicates with, and frequently collaborates with, partners including Access Services, Antelope Valley Transit Authority, Caltrans, County of Los Angeles, Metro, and Metrolink, just to name a few.

Finally, the City continues to work closely with the local business community to promote public transportation. These efforts include a close working relationship with representatives at America's Job Center of California, active participation in the Chamber of Commerce, Transportation Advisory Committee, the promotion of corporate fare programs, as well as shuttle service using our trolley for various civic and economic promotional events.

The City of Santa Clarita continues to address the transit needs of our residents and in a proactive manner and is committed to providing an effective and efficient service that improves the quality of life within the Santa Clarita Valley.

Thank you,

Cindy Valdivia
Administrative Analyst
Santa Clarita Transit



ATTACHMENT G

February 24, 2016

Board of Directors

Chairman

Marvin Crist
City of Lancaster

Vice Chair

Dianne M. Knippel
County of Los Angeles

Director

Steven D. Hofbauer
City of Palmdale

Director

Fred Thompson
City of Palmdale

Director

Angela E. Underwood-Jacobs
City of Lancaster

Director

Michelle Flanagan
County of Los Angeles

Executive Director

Len Engel

TDA Article 8 Unmet Needs Hearing Board
c/o Armineh Saint, Program Manager
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, California 90012

Re: Fiscal Year 2016 TDA Article 8 Unmet Needs Hearings

Dear Ms. Saint:

The 2015 TDA Article 8 Unmet Needs Hearing Board found that the Antelope Valley Transit Authority (AVTA) had no unmet needs that could not be met through existing funding sources. However, AVTA did receive feedback from four individuals during the hearings. The comments focused on improving service frequency, expanding service hours of operations and improving connections.

AVTA always places a high priority on the rider needs. System-wide key performance indicators continue to be monitored on a monthly basis. These measure performance on the following goals;

- Operating a Safe Transit System,
- Provide Outstanding Customer Service,
- Operate an Effective Transit System and
- Operate an Efficient Transit system

Data is collected from a variety of sources including the farebox, contractor reports, and from our business intelligence system which includes financial performance data.

In addition to system performance measures, staff is committed to responding to changes that occur within the transit network by adjusting and modifying bus services on a biannual basis. An internal service development plan allows staff to analyze and develop service recommendations based on customer inquiries and/or feedback along with additional feedback from our coach operators and customer service departments.

This provides staff with the tools and information to make service enhancements and recommendations that are focused on the riders' needs. Public outreach and informational meetings are also held in both English and Spanish. Throughout the AVTA service area in order to further gauge the public reception to all proposed service

The following is a brief update on the service enhancements and programs implemented in Fiscal Year 2015/2016:

Route to Success Ten-Year Plan: Without a long-range plan, AVTA would continue to be reactive and not proactive with future growth and service development. AVTA worked with Nelson Nygaard for the development of a Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) and ten-year plan. The study focused on six key goals addressing the near term (1-3 years), mid-term (3-7 years), and the long term (7-10years). The study included a line-by-line analysis, providing service recommendations on AVTA's 18 routes.

At the February 2016 Board of Directors meeting, AVTA presented several service enhancement recommendations that were derived from the Route to Success short range plan. The recommendations focused on improving route directness, reducing travel time and improving service transferability, while maintaining and increasing frequencies and connectivity along most corridors. Service is also proposed to be removed from unproductive corridors. In March Staff will provide final recommendation based on the results of the outreach process.

Commuter Service 78517861787: Commuter express service travel times and service frequencies continue to be evaluated and adjusted on a trip-by-trip basis to better match peak ridership demands in the morning and afternoon. In September 2014, JARC Grant funding was approved for commuter service expansion, additional trips were introduced on the Routes 785 and 787 extending the morning and afternoon services. In August 2015, the final phase of the commuter service expansion was introduced and two 786 commuter trips were included on that service. In addition to service expansion the grant also provided AVTA with three new, Motor Coach Industries (MCI) Commuter buses to support the expanded service.

Intelligent transportation System (ITS): With almost one year from system acceptance, the turnkey solution has assisted and played a key role in monitoring service and communicating with our operators. The system has also greatly enhanced our customers' overall transit experience by allowing them to take advantage of bus departure predictions through their mobile devices and computers via our Track-it website, My Stop

mobile app and predictive departure scrolling LED signs at the both major transit centers.

The system has also allowed AVTA to improve service delivery by gathering stop by stop data in real time. Including ridership by stop, dwell times and running time based on actual real-world traffic patterns.

Bus Stop Improvement Program (BSIP): AVTA's emphasis on customer service includes the improvements of its "front door" - the bus stops. The BSIP continues to increase the attractiveness of bus stops with modernized amenities for our passengers along with carousels which display bus fare and scheduled information on a specific route. Since the inception of the program over 43 bus stops have been upgraded and enhanced to meet the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. Through the program, AVTA is working with the Antelope Valley Mall to help erect a new state-of-the-art, transit hub at two locations within the mall property allowing local service to connect to one of the most popular destinations within our service area. At the January Board of Directors Meeting the board approved engineering and design for a new state-of-the-art transit hub on the perimeter of the campus. AVTA continues to evaluate bus stops within the cities of Palmdale, Lancaster and the unincorporated areas of the Los Angeles County.

Zero Emissions Bus Fleet: AVTA has been aggressively seeking competitive grant funding for zero emission buses. In June 2015 AVTA was awarded \$24.4 million from the California State Transportation Agency to purchase 29 electric buses and install electric charging infrastructure for up to 85 vehicles. In a February special Board of Directors Meeting AVTA Awarded contract to Lancaster local BYD for the amount of \$72,410,000 over a five year term for the manufacture of up to 85 battery electric buses.

Coach Operator Audits: This is the third year that AVTA has continued the coach operator performance audits using secret riders on board AVTA buses. These performance audits allow staff to monitor the performance of the service provided by operations contractor, Transdev. The performance audits provide AVTA and Transdev with tools to monitor and evaluate operator performance and identify potential areas for improvement. All audits are conducted randomly throughout the AVTA service area including our commuter service.

Mobility Management Program: AVTA recognizes the need to educate residents who may be reluctant to use public transit because they lack knowledge of how the service operates. So far in FY16, AVTA has shared its travel training program with over 200 Antelope Valley residents who attended travel training classes through the Mobility Management

Program. The training has been especially helpful to Dial-a-Ride dependent residents who now have more transportation options available to them. Our Mobility Manager has also hosted several "Train the Trainer" classes to help instructors from the Department of Public Social Services learn how to teach clients to use public transportation. The travel training program has been greeted with tremendous accolades as it showcases video instruction and provides field experience with actual trip planning. Travel training videos can also be viewed on the AVTA website and on the AVTAtv channel on You Tube.

Employment Travel Program: The Employee Travel Program (ETP) provides curb-to-curb transportation services over a three-year period to residents seeking employment in the Antelope Valley. 211 LA County and AVTA have partnered to work with human service organizations to develop mobility management programs which serve various areas of Los Angeles County with a special focus on Lancaster and Palmdale. The target population is primarily low income and welfare recipients seeking access to jobs and employment-related activities. On February 1, 2015 we began to take in passenger reservation through the ETP. And since then the program has

Fare Restructure: In FY15 Nelson Nygaard was contracted to assist the authority in analyzing our existing fare structure and assist in developing a simplified fare structure. An extensive outreach effort was conducted over a two month period to inform residents of the proposed fare changes. A comprehensive four-page brochure was widely distributed, detailing the proposal and public outreach presentations were made throughout the Antelope Valley. Although some residents expressed concern over the proposed fare increase, there was general agreement that more revenue was needed to increase service levels to improve travel convenience. The new fare structure was implemented on September 1, 2015.

Rider Relief Transportation Program: The Rider Relief Transportation Program (RRTP) was implemented in September 2015 coinciding with fare restructuring. The RRTP is a grant program provided through LA Metro to allow AVTA to provide discount coupons for monthly passes to both full fare and reduced fare customers, based on income qualifications. Staff is working with the South Antelope Valley Emergency Services (SAVES), Grace Resource Center, Work Source Center, and Antelope Valley College to help with the eligibility process.

Transit Safety: Our public safety is AVTA's top priorities. On June 2015 the AVTA Board of Directors approved a letter of understanding with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LAUSD) for Transit Law Enforcement


service. The service includes: Security presence Monday through Friday with staggered shifts for increased presence throughout the AVTA service area, Random fare and ridership audits on local and commuter services with two security assistants to assist with fare enforcement, Training and safety presentations to our coach operators, Random bomb and weapon checks of local and commuter vehicles utilizing a K9 partner, Interface with schools and city personnel regarding problematic behavior at specific stops along with other duties as assigned.

Coordinated Service: AVTA continues to work closely with local municipal operators such as Santa Clarita Transit, Los Angeles Metro and Metrolink on transit issues that affect our community. In an effort to provide improved connectivity, AVTA continues to focus on providing improved transfer connections at major transfer hubs with minimal wait times, specifically at Lancaster City Park, Palmdale Transportation Center, Lancaster Metrolink Station at Sierra Hwy. & Lancaster Blvd. and 47th Street and Avenue S. These connections are evaluated in concert with the biannual service adjustments.

AVTA values the input of our customers and other stakeholders and looks forward to continuously working to improve the public transportation service in the Antelope Valley.

If you should have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (661) 729-2206

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Len Engel". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Len Engel
Executive Director

FY 2016-17 TDA ARTICLE 8

SSTAC PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

CATALINA ISLAND AREA

- Proposed Findings - that in the City of Avalon there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet; therefore TDA Article 8 funds may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects.
- Recommended Actions - that the City of Avalon address the following and implement if reasonable to meet: 1) maintain funding sources for transit services.

ANTELOPE VALLEY AREA

- Proposed Findings – there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet; in the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale and the unincorporated portions of North Los Angeles County, existing transit needs can be met through using other existing funding sources. Therefore, TDA Article 8 funds may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects.
- Recommended Actions – That Antelope Valley Transit Authority (AVTA) address the following: 1) continue to evaluate funding opportunities for transit services.

SANTA CLARITA VALLEY AREA

- Proposed Findings - There are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet; In the City of Santa Clarita, and the unincorporated portions of the Santa Clarita Valley, existing transit needs can be met through the recommended actions using other funding sources. Therefore, TDA Article 8 funds may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects.
- Recommended Actions - that Santa Clarita Transit address the following: 1) continue to evaluate funding opportunities for transit services.



Board Report

File #: 2016-0454, **File Type:** Formula Allocation / Local Return

Agenda Number: 15.

FINANCE BUDGET AND AUDIT COMMITTEE JUNE 15, 2016

SUBJECT: FISCAL YEAR 2017 TRANSIT FUND ALLOCATIONS

**ACTION: APPROVE FY2017 TRANSIT FUND ALLOCATIONS
AND RELATED ACTIONS**

RECOMMENDATION

CONSIDER:

- A. **APPROVING \$1.8 billion in FY2017 Transit Fund Allocations for Los Angeles County jurisdictions, transit operators and Metro operations** as shown in Attachment A. These allocations comply with federal and state regulations and LACMTA Board policies and guidelines.
1. Planning and Administrative allocations of Transportation Development Act (TDA), Proposition A, Proposition C and Measure R in the amount of \$73.4 million as shown in Attachment A, page 2 Line 37.
 2. Bus Transit Subsidies of State and Local funds in the amount of \$934.9 million as shown in Attachment A, page 3.
 3. Allocation of Federal Formula Grants in the amount of \$349.1 million as shown in Attachment A, pages 12-13.
 4. Proposition A Incentive Programs in the amount of \$15.3 million as shown in Attachment A, pages 19-21.
 5. Proposition A Local Return, Proposition C Local Return, Measure R Local Return, TDA Article 3 (Pedestrian and Bikeways) and TDA Article 8 (Streets and Highways) for \$496.4 million as shown in Attachment A, pages 22-24.
- B. **AUTHORIZING** the Chief Executive Officer to adjust FY2017 Federal Section 5307 (Urbanized Formula), Section 5339 (Bus and Bus Facilities) and Section 5337 (State of Good Repair) allocations upon receipt of final apportionment from the Federal Transit Authority and amend FY2017 budget as necessary to reflect the aforementioned adjustment.

-
- C. APPROVING fund exchange in the amount of \$6 million of Santa Monica's Big Blue Bus' FY2017 Federal Section 5307 formula share allocation with Metro's TDA Article 4 allocation.
- D. APPROVING fund exchange of Federal Section 5307 discretionary fund awarded to the Southern California Regional Transit Training Consortium (SCR TTC) through Long Beach Transit in the amount of \$250,000 with Metro's TDA Article 4 allocation.
- E. APPROVING fund exchanges in the amount totaling \$11.5 million of Metro's share of Federal Section 5307 with municipal operators' shares of Federal Sections 5339 and 5337.
- F. ADOPTING a resolution designating Transportation Development Act (TDA) and State Transit Assistance (STA) fund allocations in compliance to the terms and conditions of the allocation (Attachment C); and
- G. Upon approval, AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements to implement the above funding programs.

ISSUE

- Each year, transit operating and capital funds consisting of federal, state and local revenues are allocated to Metro operations, transit operators and Los Angeles County local jurisdictions for programs, projects and services according to federal guidelines, state laws and established funding policies and procedures. The Board of Directors must approve allocations for FY2017 before funds can be disbursed.
- The Tier 2 Operators Funding Program is continued with \$6 million funding from Proposition A 95% of 40% Discretionary growth over inflation.
- Santa Monica's Big Blue Bus (BBB) is requesting a \$6 million fund exchange of its Federal Section 5307 FY2017 formula allocation with Metro's non-federal funds in order to pay capital projects that require local funds such as mid-life bus rebuilds, yard improvements, farebox upgrades, facility improvements and advanced technology projects.
- The municipal operators are requesting fund exchanges of their Federal Sections 5339 and 5337 allocations with Metro's share of Federal Section 5307 allocation in order to minimize the impact on administrative processes associated with these new funding programs.
- At its April 15, 2014 meeting, the Bus Operators Sub-Committee awarded \$250,000 a year for three years Federal Section 5307 15% Discretionary fund to the Southern California Regional Transit Training Consortium (SCR TTC) through Long Beach Transit. This allocation ends in FY17. Funds will be exchanged with Metro's share of the Transportation Development Act (TDA) fund.

DISCUSSION

We developed the recommended FY2017 Transit Fund Allocations according to federal, state and

local requirements, as well as policies and guidelines previously approved by LACMTA Board. Details of significant information, methodologies and assumptions are described in **Attachment B**.

We have reviewed the recommended allocations and related methodologies and assumptions with Metro operations, transit operators, Los Angeles County local jurisdictions, The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the Bus Operators Subcommittee (BOS) and the Local Transit Systems Subcommittee (LTSS). At their previous meetings, the TAC, the BOS and the LTSS all formally adopted the recommended FY2017 Transit Fund Allocations.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, as the Regional Transportation Planning Entity for Los Angeles County, is responsible for planning, programming and allocating transportation funding to Los Angeles County jurisdictions, transit operators, and Metro Operations. The Board approval will allow the continued funding of transportation projects, programs and services in Los Angeles County.

OPTIONS

There is no alternative to approving the FY2017 Transit Fund Allocations because federal, state and local requirements, as well as prior LACMTA Board policies and guidelines require us to annually allocate funding to Los Angeles County jurisdictions, transit operators, and Metro Operations for programs, projects and services. Allocation methodologies and assumptions comply with federal, state and local requirements, as well as policies and guidelines previously approved by LACMTA Board.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The FY2017 Transit Fund Allocations are included in the FY2017 Budget in multiple cost centers and multiple projects. Approval of these recommendations authorizes LACMTA to disburse these funds to the Los Angeles County jurisdictions and transit operators.

NEXT STEPS

After the Board of Directors approves the recommended allocations and adopts the resolution, we will work with Los Angeles County jurisdictions, transit operators, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and Metro Operations to ensure the proper disbursement of funds.

ATTACHMENTS


Attachment A - FY 2017 Transit Fund Allocations

Attachment B - Summary of Significant Information, Methodologies and Assumptions

Attachment C - TDA and STA Resolution

Prepared by: Carlos Vendiola, Transportation Planning Manager, (213)922-4527
Manijeh Ahmadi, Transportation Planning Manager III, (213)922-3083

Reviewed by: Nalini Ahuja, Executive Director, Finance and Budget, (213)922-3088



Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer



Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

TRANSIT FUND ALLOCATIONS

Fiscal Year 2017

May 26, 2016

Proposed

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>I. BUS TRANSIT SUBSIDIES</u>	
<u>State and Local Funds:</u>	
Revenue Estimates.	1-2
State and Local Fund Summary.	3
Bus Transit Funding % Shares.	4
Included and Eligible Operators Estimated Funding Levels.	5
Proposition C 5% Transit Security Funding Allocation.	6
<u>Proposition C 40% Discretionary Programs:</u>	
<i>Municipal Operators Service Improvement Program (MOSIP) • Zero-Fare Compensation for Commerce • Foothill Transit Mitigation • Transit Service Expansion • Discretionary Base Restructuring • BSIP Overcrowding Relief • Proposition 1B Bridge Funding - PTMISEA • Proposition 1B Bridge Funding - SECURITY.</i>	7
Proposition 1B Bridge Funding - PTMISEA (Worksheet).	8
Proposition 1B Bridge Funding - Security (Worksheet).	9
Measure R.	10
Tier 2 Operators.	11
<u>Federal Formula Grants:</u>	
Revenue Estimates.	12
Summary.	13
Capital Allocation Procedure - % Share Calculation.	14-15
Federal Section 5307 Urbanized Formula Program.	16
Federal Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities.	17
Federal Section 5337 State of Good Repair.	18
<u>II. LOCAL SUBSIDIES</u>	
Incentive Programs.	19-21
Local Returns, TDA Articles 3 & 8.	22-24

Bus Transit Subsidies
STATE AND LOCAL FUNDS

Proposed

REVENUE ESTIMATES								
STATE AND LOCAL			FY2017 Estimated Revenue	Carry-Over FY2015 Budget vs Actual	Interest FY2015 Actual	FY 2017 Total Funds Available	N O T E	FY 2016 Total Funds Available
Transportation Development Act:								
	Planning & Administration:							
1	Planning - Metro		\$ 2,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000,000		\$ 2,000,000
2	Planning - SCAG		2,983,875	51,684		3,035,559		2,895,529
3	Administration - Metro		3,516,125	(51,684)		3,464,441		3,604,471
4	Sub-total		8,500,000	-	-	8,500,000		8,500,000
5	Article 3 Pedestrian & Bikeways	2.0000%	7,787,000	137,824		7,924,824		7,551,412
6	Article 4 Bus Transit	91.6431%	356,812,522	6,315,314	1,539,596	364,667,432		347,794,161
7	Article 8 Streets & Highways	6.3569%	24,750,478	438,065		25,188,543		23,988,324
8	Total		397,850,000	6,891,203	1,539,596	406,280,799	a	387,833,897
Proposition A:								
9	Administration	5.0000%	39,785,000	572,732		40,357,732		38,608,497
10	Local Return	25.0000%	188,978,750	n/a		188,978,750	c	181,331,250
11	Rail Development	35.0000%	264,570,250	3,808,667		268,378,917		256,746,505
	Bus Transit:	40.0000%						
12	95% of 40% Capped at CPI	1.8500%	234,828,073	n/a		234,828,073	b	230,562,663
13	95% of 40% Over CPI		52,419,627			52,419,627	d	45,060,837
14	Sub-total		287,247,700	-		287,247,700		275,623,500
15	5% of 40% Incentive		15,118,300	217,638		15,335,938		14,671,229
16	Total		795,700,000	4,599,037		800,299,037	a	766,980,981
Proposition C:								
17	Administration	1.5000%	11,935,500	171,482		12,106,982		11,583,923
18	Rail/Bus Security	5.0000%	39,188,225	563,032		39,751,257		38,033,880
19	Commuter Rail	10.0000%	78,376,450	1,126,064		79,502,514		76,067,760
20	Local Return	20.0000%	156,752,900	n/a		156,752,900	c	150,409,500
21	Freeways and Highways	25.0000%	195,941,125	2,815,160		198,756,285		190,169,401
22	Discretionary	40.0000%	313,505,800	4,504,255		318,010,055		304,271,041
23	Total		795,700,000	9,179,992		804,879,992	a	770,535,505
State Transit Assistance:								
24	Bus (PUC 99314 Rev Base Share)		24,595,469	4,575,497	106,362	29,277,328	e	54,516,125
25	Rail (PUC 99313 Population Share)		28,259,873	1,347,912	57,363	29,665,148		52,965,044
26	Total		52,855,342	5,923,409	163,725	58,942,476		107,481,169

REVENUE ESTIMATES (Continued)							
STATE AND LOCAL		FY2017 Estimated Revenue	Carry-Over FY2015 Budget vs Actual	Interest FY2015 Actual	FY 2017 Total Funds Available	N O T E	FY 2016 Total Funds Available
Measure R:							
27	Administration	1.5000%	11,935,500	175,782	290,489		11,682,630
28	Transit Capital - "New Rail"	35.0000%	274,317,575	4,040,063	231,302		269,249,002
29	Transit Capital - Metrolink	3.0000%	23,512,935	346,291	1,204,110		23,667,510
30	Transit Capital - Metro Rail	2.0000%	15,675,290	230,861	193,645		15,420,063
31	Highway Capital	20.0000%	156,752,900	2,308,608	2,951,123		153,620,868
32	Operations "New Rail"	5.0000%	39,188,225	577,152	619,352		38,481,287
33	Operations Bus	20.0000%	156,752,900	2,308,608	(103,014)		151,622,137
34	Local Return	15.0000%	117,564,675	n/a	(9,927)	c	112,807,125
35	Total		795,700,000	9,987,364	5,377,080	a	776,550,622
36	Total Funds Available		\$ 2,837,805,342	\$ 36,581,006	\$ 7,080,401		\$ 2,881,466,749
37	Total Planning & Admin Allocations: (Lines 4, 9, 17 and 27)		\$ 72,156,000	\$ 919,996	\$ 290,489		\$ 70,375,050

Notes:

- a) The revenue estimate is 3.3% over the FY2016 revenue estimate based on several economic forecasts evaluated by MTA.
- b) CPI of 1.85% represents the average estimated growth rate provided by Beacon applied to Prop A discretionary allocated to included operators.
- c) Local Return Subfunds do not show carryover balances. These funds are distributed in the same period received.
- d) Proposition A 95% of 40% Bus Transit current year estimate will be used to fund eligible and Tier 2 operators. The carry-over is not shown since it has been converted into Proposition C 40% discretionary to fund various Board-approved discretionary programs.
- e) STA Revenue estimate from the State Controller's office is reduced by \$18M for the revenue based share and \$13M for the population based share due to anticipated shortfall of FY16 revenue.

STATE AND LOCAL FUNDS SUMMARY										
		Formula Allocation Procedure				Proposition C 5% Security	Proposition C 40% Discretionary	Measure R		Total State and Local Funds
		TDA Article 4 + Interest	STA + Interest	Proposition A 95% of 40 % Discretionary	Sub-Total FAP			20% Bus Operations	Clean Fuel & Facilities	
	Included Operators:									
1	Metro Bus Ops.	\$ 264,437,859	\$ 21,732,177	\$ 172,721,835	\$ 458,891,872	\$ 28,659,424	\$ 19,251,737	\$ 110,156,280	\$ -	\$ 616,959,314
	Municipal Operators:									
2	Arcadia	275,429	22,113	177,363	474,905	7,069	83,137	112,086	-	677,197
3	Claremont	176,891	14,202	113,909	305,002	3,157	45,923	71,986	-	426,069
4	Commerce	371,457	29,822	239,200	640,479	39,038	968,972	151,164	-	1,799,653
5	Culver City	5,165,678	414,727	3,326,445	8,906,850	313,167	2,033,553	2,102,170	-	13,355,740
6	Foothill Transit	22,940,811	1,841,803	16,081,241	40,863,856	918,025	9,743,849	9,335,751	-	60,861,481
7	Gardena	5,110,136	410,267	3,290,679	8,811,083	231,890	2,419,775	2,079,567	-	13,542,314
8	La Mirada	109,430	8,786	70,467	188,683	2,955	24,516	44,532	-	260,686
9	Long Beach	22,838,861	1,813,547	14,546,127	39,198,535	1,768,394	9,741,239	9,192,525	-	59,900,693
10	Montebello	8,132,135	652,889	5,236,699	14,021,723	480,191	3,595,675	3,309,368	-	21,406,956
11	Norwalk	2,913,330	233,897	2,155,535	5,302,761	96,160	800,101	1,185,578	-	7,384,600
12	Redondo Beach	703,281	56,463	452,879	1,212,623	25,361	204,756	286,200	-	1,728,940
13	Santa Monica	25,267,778	1,546,914	12,407,511	39,222,203	1,179,188	6,934,606	7,841,012	-	55,177,009
14	Torrance	6,224,354	499,722	4,008,181	10,732,258	255,284	3,484,821	2,532,998	-	17,005,361
15	Sub-Total	100,229,573	7,545,151	62,106,237	169,880,961	5,319,878	40,080,924	38,244,937	-	253,526,699
	Eligible Operators:									
16	Antelope Valley	-	-	4,193,858	4,193,858	222,293	1,940,930	2,356,535	-	8,713,617
17	LADOT	-	-	19,645,484	19,645,484	1,366,075	7,557,156	4,636,673	-	33,205,389
18	Santa Clarita	-	-	4,427,993	4,427,993	208,461	2,553,756	2,488,096	-	9,678,305
19	Foothill BSCP	-	-	4,558,875	4,558,875	-	1,013,558	1,075,973	-	6,648,406
20	Sub-Total	-	-	32,826,210	32,826,210	1,796,829	13,065,400	10,557,276	-	58,245,716
	Tier 2 Operators:									
21	LADOT Community Dash	-	-	4,780,654	4,780,654	-	-	-	-	4,780,654
22	Glendale	-	-	667,538	667,538	-	-	-	-	667,538
23	Pasadena	-	-	464,354	464,354	-	-	-	-	464,354
24	Burbank	-	-	87,454	87,454	-	-	-	-	87,454
25	Sub-Total	-	-	6,000,000	6,000,000	-	-	-	-	6,000,000
26	Lynwood Trolley	-	-	-	-	-	212,089	-	-	212,089
27	Total Excluding Metro	100,229,573	7,545,151	100,932,447	208,707,171	7,116,707	53,358,413	48,802,213	-	317,984,504
28	Grand Total	\$ 364,667,432	\$ 29,277,328	\$ 273,654,283	\$ 667,599,043	\$ 35,776,131	\$ 72,610,150	\$ 158,958,494	\$ -	\$ 934,943,818

BUS TRANSIT FUNDING PERCENTAGE SHARES											
		Vehicle Service Miles(VSM) [2]	Passenger Revenue (\$) [2]	Base Fare (\$) [2]	Fare Units	Fare Units Prior to Fare Increase	Fare Units Used in FAP ^[1]	Sum 50% VSM + 50% Fare Units	Proposition A Base Share	DAR Cap Adjustment [3]	TDA/STA Share
	Included Operators										
1	Metro Bus Ops. [4]	74,672,000	265,333,000	\$ 1.750	151,618,857	197,161,600	197,161,600	135,916,800	74.2287%	0.0000%	74.2287%
2	Arcadia	203,766	72,829	1.000	72,829		72,829	138,298	0.0755%	0.0000%	0.0755%
3	Claremont	95,800	78,300	2.500	31,320	81,840	81,840	88,820	0.0485%	0.0000%	0.0485%
4	Commerce	373,029	-	-	-		-	186,515	0.1019%	0.0000%	0.1019%
5	Culver City	1,514,335	3,585,261	1.000	3,585,261	3,673,208	3,673,208	2,593,772	1.4165%	0.0000%	1.4165%
6	Foothill	8,816,913	14,960,991	1.250	11,968,793	14,221,000	14,221,000	11,518,957	6.2909%	0.0000%	6.2909%
7	Gardena	1,428,166	2,616,597	1.000	2,616,597	3,703,600	3,703,600	2,565,883	1.4013%	0.0000%	1.4013%
8	La Mirada	74,805	35,088	1.000	35,088		35,088	54,947	0.0300%	0.0000%	0.0300%
9	Long Beach	6,712,017	16,454,265	1.250	13,163,412	15,972,456	15,972,456	11,342,237	6.1944%	0.0000%	6.1944%
10	Montebello	2,311,000	5,328,000	1.100	4,843,636	5,855,556	5,855,556	4,083,278	2.2300%	0.0000%	2.2300%
11	Norwalk	831,593	1,231,580	1.250	985,264	2,094,068	2,094,068	1,462,831	0.7989%	0.0000%	0.7989%
12	Redondo Beach DR	21,554	4,604	1.000	4,604		4,604	13,079	0.0071%	0.0000%	0.0071%
13	Redondo Beach MB	367,687	312,413	1.000	312,413		312,413	340,050	0.1857%	0.0000%	0.1857%
14	Santa Monica	4,688,000	13,231,000	1.000	13,231,000	14,661,333	14,661,333	9,674,667	5.2837%	0.0000%	5.2837%
15	Torrance	1,740,700	2,682,300	1.000	2,682,300	4,510,000	4,510,000	3,125,350	1.7069%	0.0000%	1.7069%
16	Sub-Total	103,851,365	325,926,228		205,151,374		262,359,595	183,105,480	100.0000%	0.0000%	100.0000%
	Eligible Operators										
17	Antelope Valley	2,668,892	4,240,418	1.500	2,826,945	3,543,241	3,543,241	3,106,067	1.5879%	0.0000%	1.5879%
18	Santa Clarita	2,845,685	3,713,259	1.000	3,713,259		3,713,259	3,279,472	1.6766%	0.0000%	1.6766%
19	LADOT Local	1,054,006	1,824,814	0.500	3,649,628	6,727,520	6,727,520	3,890,763	1.9891%	0.0000%	1.9891%
20	LADOT Express	1,288,514	3,639,982	1.500	2,426,655	3,152,832	3,152,832	2,220,673	1.1353%	0.0000%	1.1353%
21	Foothill - BSCP	1,207,120	1,604,441	1.250	1,283,553	1,650,000	1,650,000	1,428,560	0.7250%	0.0000%	0.7250%
22	Sub-Total	9,064,217	15,022,914		13,900,040		18,786,852	13,925,535			
23	Total	112,915,582	340,949,142		219,051,414		281,146,447	197,031,015			

[1] Fare units used are frozen to the level prior to fare increases in accordance with the Funding Stability policy adopted by the Board in November 2007.

[2] Operators' statistics exclude BSIP, TSE, Base Restructuring and MOSIP (including Metro's consent decree) services that are funded from PC 40% Discretionary. Also excluded are services funded from other sources (CRD, FTA, etc.)

[3] TDA cap of 0.25% is applied for DAR operators - Arcadia, Claremont, La Mirada and Redondo Beach DR.

[4] MTA Statistics include contracted services with LADOT for Lines 422, 601 and 602, Glendale and PVPTA.

INCLUDED AND ELIGIBLE OPERATORS ESTIMATED FUNDING LEVELS										
INCLUDED & ELIGIBLE OPERATORS ESTIMATED FUNDING LEVELS										
	TDA & STA % Shares	TDA Article 4 plus interest			STA	Prop A Disc % Shares	Proposition A	Total Formula Funds	Two Year Lag Funding [2]	
		Allocated	Fund Exchange	Net	Rev Base Share Plus Interest		Discretionary [1] [2]			
Included Operators										
1	Metro Bus Ops.	74.2287%	\$ 270,687,859	\$ (6,250,000)	\$ 264,437,859	\$ 21,732,177	74.2287%	\$ 172,721,835	\$ 458,891,872	\$ (1,587,968)
2	Arcadia	0.0755%	275,429		275,429	22,113	0.0755%	177,363	474,905	
3	Claremont	0.0485%	176,891		176,891	14,202	0.0485%	113,909	305,002	
4	Commerce	0.1019%	371,457		371,457	29,822	0.1019%	239,200	640,479	
5	Culver City	1.4165%	5,165,678		5,165,678	414,727	1.4165%	3,326,445	8,906,850	
6	Foothill	6.2909%	22,940,811		22,940,811	1,841,803	6.2909%	16,081,241	40,863,856	
7	Gardena	1.4013%	5,110,136		5,110,136	410,267	1.4013%	3,290,679	8,811,083	
8	La Mirada	0.0300%	109,430		109,430	8,786	0.0300%	70,467	188,683	
9	Long Beach	6.1944%	22,588,861	250,000	22,838,861	1,813,547	6.1944%	14,546,127	39,198,535	
10	Montebello	2.2300%	8,132,135		8,132,135	652,889	2.2300%	5,236,699	14,021,723	
11	Norwalk	0.7989%	2,913,330		2,913,330	233,897	0.7989%	2,155,535	5,302,761	
12	Redondo Beach DR	0.0071%	26,048		26,048	2,091	0.0071%	16,773	44,912	
13	Redondo Beach MB	0.1857%	677,233		677,233	54,372	0.1857%	436,105	1,167,711	
14	Santa Monica	5.2837%	19,267,778	6,000,000	25,267,778	1,546,914	5.2837%	12,407,511	39,222,203	
15	Torrance	1.7069%	6,224,354		6,224,354	499,722	1.7069%	4,008,181	10,732,258	
16	Sub-Total	100.0000%	364,667,432	-	364,667,432	29,277,328	100.0000%	234,828,073	628,772,833	
Eligible Operators										
Formula Equivalent Funded from Proposition A 95% of 40% Growth over CPI										
17	Antelope Valley	1.5879%	-		-	464,909	1.5879%	3,728,949	4,193,858	
18	Santa Clarita	1.6766%	-		-	490,864	1.6766%	3,937,129	4,427,993	
19	LADOT Local	1.9891%	7,253,664		7,253,664	582,361	1.9891%	4,671,007	12,507,032	
20	LADOT Express	1.1353%	4,140,066		4,140,066	332,385	1.1353%	2,666,001	7,138,453	
21	Foothill - BSCP	0.7250%	2,643,996		2,643,996	212,273	0.7250%	1,702,605	4,558,875	
22	Sub-Total		14,037,727	-	14,037,727	2,082,792	7.1140%	16,705,691	32,826,210	
23	Total FAP		\$ 364,667,432		\$ 364,667,432	\$ 29,277,328	107.1140%	\$ 234,828,073	\$ 661,599,043	\$ (0)
Proposition A Discretionary (95% of 40%) Growth Over CPI:										
24	Revenue							\$ 52,419,627		
Uses of Fund:										
25	Eligible Operators - Formula Equivalent Funds							32,826,210		
26	Tier 2 Operators							6,000,000		
27	Total Uses of Funds							38,826,210		
28	Proposition A Discretionary (95% of 40%) GOI Surplus (Shortfall)							13,593,417		
29	Backfill from (Transfer to) PC40% Discretionary							(13,593,417)		
									\$ -	

[1] Prop. A Discretionary funds, (95% of 40%) allocated to Included Operators have been capped at 1.85% CPI for FAP allocation.

[2] **The two-Year Lag Column is for information only. THESE AMOUNTS ARE ALREADY INCLUDED IN PROPOSITION A DISCRETIONARY COLUMN**

[3] These funds are allocated by formula to Eligible Operators in lieu of Section 9, TDA, STA and Prop A 40%Discretionary funds. Fund source is Proposition A 95% of 40% growth over CPI.

PROPOSITION C 5% TRANSIT SECURITY FUNDING ALLOCATION							
	Operators	FY 2015 Unlinked Passengers	Percent of Total Unlinked Passengers	Total Funding Allocation	Direct Allocation to Muni	Allocation to Partnership	Total
1	Antelope Valley	3,534,448	0.6213%	\$ 222,293	\$ 222,293	\$ -	\$222,293
2	Arcadia	112,398	0.0198%	7,069	7,069	-	7,069
3	Claremont	50,200	0.0088%	3,157	3,157	-	3,157
4	Commerce	620,696	0.1091%	39,038	39,038	-	39,038
5	Culver City	4,979,334	0.8754%	313,167	313,167	-	313,167
6	Foothill	14,596,534	2.5660%	918,025	918,025	-	918,025
7	Gardena	3,687,034	0.6482%	231,890	231,890	-	231,890
8	LADOT Local/Express	21,720,502	3.8184%	1,366,075	-	1,366,075	1,366,075
9	La Mirada	46,982	0.0083%	2,955	2,955	-	2,955
10	Long Beach	28,117,340	4.9429%	1,768,394	1,768,394	-	1,768,394
11	Montebello	7,635,000	1.3422%	480,191	480,191	-	480,191
12	Norwalk	1,528,931	0.2688%	96,160	96,160	-	96,160
13	Redondo Beach DR/MB	403,231	0.0709%	25,361	25,361	-	25,361
14	Santa Clarita	3,314,511	0.5827%	208,461	208,461	-	208,461
15	Santa Monica	18,749,000	3.2960%	1,179,188	1,179,188	-	1,179,188
16	Torrance	4,059,000	0.7136%	255,284	255,284	-	255,284
17	Subtotal	113,155,141	19.8923%	7,116,707	5,750,632	1,366,075	7,116,707
18	Metro Bus Ops.	455,682,821	80.1077%	28,659,424	-	28,659,424	28,659,424
19	Total	568,837,962	100.0000%	\$ 35,776,131	\$ 5,750,632	\$ 30,025,499	\$35,776,131

- Total funding is 90% of Prop C 5% Transit Security:
 Estimated Revenue: \$ 39,751,257
 90% Thereof: \$ 35,776,131
- Metro operations data includes unlinked passengers for bus and rail .

PROPOSITION C 40% DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS

		MOSIP		MOSIP Amount	Zero-fare Compensation [1]	Foothill Transit Mitigation	Transit Service Expansion	Discretionary Base Restruct.	BSIP Overcrowding Relief	Prop 1B Bridge Funding		TOTAL
		Prop A % Share	% Share							PTMISEA	SECURITY	
INCLUDED OPERATORS												
1	Metro Bus Ops.			\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,894,486	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,357,251	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19,251,737
2	Arcadia	0.0755%	0.2297%	53,674	-	8,033	-	-	21,431	-	-	83,137
3	Claremont	0.0485%	0.1475%	34,471	-	5,159	-	-	-	3,186	3,107	45,923
4	Commerce	0.1019%	0.3097%	72,387	640,479	10,833	-	245,273	-	-	-	968,972
5	Culver City	1.4165%	4.3075%	1,006,649	-	150,655	236,417	-	165,209	402,419	72,204	2,033,553
6	Foothill	6.2909%	19.1298%	4,470,534	-	-	327,222	1,963,620	914,207	1,784,518	283,749	9,743,849
7	Gardena	1.4013%	4.2612%	995,825	-	149,035	679,548	-	172,465	356,817	66,085	2,419,775
8	La Mirada	0.0300%	0.0913%	21,325	-	3,191	-	-	-	-	-	24,516
9	Long Beach	6.1944%	18.8363%	4,401,948	-	658,794	2,243,518	-	809,811	1,383,233	243,935	9,741,239
10	Montebello	2.2300%	6.7812%	1,584,730	-	237,170	-	1,120,117	213,765	366,203	73,690	3,595,675
11	Norwalk	0.7989%	2.4294%	567,728	-	84,966	-	-	55,308	78,475	13,624	800,101
12	Redondo Beach DR/MB	0.1929%	0.5864%	137,050	-	20,511	-	-	3,926	33,787	9,482	204,756
13	Santa Monica	5.2837%	16.0669%	3,754,760	-	561,936	-	-	783,496	1,558,334	276,080	6,934,606
14	Torrance	1.7069%	5.1903%	1,212,956	-	181,530	795,677	712,731	236,562	288,859	56,506	3,484,821
15	Subtotal Included	25.7713%	78.3672%	18,314,036	640,479	2,071,813	4,282,381	4,041,741	3,376,180	6,255,832	1,098,463	40,080,924
ELIGIBLE OPERATORS												
16	Antelope Valley	1.5879%	4.8287%	1,128,454	-	11,729	370,518	-	47,026	326,683	56,519	1,940,930
17	Santa Clarita	1.6766%	5.0983%	1,191,454	-	12,384	193,792	-	50,302	935,288	170,536	2,553,756
18	LADOT Local/Express	3.1244%	9.5009%	2,220,325	-	310,527	2,661,900	-	147,446	1,904,961	311,998	7,557,156
19	Foothill BSCP	0.7250%	2.2048%	515,242	-	-	-	-	-	429,605	68,710	1,013,558
20	Subtotal Eligible	7.1140%	21.6328%	5,055,475	-	334,640	3,226,211	-	244,774	3,596,537	607,763	13,065,400
21	City of Lynwood Trolley						212,089	-	-			212,089
22	Total Municipal Operators	32.8853%	100.0000%	23,369,511	640,479	2,406,453	7,720,681	4,041,741	3,620,954	9,852,368	1,706,226	53,358,413
23	TOTAL	32.8853%	100.0000%	\$23,369,511	\$ 640,479	\$10,300,939	\$7,720,681	\$4,041,741	\$14,978,205	\$ 9,852,368	\$ 1,706,226	\$ 72,610,150
				Last Year			\$7,580,442	\$3,968,327	\$14,706,142			
				% Increase	3.00%		1.850%	1.850%	1.850%			
				Current Year	\$23,369,511		\$7,720,681	\$4,041,741	\$14,978,205			

[1] Allocated as part of FAP to Commerce as compensation for having zero passenger revenues.

BRIDGE FUNDING FOR PROPOSITION 1B PTMISEA FUND								
FY 2011 4th of 4 Installments								
		[A]	[B]	[C]	[D] (C-A)	[E]	[F] (A+E)	[G] ([E] / 4)
		State STA Allocation Basis	FAP FY11 Allocation%	FAP Allocation	FAP Allocation Over (Under) STA Allocation Basis	FY11 Bridge Funding Allocation	Total Funds Available	FY11 Bridge Funding Allocation (4th of 4 Installments)
	Included Operators							
1	Arcadia	\$ 251,401	0.0747%	\$ 186,968	\$ (64,433)	\$ -	\$ 251,401	\$ -
2	Claremont	76,805	0.0358%	89,549	12,744	12,744	89,549	3,186
3	Commerce	533,440	0.0674%	168,764	(364,676)	-	533,440	-
4	Culver City	1,651,856	1.3030%	3,261,534	1,609,678	1,609,678	3,261,534	402,419
5	Foothill	8,177,915	6.1190%	15,315,987	7,138,072	7,138,072	15,315,987	1,784,518
6	Gardena	1,917,856	1.3364%	3,345,124	1,427,268	1,427,268	3,345,124	356,817
7	La Mirada	202,498	0.0387%	96,858	(105,640)	-	202,498	-
8	Long Beach	9,275,621	5.9163%	14,808,554	5,532,933	5,532,933	14,808,554	1,383,233
9	Montebello	3,791,562	2.1000%	5,256,374	1,464,812	1,464,812	5,256,374	366,203
10	Metro Bus Ops.	195,097,286	75.2506%	188,352,898	(6,744,388)	-	195,097,286	-
11	Norwalk	1,790,228	0.8406%	2,104,127	313,899	313,899	2,104,127	78,475
12	Redondo Beach	228,277	0.1452%	363,426	135,149	135,149	363,426	33,787
13	Santa Monica	6,675,717	5.1574%	12,909,051	6,233,334	6,233,334	12,909,051	1,558,334
14	Torrance	2,886,067	1.6147%	4,041,504	1,155,437	1,155,437	4,041,504	288,859
15	Subtotal Included	232,556,529	100.0000%	250,300,719	17,744,190	25,023,327	257,579,856	6,255,832
	Eligible Operators							
16	Antelope Valley	2,394,099	1.4786%	3,700,832	1,306,733	1,306,733	3,700,832	326,683
17	Santa Clarita	-	1.4947%	3,741,150	3,741,150	3,741,150	3,741,150	935,288
18	City of Los Angeles	-	3.0443%	7,619,843	7,619,843	7,619,843	7,619,843	1,904,961
19	Foothill BSCP	-	0.6865%	1,718,420	1,718,420	1,718,420	1,718,420	429,605
20	Subtotal Eligible	2,394,099	6.7040%	16,780,246	14,386,147	14,386,147	16,780,246	3,596,537
21	Total all Operators	234,950,628	106.7040%	267,080,965	32,130,337	39,409,473	274,360,101	9,852,368
22	SCRRRA	15,350,091	-	-	-	-	15,350,091	-
23	Grand Total	\$ 250,300,719	106.7040%	\$ 267,080,965	\$ 32,130,337	\$ 39,409,473	\$ 289,710,192	\$ 9,852,368

BRIDGE FUNDING FOR PROPOSITION 1B SECURITY FUND							
		Allocation Basis - FY2014 FAP					
		[A]	[B]	[C]	[D] (C-A)	[E]	[F] (A+E)
Operators		State STA Allocation Basis	FAP FY14 Allocation%	FAP Allocation	FAP Allocation Over (Under) STA Allocation Basis	FY14 Bridge Funding Allocation	Total Funds Available
Included Operators							
1	Arcadia	\$ 10,058	0.0784%	\$ 7,851	\$ (2,207)	\$ -	\$ 10,058
2	Claremont	3,073	0.0617%	6,180	3,107	3,107	6,180
3	Commerce	21,343	0.0752%	7,529	(13,814)	-	21,343
4	Culver City	66,090	1.3810%	138,294	72,204	72,204	138,294
5	Foothill	327,193	6.1007%	610,942	283,749	283,749	610,942
6	Gardena	76,732	1.4261%	142,818	66,085	66,085	142,818
7	La Mirada	8,102	0.0317%	3,174	(4,928)	-	8,102
8	Long Beach	371,112	6.1416%	615,047	243,935	243,935	615,047
9	Montebello	151,698	2.2506%	225,388	73,690	73,690	225,388
10	Metro Bus Ops.	7,805,715	74.2746%	7,438,134	(367,581)	-	7,805,715
11	Norwalk	71,626	0.8513%	85,250	13,624	13,624	85,250
12	Redondo Beach	9,133	0.1859%	18,615	9,482	9,482	18,615
13	Santa Monica	267,091	5.4239%	543,172	276,080	276,080	543,172
14	Torrance	115,470	1.7173%	171,976	56,506	56,506	171,976
15	Subtotal Included	9,304,435	100.0000%	10,014,368	709,933	1,098,463	10,402,898
Eligible Operators							
16	Antelope Valley	95,786	1.5209%	152,305	56,519	56,519	152,305
17	Santa Clarita	-	1.7029%	170,536	170,536	170,536	170,536
18	City of Los Angeles	-	3.1155%	311,998	311,998	311,998	311,998
19	Foothill BSCP	-	0.6861%	68,710	68,710	68,710	68,710
20	Subtotal Eligible	95,786	7.0254%	703,549	607,763	607,763	703,549
21	Total all Operators	9,400,221	107.0254%	10,717,917	1,317,696	1,706,226	11,106,447
22	SCRRRA	614,147	-	-	-	-	614,147
23	Grand Total	\$ 10,014,368	107.0254%	\$ 10,717,917	\$ 1,317,696	\$ 1,706,226	\$ 11,720,594

MEASURE R 20% BUS OPERATIONS AND CAPITAL ALLOCATIONS						
		20% Bus Operations			Clean Fuel Bus Capital Facilities and Rolling Stock Fund	
		Proposition A Base Share %	Percentage Share	Bus Operations Allocation	Federal Section 5307 Capital Allocation Formula Share	Allocation Amount
Included Operators:						
1	Metro Bus Ops.	74.2287%	69.2988%	\$110,156,280	67.0922%	\$ -
2	Arcadia	0.0755%	0.0705%	112,086	0.1423%	-
3	Claremont	0.0485%	0.0453%	71,986	0.0593%	-
4	Commerce	0.1019%	0.0951%	151,164	0.3207%	-
5	Culver City	1.4165%	1.3225%	2,102,170	1.3738%	-
6	Foothill	6.2909%	5.8731%	9,335,751	7.8600%	-
7	Gardena	1.4013%	1.3082%	2,079,567	1.2499%	-
8	La Mirada	0.0300%	0.0280%	44,532	0.0725%	-
9	Long Beach	6.1944%	5.7830%	9,192,525	6.2001%	-
10	Montebello	2.2300%	2.0819%	3,309,368	1.9925%	-
11	Norwalk	0.7989%	0.7458%	1,185,578	0.5629%	-
12	Redondo Beach DR	0.0071%	0.0067%	10,600		-
13	Redondo Beach MB	0.1857%	0.1734%	275,600	0.2619%	-
14	Santa Monica	5.2837%	4.9327%	7,841,012	4.6633%	-
15	Torrance	1.7069%	1.5935%	2,532,998	1.3734%	-
Eligible Operators:						
16	Antelope Valley	1.5879%	1.4825%	2,356,535	1.7797%	-
17	Santa Clarita	1.6766%	1.5652%	2,488,096	1.8625%	-
18	LADOT Local	1.9891%	1.8570%	2,951,875		-
19	LADOT Express	1.1353%	1.0599%	1,684,798	3.1331%	-
20	Foothill BSCP	0.7250%	0.6769%	1,075,973		-
21						
22	Total Municipal Operators	32.8853%	30.7012%	48,802,213	32.9078%	-
23	Total Funds Allocated	107.1140%	100.0000%	\$158,958,494	100.0000%	\$ -

Note: Clean Fuel Capital Facilities and Rolling Stock Funds are allocated every even year at \$10M.

TIER 2 OPERATORS ESTIMATED FUNDING LEVELS							
	% Shares Calculation	Vehicle Service Miles	Passenger Revenue	Base Fare	Fare Units (1)	50% VSM + 50% Fare Units	% Share
1	LADOT Community Dash	3,235,035	\$ 4,679,465	\$ 0.50	16,808,232	10,021,634	4.7811%
2	Glendale	610,870	1,068,904	1.00	2,187,836	1,399,353	0.6676%
3	Pasadena	855,136	818,778	0.75	1,091,704	973,420	0.4644%
4	Burbank	258,232	108,425	1.00	108,425	183,329	0.0875%
5	Sub-Total	4,959,273	6,675,572		20,196,197	12,577,735	6.0006%
6	Included and Eligible Operators	112,915,582	340,949,142		219,051,414	197,031,015	93.9994%
7	Total	117,874,855	\$ 347,624,714		239,247,611	209,608,750	100.0000%
			% Share	TDA Article 4 + Interest	STA Revenue Base Share + Interest	Proposition A Discretionary	Total
8	Funds Allocated to Included Operators			\$ 364,667,432	\$ 29,277,328	\$ 234,828,073	\$ 628,772,833
	Formula Equivalent Calculation						
9	LADOT Community Dash		4.7811%	\$ 17,435,166	\$ 1,399,782	\$ 11,227,398	\$ 30,062,347
10	Glendale		0.6676%	2,434,528	195,456	1,567,718	4,197,702
11	Pasadena		0.4644%	1,693,510	135,963	1,090,538	2,920,012
12	Burbank		0.0875%	318,946	25,607	205,386	549,939
13	Total		6.0006%	\$ 21,882,151	\$ 1,756,809	\$ 14,091,040	\$ 37,730,000
14	Funds Allocated to Tier 2 Operators		15.90% (2)	\$ 3,479,801	\$ 279,376	\$ 2,240,823	\$ 6,000,000
	Actual Allocation						
15	LADOT Community Dash			\$ 2,772,621	\$ 222,600	\$ 1,785,433	\$ 4,780,654
16	Glendale			387,150	31,082	249,306	667,538
17	Pasadena			269,310	21,622	173,422	464,354
18	Burbank			50,720	4,072	32,661	87,454
19	Total			\$ 3,479,801	\$ 279,376	\$ 2,240,823	\$ 6,000,000
20		Prop A Incentive Allocation:		Before Tier 2 GOI Allocation	GOI Allocation Deduction	Net Prop A Incentive Allocation	
21		LADOT Community Dash		\$ 1,440,762	\$ (229,117)	\$ 1,211,645	
22		Glendale		310,302	(49,346)	260,956	
23		Pasadena		286,356	(45,538)	240,818	
24		Burbank		106,966	(17,010)	89,956	
25		Total		\$ 2,144,386	\$ (341,010)	\$ 1,803,376	
	(1) Funding Stability policy is applied in Glendale and LADOT Fare Units						
	(2) This percentage is applied as a deduction from the operators' Incentive Programs allocation.						

Bus Transit Subsidies

FEDERAL FORMULA GRANTS

Proposed

FEDERAL FORMULA GRANTS		
Los Angeles County Share of Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim UZA		
Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Grants:		
Estimated Revenue		\$ 238,954,631
	Estimated Revenue	\$ 238,954,631
	Off the Top:	
	1% Enhancement Allocation	(2,389,546)
		\$ 236,565,085
	85% Formula Allocation	\$ 201,080,322
	15% Discretionary Allocation	35,484,763
		\$ 236,565,085
Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities Formula Grants:		
Estimated Revenue		\$ 23,688,339
Section 5337 State of Good Repair (LA County Share of LA UZA 2):		
High Intensity Fixed Guideway:		
	Directional Route Miles (DRM) Generated	\$ 29,384,123
	Vehicle Revenue Miles (VRM) Generated	51,350,026
		80,734,149
High Intensity Motorbus:		
	Directional Route Miles (DRM) Generated	\$ 2,507,526
	Vehicle Revenue Miles (VRM) Generated	3,246,899
		5,754,425
Section 5337 State of Good Repair Total Estimated Revenue		\$ 86,488,574
Total Federal Formula Funds Available		\$ 349,131,544

FEDERAL FORMULA GRANTS ALLOCATION SUMMARY

	Urbanized Formula Program (Section 5307)			Bus & Bus Facilities (Section 5339)			State of Good Repair (Section 5337)			Total Federal funds Allocation	
	FY17 \$Allocation	Fund Exchanges	Adjusted \$ Allocation	FY17 \$Allocation	Fund Exchange	Adjusted \$ Allocation	FY17 \$Allocation	Fund Exchange	Adjusted \$ Allocation		
Included Operators:											
1	Metro Bus Ops.	\$ 157,594,833	\$ (5,204,799)	\$ 152,390,035	\$ 16,375,053	\$ 7,313,286	\$23,688,339	\$ 82,347,061	\$4,141,513	\$ 86,488,574	\$ 262,566,948
Municipal Operators:											
2	Arcadia	294,743	34,722	329,466	34,722	(34,722)	-	-	-	-	329,466
3	Claremont	122,780	14,464	137,244	14,464	(14,464)	-	-	-	-	137,244
4	Commerce	664,434	78,274	742,708	78,274	(78,274)	-	-	-	-	742,708
5	Culver City	4,231,013	335,305	4,566,318	335,305	(335,305)	-	-	-	-	4,566,318
6	Foothill Transit	21,264,358	4,617,609	25,881,968	1,918,385	(1,918,385)	-	2,699,225	(2,699,225)	-	25,881,968
7	Gardena	5,501,799	357,304	5,859,102	305,059	(305,059)	-	52,245	(52,245)	-	5,859,102
8	La Mirada	150,106	17,683	167,790	17,683	(17,683)	-	-	-	-	167,790
9	Long Beach	16,080,940	1,425,665	17,506,605	1,513,251	(1,513,251)	-	162,414	(162,414)	-	17,506,605
10	Montebello	4,127,943	486,294	4,614,237	486,294	(486,294)	-	-	-	-	4,614,237
11	Norwalk	2,040,442	137,397	2,177,839	137,397	(137,397)	-	-	-	-	2,177,839
12	Redondo Beach	542,653	63,927	606,580	63,927	(63,927)	-	-	-	-	606,580
13	Santa Monica	15,554,960	(4,696,408)	10,858,552	1,138,154	(1,138,154)	-	165,438	(165,438)	-	10,858,552
14	Torrance	2,845,307	335,192	3,180,500	335,192	(335,192)	-	-	-	-	3,180,500
15	Sub-Total	73,421,478	3,207,430	76,628,909	6,378,109	(6,378,109)	-	3,079,321	(3,079,321)	-	76,628,909
Eligible Operators:											
16	Antelope Valley	147,326	449,883	597,209	17,356	(17,356)	-	432,527	(432,527)	-	597,209
17	LADOT	6,491,075	1,394,348	7,885,423	764,683	(764,683)	-	629,664	(629,664)	-	7,885,423
18	Santa Clarita	1,299,918	153,137	1,453,056	153,137	(153,137)	-	-	-	-	1,453,056
19	Foothill BSCP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	Sub-Total	7,938,320	1,997,368	9,935,688	935,177	(935,177)	-	1,062,191	(1,062,191)	-	9,935,688
Tier 2 Operators:											
21	LADOT Community Dash	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	Glendale	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
23	Pasadena	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	Burbank	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	Sub-Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	Lynwood Trolley	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
27	Total Excluding Metro	81,359,798	5,204,799	86,564,596	7,313,286	(7,313,286)	-	4,141,513	(4,141,513)	-	86,564,596
28	Grand Total	\$ 238,954,631	\$ -	\$ 238,954,631	\$ 23,688,339	\$ -	\$23,688,339	\$ 86,488,574	\$ -	\$ 86,488,574	\$ 349,131,544

CAPITAL ALLOCATION % SHARE CALCULATION												
	MILEAGE CALCULATION					ACTIVE FLEET CALCULATION						
	OPERATOR	LOCAL VEH MILES [INPUT]	EXPRESS VEH MILES [INPUT]	TOTAL MILES WEIGHTED 60% Local/ 40% Express	1/3 Weight	ACTIVE FLEET* [INPUT]	PK BUS FIXED RTE** [INPUT]	ALLOWABLE PEAK BUS (PK+20%)	DAR SEATS*** [INPUT]	BUS EQVT (44)	TOTAL ACTIVE VEH	1/3 Weight
1	ANTELOPE VALLEY	2,427,727	867,421	1,803,605	0.7406%	75	62	74.4	0	0.0	74.4	0.6701%
2	ARCADIA	251,420	-	150,852	0.0619%	0	0	0.0	344	7.8	7.8	0.0704%
3	CLAREMONT	103,800	-	62,280	0.0256%	0	0	0.0	144	3.3	3.3	0.0295%
4	COMMERCE	418,953	-	251,372	0.1032%	18	14	16.8	50	1.1	17.9	0.1615%
5	CULVER CITY	1,708,506	-	1,025,104	0.4209%	54	45	54.0	0	0.0	54.0	0.4864%
6	FOOTHILL	8,674,688	6,566,776	7,831,523	3.2158%	330	278	330.0	0	0.0	330.0	2.9722%
7	GARDENA	1,723,499	-	1,034,099	0.4246%	65	43	51.6	0	0.0	51.6	0.4647%
8	LADOT	2,588,136	2,255,729	2,455,173	1.0082%	170	140	168.0	0	0.0	168.0	1.5131%
9	LA MIRADA	83,571	-	50,143	0.0206%	0	0	0.0	232	5.3	5.3	0.0475%
10	LONG BEACH	7,788,996	-	4,673,398	1.9190%	264	202	242.4	60	1.4	243.8	2.1955%
11	MONTEBELLO	2,563,000	79,000	1,569,400	0.6444%	75	62	74.4	40	0.9	75.3	0.6783%
12	METRO OPERATIONS	85,459,000	5,356,000	53,417,800	21.9346%	2,369	1,924	2,308.8	0	0.0	2,308.8	20.7948%
13	NORWALK	902,305	-	541,383	0.2223%	33	19	22.8	0	0.0	22.8	0.2054%
14	REDONDO BEACH	445,868	-	267,521	0.1099%	14	10	12.0	20	0.5	12.5	0.1122%
15	SANTA CLARITA	2,238,208	1,100,146	1,782,983	0.7321%	84	67	80.4	0	0.0	80.4	0.7241%
16	SANTA MONICA	4,810,000	534,000	3,099,600	1.2728%	188	157	188.0	0	0.0	188.0	1.6933%
17	TORRANCE	1,557,900	566,100	1,161,180	0.4768%	56	48	56.0	48	1.1	57.1	0.5142%
18	TOTAL	123,745,577	17,325,172	81,177,415	33.3333%	3,795	3,071	3,679.6	938	21.3	3,700.9	33.3333%

Include only MTA Funded Programs:

*Source: NTD Report Form A-30 "Vehicle Inventory Report (Mode MB), Number of Active Vehicles in Fleet". LADOT's total active vehicles is reported separately.

**Source: NTD Report Form S-10 "Service Non-Rail (Mode MB), Vehicles Operated in Annual Maximum Service". LADOT's figure is from TPM excluding Community Dash.

***Source: NTD Report Form A-30 "Vehicle Inventory Report (Mode DR), Seating Capacity". Redondo Beach's Seating Capacity is apportioned between FAP and non-FAP vehicles.

CAPITAL ALLOCATION % SHARE CALCULATION (Continued)

	OPERATOR	FARE UNITS				UNLINKED PASSENGERS		GROSS FORMULA SHARE	Re-Allocate AVTA And Santa Clarita's Non-LA2 UZA Share	LA UZA 2 NET FORMULA SHARE
		PASSENGER REVENUE [INPUT]	BASE FARE [INPUT]	FARE UNITS	1/2 of 1/3 Weight	UNLINKED PASSENGER S [INPUT]	1/2 of 1/3 Weight			
1	ANTELOPE VALLEY	\$4,766,186	\$ 1.500	3,177,457	0.2366%	3,534,448	0.1324%	1.7797%	-1.7064%	0.0733%
2	ARCADIA	76,484	1.000	76,484	0.0057%	112,398	0.0042%	0.1423%	0.0043%	0.1466%
3	CLAREMONT	78,300	2.500	31,320	0.0023%	50,200	0.0019%	0.0593%	0.0018%	0.0611%
4	COMMERCE	-	-	438,997	0.0327%	620,696	0.0233%	0.3207%	0.0097%	0.3304%
5	CULVER CITY	3,760,517	1.000	3,760,517	0.2800%	4,979,334	0.1865%	1.3738%	0.0417%	1.4155%
6	FOOTHILL	18,890,298	1.250	15,112,238	1.1252%	14,596,534	0.5468%	7.8600%	0.2384%	8.0984%
7	GARDENA	2,986,997	1.000	2,986,997	0.2224%	3,687,034	0.1381%	1.2499%	0.0379%	1.2878%
8	LADOT	6,208,941	1.500	4,139,294	0.3082%	8,104,486	0.3036%	3.1331%	0.0950%	3.2281%
9	LA MIRADA	35,088	1.000	35,088	0.0026%	46,982	0.0018%	0.0725%	0.0022%	0.0746%
10	LONG BEACH	17,331,149	1.250	13,864,919	1.0324%	28,117,340	1.0532%	6.2001%	0.1880%	6.3882%
11	MONTEBELLO	5,669,000	1.100	5,153,636	0.3837%	7,635,000	0.2860%	1.9925%	0.0604%	2.0529%
12	METRO OPERATIONS	268,512,000	1.750	153,435,429	11.4247%	345,401,000	12.9381%	67.0922%	2.0348%	69.1271%
13	NORWALK	1,309,730	1.250	1,047,784	0.0780%	1,528,931	0.0573%	0.5629%	0.0171%	0.5800%
14	REDONDO BEACH	332,956	1.000	332,956	0.0248%	403,321	0.0151%	0.2619%	0.0079%	0.2699%
15	SANTA CLARITA	3,787,999	1.000	3,787,999	0.2821%	3,314,511	0.1242%	1.8625%	-1.2160%	0.6465%
16	SANTA MONICA	13,362,000	1.000	13,362,000	0.9949%	18,749,000	0.7023%	4.6633%	0.1414%	4.8047%
17	TORRANCE	3,093,000	1.000	3,093,000	0.2303%	4,059,000	0.1520%	1.3734%	0.0417%	1.4150%
18	TOTAL	\$350,200,645		223,836,116	16.6667%	444,940,215	16.6667%	100.0000%	0.0000%	100.0000%

Commerce Fare Units are calculated as follows: ((Total Fare Units w/out MTA and Commerce) / (Total Unlinked Passengers w/out MTA and Commerce)) * Commerce's Unlinked Passengers.

FORM FFA10, SECTION 9 STATISTICS PASSENGER MILES IS USED TO CALCULATE AVTA AND SANTA CLARITA'S RE-ALLOCATION OF CAPITAL MONIES.						
	ANTELOPE VALLEY			SANTA CLARITA		
	Passenger Miles	%	Re-Allocated Share	Passenger Miles	%	Re-Allocated Share
Non-LA 2 UZA (AV 123 for AVTA, AV 176 for Santa Clarita)	64,301,680	95.8831%	1.7064%	14,504,569	65.2901%	1.2160%
UZA number LA 2	2,760,869	4.1169%	0.0733%	7,711,004	34.7099%	0.6465%
Total	67,062,549	100.0000%	1.7797%	22,215,573	100.0000%	1.8625%

FEDERAL SECTION 5307 URBANIZED FORMULA PROGRAM

	OPERATOR	LA UZA 2 NET FORMULA SHARE	85% FORMULA ALLOCATION	1% ENHANCEMENT ALLOCATION		15% DISCRETIONARY ALLOCATION		TOTAL	TDA Fund Exchange	\$5339/\$5337 Fund Exchange	Total Funds Available
				Project Title	Amount	Project Title	Amount				
1	ANTELOPE VALLEY	0.0733%	\$ 147,326					\$ 147,326		\$ 449,883	\$ 597,209
2	ARCADIA	0.1466%	294,743					294,743		34,722	329,466
3	CLAREMONT	0.0611%	122,780					122,780		14,464	137,244
4	COMMERCE	0.3304%	664,434					664,434		78,274	742,708
5	CULVER CITY	1.4155%	2,846,264	Bus Stops Impvts	250,000	Bus Repl (2) 40' CNG	798,257	4,231,013		335,305	4,566,318
				Bus Stops Impvts FY16 (1)	336,492						
6	FOOTHILL	8.0984%	16,284,358			Bus Repl (30) 40' CNG	4,980,000	21,264,358		4,617,609	25,881,968
7	GARDENA	1.2878%	2,589,517			Bus Repl (6) 40' Elec	2,912,282	5,501,799		357,304	5,859,102
8	LADOT	3.2281%	6,491,075					6,491,075		1,394,348	7,885,423
9	LA MIRADA	0.0746%	150,106					150,106		17,683	167,790
10	LONG BEACH	6.3882%	12,845,354			Regional Training	250,000	16,080,940	(5) (250,000)	1,675,665	17,506,605
						Bus Repl (10) 30' CNG/Electrc	2,985,586				
11	MONTEBELLO	2.0529%	4,127,943					4,127,943		486,294	4,614,237
12	METRO OPERATIONS	69.1271%	139,000,924	Rosa Park/Willow Brook Station impvt	976,527	Bus Repl (350) 40' CNG	17,617,382	157,594,833	6,250,000	(11,454,799)	152,390,035
13	NORWALK	0.5800%	1,166,308	Bike Lockers	40,000	Bus Repl (2) 40' CNG	834,134	2,040,442		137,397	2,177,839
14	REDONDO BEACH	0.2699%	542,653					542,653		63,927	606,580
15	SANTA CLARITA	0.6465%	1,299,918					1,299,918		153,137	1,453,056
16	SANTA MONICA	4.8047%	9,661,311	EXPO Bus Stop Impvt	288,000	Bus Repl (14) 40' CNG	5,107,122	15,554,960	(4) (6,000,000)	1,303,592	10,858,552
				EXPO Bus Stop Impvt FY16 (2)	100,000						
				Project TBD (3)	398,527						
17	TORRANCE	1.4150%	2,845,307					2,845,307		335,192	3,180,500
18	Unallocated							-		-	-
19	TOTAL	100.0000%	\$201,080,322		\$ 2,389,546		\$35,484,763	\$238,954,631	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 238,954,631

Other:

- (1) Culver City's FY16 allocation in the amount of \$336,492 was deferred in favor of Metro. This allocation is now allocated in FY2017 1% Enhancement fund.
- (2) \$100,000 of Santa Monica's FY16 allocation was deferred in favor of Metro. This allocation is now allocated in FY2017 1% Enhancement Fund.
- (3) Unsubscribed balance allocated to Santa Monica for a project pending identification
- (4) \$6M Santa Monica's formula share is exchange with Metro's TDA Share
- (5) Funds allocated to Southern California Regional Transit Training Consortium (SCR TTC) through Long Beach Transit is exchanged with Metro's TDA share.

FEDERAL SECTION 5339 BUS AND BUS FACILITIES					
(Estimated - to be Adjusted to Actual apportionment)					
	OPERATOR	LA UZA 2 NET FORMULA SHARE	Net Formula Share	Fund Exchange	Net Funds Available
1	ANTELOPE VALLEY	0.0733%	\$ 17,356	\$ (17,356)	\$ -
2	ARCADIA	0.1466%	34,722	(34,722)	-
3	CLAREMONT	0.0611%	14,464	(14,464)	-
4	COMMERCE	0.3304%	78,274	(78,274)	-
5	CULVER CITY	1.4155%	335,305	(335,305)	-
6	FOOTHILL	8.0984%	1,918,385	(1,918,385)	-
7	GARDENA	1.2878%	305,059	(305,059)	-
8	LADOT	3.2281%	764,683	(764,683)	-
9	LA MIRADA	0.0746%	17,683	(17,683)	-
10	LONG BEACH	6.3882%	1,513,251	(1,513,251)	-
11	MONTEBELLO	2.0529%	486,294	(486,294)	-
12	METRO OPERATIONS	69.1271%	16,375,053	7,313,286	23,688,339
13	NORWALK	0.5800%	137,397	(137,397)	-
14	REDONDO BEACH	0.2699%	63,927	(63,927)	-
15	SANTA CLARITA	0.6465%	153,137	(153,137)	-
16	SANTA MONICA	4.8047%	1,138,154	(1,138,154)	-
17	TORRANCE	1.4150%	335,192	(335,192)	-
18	TOTAL	100.0000%	\$ 23,688,339	\$ -	\$ 23,688,339

FEDERAL SECTION 5337 STATE OF GOOD REPAIR										
(Estimated - to be Adjusted to Actual apportionment)										
LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHARE (UZA 2)		Directional Route Miles (DRM) Allocation			Vehicle Revenue Miles (VRM) Allocation			Total \$ Allocation	Fund Exchange	Net Funds Available
OPERATOR	DRM	DRM%	DRM \$Allocation	VRM	VRM%	VRM \$Allocation				
High Intensity Fixed Guideway:										
1	METRO (Including Metrolink)	452.1	99.757%	\$ 29,312,802	24,994,871	98.358%	\$ 50,506,982	\$ 79,819,785	\$ 914,364	\$ 80,734,149
2	Long Beach Transit	0.5	0.110%	32,418	64,332	0.253%	129,995	162,414	(162,414)	-
3	Santa Monica	0.6	0.132%	38,902	62,620	0.246%	126,536	165,438	(165,438)	-
4	Foothill Transit	-	0.000%	-	290,253	1.142%	586,512	586,512	(586,512)	-
5	Sub-total	453.2	100.000%	29,384,123	25,412,076	100.000%	51,350,026	80,734,149	-	80,734,149
High Intensity Motorbus:										
6	ANTELOPE VALLEY	23.6	13.184%	330,601	92,790	3.139%	101,926	432,527	(432,527)	-
7	FOOTHILL	39.4	22.011%	551,936	1,420,880	48.070%	1,560,776	2,112,712	(2,112,712)	-
8	GARDENA		0.000%	-	47,562	1.609%	52,245	52,245	(52,245)	-
9	LADOT	35.1	19.609%	491,699	125,599	4.249%	137,965	629,664	(629,664)	-
10	METRO OPERATIONS	80.9	45.196%	1,133,290	1,269,040	42.933%	1,393,987	2,527,276	3,227,149	5,754,425
11	TORRANCE		0.000%	-		0.000%	-	-	-	-
12	Sub-total	179.0	100.00%	2,507,526	2,955,871	100.000%	3,246,899	5,754,425	-	5,754,425
13	Total LA County Share - UZA 2	632.20		\$ 31,891,649	28,367,947	200.000%	\$ 54,596,925	\$ 86,488,574	\$ -	\$ 86,488,574

LOCAL SUBSIDIES

Proposed

PROPOSITION A 5% OF 40% DISCRETIONARY INCENTIVE PROGRAMS		
		FY17 Allocation
<u>PRIORITY I: EXISTING SUB-REGIONAL PARATRANSIT PROJECTS:</u>		
1	Agoura Hills	\$ 101,009
2	Antelope Valley, Elderly & Disabled	291,240
3	Beverly Hills Taxi & Lift Van	27,436
4	Culver City Community Transit and LA County	55,636
5	Gardena, Hawthorne and LA County	146,085
6	Glendale Paratransit and La Canada Flintridge	253,838
7	Inglewood Transit and LA County	173,065
8	LA County (Whittier et al)	193,095
9	LA County (Willowbrook)	47,204
10	Los Angeles Taxi & Lift Van, City Ride	398,928
11	Los Angeles Dial-a-Ride, City Ride	1,076,079
12	Monrovia D.A.R. and LA County	171,998
13	Palos Verdes PTA D.A.R.	49,879
14	Palos Verdes PTA - PV Transit	333,412
15	Pasadena Community Transit, San Marino and LA County	356,939
16	Pomona Valley TA - E&D (Get About)	614,440
17	Pomona Valley TA General Public (VC)	78,628
18	Redondo Beach Community Transit and Hermosa Beach	87,493
19	Santa Clarita D.A.R.	806,544
20	West Hollywood (DAR)	259,691
21	West Hollywood (Taxi)	68,734
22	Whittier (DAR)	305,601
23		
	1st Priority Sub-total	\$ 5,896,974
<u>PRIORITY II: SERVICES THAT RECEIVE GROWTH OVER INFLATION</u>		
(IF PROP A DISC. CANNOT FULLY FUND THESE SYSTEMS)		
24	City of L.A. - Bus Service Continuation Project/DASH/Central City Shuttle	\$ -
25	Santa Clarita - Local Fixed Route	-
26	Antelope Valley - Local Fixed Route	-
27	Foothill - Bus Service Continuation Project	-
28		
	2nd Priority Sub-total	\$ -
29	<u>PRIORITY III: APPROVED EXISTING EXPANDED PARATRANSIT</u>	\$ -
30	<u>PRIORITY IV: APPROVED NEW EXPANDED PARATRANSIT SERVICES</u>	\$ -

PROPOSITION A 5% OF 40% DISCRETIONARY INCENTIVE PROGRAMS				
	Priority V: VOLUNTARY NTD DATA REPORTING: FY15 NTD Report Year	Estimate	Tier 2 Deduction (1)	FY17 Net Allocation
31	City of Alhambra (MB and DR)	\$ 138,461		\$ 138,461
32	City of Artesia (DR)	6,809		6,809
33	City of Azusa (DR)	43,298		43,298
34	City of Baldwin Park (MB and DR)	124,272		124,272
35	City of Bell (MB/DR)	20,259		20,259
36	City of Bell Gardens (MB and DR)	63,705		63,705
37	City of Bellflower (MB and DR)	46,254		46,254
38	City of Burbank (MB)*	106,966	17,010	89,956
39	City of Carson (MB and DT)	194,001		194,001
40	City of Cerritos (MB)	71,105		71,105
41	City of Compton (MB)	55,639		55,639
42	City of Covina (DR)	27,620		27,620
43	City of Cudahy (MB and DR)	24,535		24,535
44	City of Downey (MB and DR)	93,166		93,166
45	City of Duarte (MB)	36,022		36,022
46	City of El Monte (MB and DR)	159,671		159,671
47	City of Glendora (MB and DR)	58,019		58,019
48	City of Glendale (MB)*	310,302	49,346	260,956
49	City of Huntington Park (MB)	45,148		45,148
50	City of Los Angeles -- Community DASH* (MB)	1,440,762	229,117	1,211,645
51	City of Los Angeles -- Department of Aging (DR)	197,662		197,662
52	LA County Dept. of Public Works -- Avocado Heights (MB)	15,543		15,543
53	LA County Dept. of Public Works -- East Valinda (MB)	23,833		23,833
54	LA County Dept. of Public Works -- East LA (MB and DR)	213,196		213,196
55	LA County Dept. of Public Works -- Willowbrook (MB)	8,753		8,753
56	LA County Dept. of Public Works -- King Medical (MB)	36,960		36,960
57	LA County Dept. of Public Works -- South Whittier (MB)	66,778		66,778
58	City of Lawndale (MB)	34,781		34,781
59	City of Lynwood (MB)	64,812		64,812
60	City of Malibu (DT)	21,641		21,641
61	City of Manhattan Beach (DR)	18,002		18,002
62	City of Maywood (DR)	4,346		4,346
63	City of Monterey Park (MB and DR)	108,736		108,736
64	City of Pasadena (MB)*	286,356	45,538	240,818
65	City of Pico Rivera (DR)	22,138		22,138
66	City of Rosemead (MB and DR)	76,030		76,030
67	City of Santa fe Springs (DR)	5,027		5,027
68	City of South Gate (DT and MB)	142,556		142,556
69	City of South Pasadena (DR)	13,080		13,080
70	City of West Covina (MB and DR)	103,818		103,818
71	City of West Hollywood (MB)	33,522		33,522
72	5th Priority Sub-Total	\$ 4,563,584	\$ 341,010	\$ 4,222,574

PROPOSITION A 5% OF 40% DISCRETIONARY INCENTIVE PROGRAMS			
<u>PRIORITY VI: SPECIAL DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS</u>			
73	Avalon Ferry Subsidy		\$ 650,000
74	Avalon Transit Services (Jitney and Dial-a-Ride)		250,000
75	Hollywood Bowl Shuttle Service		1,057,000
76		6th Priority Sub-total	\$ 1,957,000
77	Total Expenditures		\$12,076,548
78	Reserves for contingencies (2)		3,259,390
79	Sub-total		15,335,938
80	Estimated Revenue		15,335,938
81	Surplus (Deficit)		\$ -

NOTES:

(1) Tier 2 Operators' shares have been reduced by % of GOI Funding per Tier 2 Operators Funding Program.

(2) 5th Priority - locally funded systems which voluntarily reported NTD data for FY14 report year. Exact amounts TBD and may be higher, based upon actual FY 17 FTA 5307 apportionment unit values.

**PROPOSITION A, PROPOSITION C AND MEASURE R LOCAL RETURNS
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLES 3 AND 8**

	LOCAL JURISDICTION	Population	Population	Proposition A	Proposition C	Measure R	TDA Article 3	TDA Article 8 (S & H)		Total Allocations
		DOF Report	as % of	Local Return	Local Return	Local Return	Ped & Bike	Population	Article 8	
		2015 data	County	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	[1]		Allocation	
1	AGOURA HILLS	20,767	0.2049%	\$ 387,165	\$ 321,143	\$ 240,840	\$ 13,772		\$ -	\$ 962,920
2	ALHAMBRA	85,545	0.8439%	1,594,840	1,322,878	992,086	56,680			3,966,484
3	ARCADIA	57,761	0.5698%	1,076,855	893,223	669,869	38,276			2,678,222
4	ARTESIA	16,849	0.1662%	314,121	260,555	195,402	11,177			781,254
5	AVALON	3,840	0.0379%	71,590	59,382	44,533	5,000	3,840	150,107	330,613
6	AZUSA	49,425	0.4876%	921,444	764,314	573,194	32,755			2,291,707
7	BALDWIN PARK	77,047	0.7601%	1,436,409	1,191,464	893,533	51,051			3,572,457
8	BELL	36,135	0.3565%	673,675	558,796	419,067	23,952			1,675,489
9	BELLFLOWER	78,106	0.7705%	1,456,152	1,207,840	905,815	51,753			3,621,560
10	BELL GARDENS	42,875	0.4230%	799,331	663,024	497,232	28,416			1,988,003
11	BEVERLY HILLS	34,833	0.3436%	649,402	538,661	403,967	23,089			1,615,119
12	BRADBURY	1,087	0.0107%	20,265	16,809	12,606	5,000			54,681
13	BURBANK	106,084	1.0465%	1,977,754	1,640,495	1,230,282	70,285			4,918,817
14	CALABASAS	24,212	0.2389%	451,391	374,417	280,793	16,054			1,122,655
15	CARSON	93,148	0.9189%	1,736,585	1,440,451	1,080,260	61,717			4,319,013
16	CERRITOS	49,968	0.4929%	931,568	772,711	579,491	33,114			2,316,884
17	CLAREMONT	36,282	0.3579%	676,416	561,069	420,771	24,049			1,682,305
18	COMMERCE	13,060	0.1288%	243,481	201,961	151,460	8,667			605,570
19	COMPTON	98,506	0.9718%	1,836,475	1,523,308	1,142,398	65,266			4,567,447
20	COVINA	48,876	0.4822%	911,209	755,824	566,827	32,391			2,266,251
21	CUDAHY	24,270	0.2394%	452,473	375,314	281,465	16,092			1,125,344
22	CULVER CITY	39,773	0.3924%	741,499	615,054	461,257	26,361			1,844,172
23	DIAMOND BAR	56,668	0.5590%	1,056,478	876,320	657,193	37,553			2,627,543
24	DOWNEY	113,900	1.1237%	2,123,470	1,761,363	1,320,926	75,462			5,281,221
25	DUARTE	21,839	0.2154%	407,151	337,721	253,272	14,482			1,012,626
26	EL MONTE	115,774	1.1421%	2,158,408	1,790,342	1,342,660	76,704			5,368,113
27	EL SEGUNDO	17,000	0.1677%	316,936	262,890	197,153	11,277			788,256
28	GARDENA	60,414	0.5960%	1,126,315	934,249	700,636	40,034			2,801,234
29	GLENDALE	199,182	1.9650%	3,713,407	3,080,173	2,309,963	131,952			9,235,495
30	GLEN DORA	51,463	0.5077%	959,439	795,830	596,829	34,105			2,386,203
31	HAWAIIAN GARDENS	14,545	0.1435%	271,167	224,926	168,682	9,651			674,425
32	HAWTHORNE	87,657	0.8648%	1,634,214	1,355,538	1,016,580	58,079			4,064,411
33	HERMOSA BEACH	19,772	0.1951%	368,615	305,756	229,301	13,113			916,785
34	HIDDEN HILLS	1,901	0.0188%	35,441	29,397	22,046	5,000			91,885
35	HUNTINGTON PARK	59,312	0.5851%	1,105,770	917,208	687,856	39,304			2,750,138

**PROPOSITION A, PROPOSITION C AND MEASURE R LOCAL RETURNS
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLES 3 AND 8**

	LOCAL JURISDICTION	Population	Population	Proposition A	Proposition C	Measure R	TDA Article 3	TDA Article 8 (S & H)		Total Allocations
		DOF Report	as % of	Local Return	Local Return	Local Return	Ped & Bike	Population	Article 8	
		2015 data	County	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	[1]		Allocation	
36	INDUSTRY [3]	440	0.0043%	8,203	6,804	5,103	-			20,110
37	INGLEWOOD	112,333	1.1082%	2,094,256	1,737,130	1,302,754	74,424			5,208,564
38	IRWINDALE	1,473	0.0145%	27,462	22,779	17,083	5,000			72,323
39	LA CANADA-FLINTRIDGE	20,592	0.2031%	383,903	318,437	238,811	13,656			954,806
40	LA HABRA HEIGHTS	5,439	0.0537%	101,401	84,109	63,077	5,000			253,588
41	LAKEWOOD	81,601	0.8050%	1,521,311	1,261,887	946,347	54,068			3,783,613
42	LA MIRADA	49,521	0.4885%	923,234	765,798	574,307	32,818			2,296,158
43	LANCASTER	160,784	1.5862%	2,997,542	2,486,382	1,864,652	106,518	160,784	6,285,096	13,740,189
44	LA PUENTE	40,690	0.4014%	758,595	629,235	471,892	26,969			1,886,691
45	LA VERNE	33,042	0.3260%	616,011	510,965	383,196	21,903			1,532,076
46	LAWNDALE	33,403	0.3295%	622,742	516,548	387,383	22,142			1,548,814
47	LOMITA	20,733	0.2045%	386,531	320,617	240,446	13,749			961,344
48	LONG BEACH	472,779	4.6641%	8,814,153	7,311,108	5,482,935	313,181			21,921,377
49	LOS ANGELES CITY	3,957,022	39.0371%	73,771,886	61,191,838	45,890,560	2,976,578			183,830,861
50	LYNWOOD	71,381	0.7042%	1,330,776	1,103,844	827,823	47,298			3,309,741
51	MALIBU	12,935	0.1276%	241,151	200,028	150,010	8,584			599,774
52	MANHATTAN BEACH	35,763	0.3528%	666,740	553,043	414,752	23,705			1,658,240
53	MAYWOOD	27,884	0.2751%	519,849	431,201	323,378	18,486			1,292,915
54	MONROVIA	37,406	0.3690%	697,371	578,451	433,807	24,794			1,734,421
55	MONTEBELLO	64,104	0.6324%	1,195,109	991,312	743,430	42,478			2,972,329
56	MONTEREY PARK	62,063	0.6123%	1,157,058	959,749	719,760	41,126			2,877,693
57	NORWALK	107,166	1.0572%	1,997,926	1,657,227	1,242,831	71,002			4,968,986
58	PALMDALE	157,009	1.5489%	2,927,163	2,428,005	1,820,872	104,017	157,009	6,137,530	13,417,588
59	PALOS VERDES ESTATES	13,730	0.1355%	255,972	212,322	159,230	9,111			636,636
60	PARAMOUNT	55,302	0.5456%	1,031,011	855,196	641,351	36,648			2,564,206
61	PASADENA	141,510	1.3960%	2,638,211	2,188,327	1,641,126	93,751			6,561,415
62	PICO RIVERA	64,182	0.6332%	1,196,563	992,518	744,334	42,530			2,975,945
63	POMONA	152,419	1.5037%	2,841,591	2,357,025	1,767,641	100,977			7,067,233
64	RANCHO PALOS VERDES	42,564	0.4199%	793,533	658,215	493,625	28,210			1,973,583
65	REDONDO BEACH	68,095	0.6718%	1,269,514	1,053,029	789,715	45,122			3,157,379
66	ROLLING HILLS	1,904	0.0188%	35,497	29,444	22,081	5,000			92,022
67	ROLLING HILLS ESTATES	8,223	0.0811%	153,304	127,161	95,364	5,463			381,292
68	ROSEMEAD	55,017	0.5428%	1,025,698	850,789	638,046	36,459			2,550,991
69	SAN DIMAS	34,713	0.3425%	647,164	536,806	402,575	23,010			1,609,555
70	SAN FERNANDO	24,558	0.2423%	457,842	379,768	284,805	16,283			1,138,698

**PROPOSITION A, PROPOSITION C AND MEASURE R LOCAL RETURNS
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLES 3 AND 8**

	LOCAL JURISDICTION	Population	Population	Proposition A	Proposition C	Measure R	TDA Article 3	TDA Article 8 (S & H)		Total Allocations
		DOF Report	as % of	Local Return	Local Return	Local Return	Ped & Bike	Article 8		
		2015 data	County	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	[1]	Population	Allocation	
71	SAN GABRIEL	40,517	0.3997%	755,370	626,559	469,886	26,854			1,878,669
72	SAN MARINO	13,414	0.1323%	250,081	207,436	155,565	8,901			621,984
73	SANTA CLARITA	213,231	2.1036%	3,975,326	3,297,428	2,472,892	141,258	213,231	8,335,265	18,222,171
74	SANTA FE SPRINGS	17,627	0.1739%	328,625	272,586	204,425	11,692			817,328
75	SANTA MONICA	93,283	0.9203%	1,739,101	1,442,539	1,081,826	61,806			4,325,272
76	SIERRA MADRE	11,133	0.1098%	207,556	172,162	129,112	7,391			516,220
77	SIGNAL HILL	11,585	0.1143%	215,982	179,152	134,354	7,690			537,178
78	SOUTH EL MONTE	20,841	0.2056%	388,545	322,288	241,698	13,821			966,352
79	SOUTH GATE	96,547	0.9525%	1,799,953	1,493,014	1,119,679	63,968			4,476,614
80	SOUTH PASADENA	26,174	0.2582%	487,969	404,758	303,546	17,354			1,213,627
81	TEMPLE CITY	36,275	0.3579%	676,285	560,961	420,690	24,044			1,681,980
82	TORRANCE	148,427	1.4643%	2,767,167	2,295,292	1,721,345	98,333			6,882,136
83	VERNON [4]	123	0.0012%	2,293	1,902	1,902	5,000			9,195
84	WALNUT	30,257	0.2985%	564,090	467,898	350,898	20,058			1,402,944
85	WEST COVINA	108,401	1.0694%	2,020,951	1,676,325	1,257,153	71,820			5,026,249
86	WEST HOLLYWOOD	35,825	0.3534%	667,896	554,002	415,471	23,746			1,661,115
87	WESTLAKE VILLAGE	8,423	0.0831%	157,032	130,254	97,684	5,595			390,566
88	WHITTIER	86,948	0.8578%	1,620,996	1,344,574	1,008,357	57,610			4,031,537
89	UNINCORP LA COUNTY	1,051,872	10.3770%	19,610,349	16,266,268	12,198,819	1,526,188	109,504	4,280,545	53,882,169
90	TOTAL	10,136,559	100.0000%	\$ 188,978,750	\$ 156,752,900	\$ 117,554,748	\$ 7,924,824	644,368	\$ 25,188,543	\$ 496,399,765

NOTES:

Population estimates are based on State of California Department of Finance's 2014 population estimates. The Unincorporated Population figure for TDA 8 is based on 2007 estimates by Urban Research

Proposition A, Proposition C and Measure R Local Return funds are allocated their share of estimated revenues (minus administration) without carryover since payments are made based on actual revenues received.

TDA Article 3 Allocation:

[1] 15% of the estimated revenue is first awarded to the City of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County (30%-70% split) as Supplemental Allocation.

[3] City of Industry has opted out of the TDA Article 3 program indefinitely.

[4] City of Vernon has opted out of the Measure R Local Return program indefinitely.

Summary of Significant Information, Methodologies and Assumptions for

Revenue Estimates

- Sales tax revenue estimate is 3.3% over FY2016 budget based upon review of several economic forecasts.
- Consumer price index (CPI) of 1.85% represents a composite index from several economic forecasting sources and is applied to Proposition A Discretionary program for included operators, Transit Service Enhancement (TSE), Bus Service Improvement Program (BSIP), and Discretionary Base Restructuring program. Municipal Operators Service Improvement Program (MOSIP) receives 3% increase from FY2016 allocation.
- Proposition A 95% of 40% growth over inflation (GOI) revenue of \$52 million is used to fund formula equivalents for eligible and Tier 2 operators.
- Proposition 1B PTMISEA Bridge funding allocation represents the 4th of four installments of FY2011 funding allocation.
- Proposition 1B Security Bridge funding allocation represents FY2014 funding allocation.
- Federal formula grants (urbanized Formula Section 5307, Bus and Bus Facilities Section 5339 and State of Good Repair Section 5337) are presented for budgetary purposes only and will be adjusted upon receipt of the final apportionments. Sections 5307 and 5339 are calculated using the Capital Allocation Procedure (CAP) as adopted by the Bus Operations Subcommittee (BOS), while Section 5337 is calculated using the same formula used by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) based on directional route miles and vehicle revenue miles. Estimates are based on FY2017 estimated revenues. Operators' shares of sections 5339 and 5337 will be exchanged with Metro's share of section 5307 allocation.

Bus Transit Subsidies (\$667.6M)

Formula Allocation Procedure

Allocations of transit subsidy funds (STA, TDA Article 4, and Proposition A 95% of 40% Discretionary) are based on the Formula Allocation Procedure (FAP) that was adopted by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) Board of Directors and legislated through SB 1755 (Calderon – 1996). Los Angeles County included and eligible operators submitted their FY2015 Transit Performance Measures

ATTACHMENT B

data for the FY2017 FAP calculations. This data was validated and used in the calculations. The FAP as applied uses 50% of operators' vehicle service miles and 50% of operators' fare units. (Fare units are defined as operators' passenger revenues divided by operators' base cash fare.) In November 2008, the Board approved Funding Stability Policy where operators who increase their fares will have their fare units frozen at their level prior to the fare increase until such time that fare unit calculation based on the new higher fare becomes greater than the frozen level.

Tier 2 Operators Funding Program was approved by the Board in April 2010 to provide operating assistance to LADOT Community Dash program and Glendale, Pasadena and Burbank's fixed route transit programs. Allocation is calculated by the same methodology as in the FAP and does not negatively impact the existing included and eligible operators. This program was funded \$6 million each year for three years beginning FY2011 from the \$18 million GOI funds that was set aside by the Board in FY2008. With the Board's approval, we will continue to fund this program in FY2017 for the amount of \$6 million.

Two-Year Lag Funding (\$1.6M)

Pursuant to the two-year lag funding policy adopted by the Board in 2006, a total of \$1,587,968 is being re-allocated from Metro to Foothill Transit and Norwalk Transit following the transfers of Lines 190/194 and 270 as approved by the Board at its April 28, 2016 meeting.

- **Line 190/194.** Service will be transitioned from Metro to Foothill effective June 28, 2016 for a total of 1,248,566 annual revenue miles.
- **Line 270 (Northern portion from Monrovia to El Monte Station).** Service will be transitioned from Metro to Foothill effective June 28, 2016 for a total of 81,290 annual revenue miles.
- **Line 270 (Southern Portion).** Service will be transitioned from Metro to Norwalk effective June 27, 2016 for a total 219,430 annual revenue miles.

The two year lag funding is paid through the FAP for two years beginning FY2017. After two years, the transitioned services operating data will become part of the FAP calculations.

Measure R 20% Bus Operations (\$159M)

Measure R, which voters approved in November 2008, provides that 20% of the revenues be allocated to bus service operations, maintenance and expansion. The 20% bus operations share is allocated according to FAP calculation methodology. In addition, the Measure R ordinance also provides a lump sum allocation of \$150M over

the life of the ordinance for clean fuel and bus facilities. This fund is allocated to Metro and LA County municipal operators at \$10 million every two years.

Proposition C 5% Security (\$35.8M)

Ninety percent of Proposition C 5% Security fund is allocated to Los Angeles County transit operators and Metro Operations for security services. State law requires that each operator's share of funds be based on its share of unlinked boardings to total Los Angeles County unlinked boardings. The unlinked boardings used for allocating these funds are based from the operators' TPM reports of LACMTA approved services. The remaining ten percent is allocated to Metro to mitigate other security needs.

Proposition C 40% Discretionary Programs (\$72.6M)

- **Municipal Operators Service Improvement Program (MOSIP).** MOSIP was adopted by the Board in April 2001. The program as continued is intended to provide bus service improvements to the transit dependent in Los Angeles County by reducing overcrowding and expanding services. Funding is increased by 3% from the previous year's funding level. All municipal operators participate in this program, and funds are allocated according to FAP calculation methodology.
- **Zero-Fare Compensation.** The City of Commerce is allocated with an amount equivalent to its FAP share as compensation for having zero fare revenues.
- **Foothill Mitigation.** This fund is allocated to operators to mitigate the impact of Foothill becoming an included operator. The Foothill Mitigation Program is calculated similarly to the TDA and STA portion of the normal FAP, except that Foothill's data are frozen at its pre-inclusion level. The result of this calculation is then deducted from the TDA and STA portion of the normal FAP to arrive at the Foothill Mitigation funding level. This methodology was adopted by the Bus Operator Sub-Committee (BOS) in November 1995.
- **Transit Service Expansion Program (TSE).** The TSE Program continues for five municipal operators for expansion or introduction of fixed-route bus service in congested corridors. Metro Operations does not participate in this program.
- **Base Re-Structuring Program (Base-Re).** The Base Re-Structuring Program continues for four municipal operators who added service before 1990. These four municipal operators were given additional funding from Proposition C 40% Discretionary.
- **Bus Service Improvement Program (BSIP).** The BSIP also continues to address service improvements on overcrowded non-Metro bus lines used primarily by the transit dependent. Metro Operations and all other Los Angeles County transit operators, except Claremont, La Mirada and Commerce, participate in this program.

- **Proposition 1B Bridge Funding Program.** The Bridge Funding Program is established to compensate certain operators for the differences in State Proposition 1B allocation, which uses the State Transit Assistance (STA) allocation methodology, and the Los Angeles County Formula Allocation Procedure (FAP). Operators who would have received less or no funding under the State method are allocated with local funds if the FAP method is used. This program is to continue through the life of the bond as approved by the Board in September 2009. For FY2017, Bridge Funding allocation for the Transit Modernization (PTMISEA) account represents the 4th of four installments the operators earned from FY2011 Proposition 1B allocation; Bridge Funding for the Security account represents the full funding earned from the FY2014 allocation.

Federal Funds

Section 5307 Urbanized Formula Program (\$239M)

The Urbanized Area Formula Funding program (49 U.S.C. 5307) makes Federal resources available to urbanized areas for transit capital and operating assistance in urbanized areas and for transportation related planning. Based on federal revenue estimates for FY2017, \$239 million in Federal Section 5307 Urban Formula funds are allocated to Los Angeles County transit operators and LACMTA Operations. Eighty-five percent (85%) of these funds have been allocated based on a capital allocation formula consisting of total vehicle miles, number of vehicles, unlinked boardings, passenger revenue and base fare. 15% Capital Discretionary fund and the 1% Transit Enhancement Act fund have been allocated on a discretionary basis with Bus Operations Subcommittee's review and concurrence.

At its April 15, 2014 meeting, the Bus Operators Subcommittee allocated \$250,000 each year for the next three years to the Southern California Regional Transit Training Consortium (SCR TTC) from the 15% discretionary fund. SCR TTC provides a training resource network comprised of Community Colleges, Universities, Transit Agencies, Public and Private Organizations focused on the development and delivery of training and employment of the transit industry workforce that is proficient at the highest standards, practices, and procedures for the industry. The fund will be exchanged with Metro's TDA Article 4 share and disbursed through Long Beach Transit.

Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities (\$23.7M)

Section 5339 is a grant program authorized by 49 United States Code (U.S.C) Section 5339 as specified under the Federal Reauthorization Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century or "MAP 21". The Program provides capital funding to replace, rehabilitate and purchase buses, vans, and related equipment, and to construct bus-related facilities. Based on federal revenue estimates for FY2017, \$23.7 million is allocated to Los Angeles County operators and Metro operations using the Capital Allocation

Procedure adopted by the Bus Operations Subcommittee. Operators' shares are swapped with Metro's share of Federal Section 5307 to minimize administrative process.

Section 5337 State of Good Repair (\$86.5M)

Provides grants for new and expanded rail, bus rapid transit, and ferry systems that reflect local priorities to improve transportation options in key corridors. This program defines a new category of eligible projects, known as core capacity projects, which expand capacity by at least 10% in existing fixed guideway transit corridors that are already at or above capacity today, or are expected to be at or above capacity within five years. The program also includes provisions for streamlining aspects of the New Starts process to increase efficiency and reduce the time required to meet critical milestones. This funding program consists of two separate formula programs:

- **High Intensity Fixed Guideway** – provides capital funding to maintain a system in a state of good repair for rail and buses operating on lanes for exclusive use of public transportation vehicles, i. e. bus rapid transit. Based on federal revenue estimates for FY2017, **\$80.7** million is allocated to Metro and municipal operations.
- **High Intensity Motorbus** - provides capital funding to maintain a system in a state of good repair for buses operating on lanes not fully reserved only for public transportation vehicles. Based on federal revenue estimates for FY2017, **\$5.7** million is allocated to Metro operations and Los Angeles County operators following the FTA formula: the fund allocated with Directional Route Miles (DRM) data is allocated using the operators' DRM data while the fund allocated with Vehicle Revenue Miles (VRM) data is allocated using the operators' VRM data. Operators' shares are swapped with Metro's share of Federal Section 5307 to minimize administrative process.

Proposition A Incentive Programs (\$15.3M)

In lieu of TDA Article 4.5, five percent (5%) of Proposition A 40% Discretionary funds have been allocated to local transit operators through Board-adopted Incentive Program guidelines. Programs include the Sub-Regional Paratransit Program, the Voluntary NTD Reporting Program and the Sub-Regional Grant Projects. Under the Voluntary NTD Reporting Program, local transit operators report operating data through our Consolidated NTD Report for entitlement to the Federal FTA Section 5307 funds. Operators participating in the Voluntary NTD Reporting Program and who are not receiving Sub-Regional Paratransit funds are allocated an amount equal to the Federal FTA Section 5307 funds they generate for the region.

Under the Sub-Regional Grant Projects, Avalon's Ferry, which provides a lifeline service to its residents who commute between Avalon and the mainland will continue to receive \$650,000 in subsidy; Avalon's Transit Services annual subsidy remains at \$250,000 while Hollywood Bowl Shuttles subsidy will remain at to \$1,057,000.

Local Returns, TDA Articles 3 & 8 (\$496.4M)

- **Proposition A 25% Local Return (\$189M), Proposition C 20% (\$156.7M) Local Return and Measure R 15% Local Return (\$117.5M) funds estimates** are apportioned to all Los Angeles County cities and the County of Los Angeles based on population shares according to state statutes and Proposition A, Proposition C and Measure R ordinances. The City of Vernon opted out of the Measure R Local Return program indefinitely.
- **TDA Article 3 funds (\$7.9M).** 15% of TDA Article 3 funds are allocated towards maintenance of regionally significant Class I bike paths as determined by LACMTA policy and in current TDA Article 3 Guidelines. This portion is divided in a ratio of 30% to 70% to City of Los Angeles and County of Los Angeles, respectively. The remaining 85% is allocated to all Los Angeles County cities and the County of Los Angeles based on population shares. TDA Article 3 has a minimum allocation amount of \$5,000. The City of Industry has opted out of the TDA Article 3 program indefinitely. The Street and Freeway Subcommittee and the Technical Advisory Committee have approved this redistribution methodology in prior years, and it remains unchanged.
- **TDA Article 8 funds (\$25.8M)** are allocated to areas within Los Angeles County, but outside the Metro service area. These are Avalon, Lancaster, Palmdale, Santa Clarita and portions of unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. The amount of TDA funds for Article 8 allocation is calculated based on the proportionate population of these areas to the total population of Los Angeles County.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
2017 Transit Fund Allocations

RESOLUTION OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016-2017 FOR LOCAL TRANSPORTATION, TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT, AND STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATIONS

WHEREAS, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) is the designated Transportation Planning agency for the County of Los Angeles and is, therefore, responsible for the administration of the Transportation Development Act (TDA), Public Utilities Code Section 99200 et seq.; and

WHEREAS, under Chapter 2.5, Article 5, the State Transit Assistance Fund (STA) Section 6753, allocations to claimants shall be made and take effect by resolution and shall designate: 1) the fiscal year for which the allocation is made; 2) the amount allocated to the claimant for each of the purposes defined in Sections 6730 and 6731; and 3) any other terms and conditions of the allocation; and

WHEREAS, Section 6659 requires that allocation instructions be conveyed each year to the county auditor by written memorandum of its executive director and accompanied by a certified copy of the authorizing resolution; and

WHEREAS, the resolution shall also specify conditions of payment and may call for a single payment, for payments as moneys become available, or for payment by installments monthly, quarterly, or otherwise; and

WHEREAS, the amount of a regional entity's allocation for a fiscal year that is not allocated to claimants for that fiscal year shall be available to the regional entity for allocation in the following fiscal year; and

WHEREAS, Section 6754 requires that the regional entity may allocate funds to an operator or a transit service claimant only if, in the resolution allocating the funds, it finds all of the following:

- a.1 The claimant's proposed expenditures are in conformity with the Regional Transportation Plan.
- a.2 The level of passenger fares and charges is sufficient to enable the operator or transit service claimant to meet the fare revenue requirements of PUC Section 99268.2, 99268.3, 99268.4, 99268.5, and 99268.9, as they may be applicable to the claimant.
- a.3 The claimant is making full use of federal funds available under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
2017 Transit Fund Allocations

- a.4 The sum of the claimant's allocations from the state transit assistance fund and from the local transportation fund does not exceed the amount the claimant is eligible to receive during the fiscal year.
- a.5 Priority consideration has been given to claims to offset reductions on federal operating assistance and the unanticipated increase in the cost of fuel, to enhance existing public transportation services, and to meet high priority regional, countywide, or area wide public transportation needs.

WHEREAS, the regional entity may allocate funds to an operator for the purposes specified in Section 6730 only if, in the resolution allocating the funds, it finds all of the following:

- b.1 The operator has made a reasonable effort to implement the productivity improvements recommended pursuant to PUC Section 99244.
- b.2 A certification by the Department of the California Highway Patrol verifying that the operator is in compliance with Section 1808.1 of the Vehicle code, as required in PUC Section 99251. The certification shall have been completed within the last 13 month, prior to filing claims.
- b.3 The operator is in compliance with the eligibility requirements of PUC Section 99314.6 or 99314.7

WHEREAS, the regional entity may allocate funds to an operator to exchange funds pursuant to PUC Section 99314.4(b) only if, in the resolution allocating the funds made available pursuant to PUC Section 99231, it find that the operator is eligible to receive State Transit Assistance funds; and

WHEREAS, LACMTA staff in consultation with the Transit Operators and Cities has developed allocations in accordance with the Transportation Development Act as previously specified.

NOW THEREFORE,

- 1.0 The LACMTA Board of Directors approves the allocation of TDA and STA for the Fiscal Year 2016-17 to each claimant for each of the purposes as specified in Attachments A.
- 2.0 The Board of Directors hereby finds that a claimant's proposed expenditures are in conformity with the Regional Transportation Plan.; the level of passenger fares and charges is sufficient to enable the operator or transit service claimant to meet the fare revenue requirements; the claimant is making full use of federal funds

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
2017 Transit Fund Allocations**

available under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964; the sum of the claimant's allocations from the State Transit Assistance fund and from the Local Transportation Fund do not exceed the amount the claimant is eligible to receive during the fiscal year; and that priority consideration has been given to claims to offset reductions on federal operating assistance and the unanticipated increase in the cost of fuel,

to enhance existing public transportation services, and to meet high priority regional, countywide, or area wide public transportation needs.

- 3.0 The Board of Directors hereby finds that, for the purposes specified in Section 6730, the operators eligible for funding have made reasonable efforts to implement the productivity improvements recommended pursuant to PUC Section 99244. A certification by the Department of the California Highway Patrol verifying that the operator is in compliance with Section 1808.1 of the Vehicle Code, has been remitted. The operator is in compliance with the eligibility requirements of PUC Section 99314.6 or 99314.7
- 4.0 The Board of Directors hereby authorizes that the operators listed in Attachment A are eligible to receive State Transit Assistance funds.
- 5.0 The Board of Directors hereby authorizes that the operators may receive payments upon meeting the requirements of the STA eligibility test and submittal of TDA and STA claims.

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned, duly qualified and acting as the Board Secretary of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, certifies that the foregoing is a true and correct representation of the Resolution adopted at a legally convened meeting of the Board of Directors of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority held on June, 2016.

MICHELE JACKSON
Board Secretary

DATED:
(SEAL)



Board Report

File #: 2016-0254, File Type: Formula Allocation / Local Return

Agenda Number: 16.

FINANCE, BUDGET AND AUDIT COMMITTEE JUNE 15, 2016

SUBJECT: MEASURE R LOCAL RETURN CAPITAL RESERVE, AND PROPOSITION A AND PROPOSITION C CAPITAL RESERVE

ACTION: ESTABLISH NEW ACCOUNTS AND AMEND EXISTING CAPITAL RESERVE ACCOUNTS FOR CITIES

RECOMMENDATION

AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements between Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) and the Cities for their Capital Reserve Accounts as approved; and:

- A. ESTABLISH **Measure R Local Return funded Capital Reserve Account for the City of Beverly Hills**, as described in Attachment A;
- B. ESTABLISH **Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return funded Capital Reserve Account for the City of Burbank**, as described in Attachment A;
- C. APPROVE three year extension of **Proposition C Local Return Capital Reserve Account for the Cities of Beverly Hills, El Monte, Lynwood and Manhattan Beach**, as described in Attachment A.

ISSUE

A local jurisdiction may need additional time to accumulate sufficient funding to implement a project or to avoid lapsing of funds. Board approval is required if there is a need to extend beyond the normal lapsing deadline for Local Return Funds. The local jurisdiction may request that funding be dedicated in a Capital Reserve Account. Once approved, a local jurisdiction may be allowed additional years to accumulate and expend its Local Return funds from the date that the funds are made available.

DISCUSSION

Measure R Local Return Guidelines require that Local Return funds be expended before a five-year

lapsing deadline. Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines require that Local Return funds be expended before a four-year lapsing deadline (the year of allocation plus three years). However, Capital Reserve Accounts are permitted under both Local Return Guidelines, with approval from the Board of Directors, the accounts may be established so that Los Angeles County local jurisdictions may extend the life of their Local Return revenue to accommodate longer term financial and planning commitments for specific capital projects.

Some of the Measure R and Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return funds could lapse due to time constraints. According to the Local Return Guidelines, the lapsed funds then would be returned to LACMTA, so that the Board may redistribute the funds for reallocation to Jurisdictions for discretionary programs of county-wide significance, or redistribute to each Los Angeles County local jurisdiction by formula on a per capita basis.

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

Approval of the projects will allow for improvements to the streets and roads improvements and vehicle equipment replacement as listed on Attachment A.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

With our recommendation, there would be no impact on the LACMTA Budget, or on LACMTA's Financial Statements. The Capital Reserve Account funds originate from the portion of Measure R and Proposition A and Proposition C funds that are allocated to each Los Angeles County local jurisdiction by formula on a per capita basis.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The cities have no other funds, and the projects could not be constructed in a timely manner.

NEXT STEPS

With Board approval of our recommendation, we will negotiate and execute all necessary agreements between LACMTA and the listed cities for their Capital Reserve Accounts as approved. We will monitor the account to ensure that the cities comply with the Local Return Guidelines and the terms of the agreement.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - Project Summary for Proposed New or Amended Capital Reserve Accounts

Prepared by: Susan Richan, Program Manager (231) 922-3017
Kelly Hines, DEO Finance, Local Programming & TAP (213) 922-4569

Reviewed by: Nalini Ahuja, Executive Director, Finance and Budget, (213) 922-3088



Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer

ATTACHMENT A

PROJECT SUMMARY FOR PROPOSED NEW AND AMENDED
CAPITAL RESERVE ACCOUNTS

JURISDICTION	PROJECT	AMOUNT	FUND	AGREEMENT TERMINATION/ REVIEW DATE
City of Beverly Hills #1.05 (New)	North Santa Monica Blvd Improvement/Reconstruction <u>Justification:</u> The capital reserve will assist in the accumulation of funds and in the non-lapsing of funds to provide improvements on Santa Monica Blvd.	\$1,400,000	Measure R 15% Local Return	6/30/19
City of Burbank #01-380 (New)	Vehicle Equipment Replacement Fund <u>Justification:</u> The capital reserve will assist in the accumulation of funds and in the non-lapsing of funds to provide improvements.	\$125,000 \$500,000	Proposition A 25% Local Return Proposition C 20% Local Return	6/30/19
City of Beverly Hills #03-380 (Amended)	Santa Monica Blvd Improvement Project <u>Justification:</u> The capital reserve will assist in the accumulation of funds and in the non-lapsing of funds to provide improvements on Santa Monica Blvd.	\$2,500,000	Proposition C 20% Local Return	6/30/19
City of El Monte #01-380 (Amended)	El Monte Santa Anita Bridge Overcrossing <u>Project:</u> Street and Bridge Improvements <u>Justification:</u> The city is in the process of completing the El Monte Transit Village and Bus Station. The Transit Village and Bus Station plans to ease congestion on and along Santa Anita Avenue by diverting inbound and outbound local buses onto Ramona Blvd via grade separated busway	\$400,000	Proposition C 20% Local Return	6/30/19

JURISDICTION	PROJECT	AMOUNT	FUND	AGREEMENT TERMINATION/ REVIEW DATE
City of El Monte #02-380 (Amended)	Ramona Blvd at Valley Blvd Intersection Improvement <u>Project:</u> Consists of reconfiguration of existing roadway and addition of dedicated turn lanes <u>Justification:</u> This project will improve existing traffic conditions and allow for non-lapsing of funds	\$771,591	Proposition C 20% Local Return	6/30/19
City of El Monte #03-380 (Amended)	Ramona Blvd/Badillo St/Covina Blvd Improvements <u>Project:</u> Consists of Traffic Signal Synchronization, and Bus Speed Improvements <u>Justification:</u> This project will improve existing traffic conditions and allow for non-lapsing of funds	\$141,262	Proposition C 20% Local Return	6/30/19
City of Lynwood #57-380 (Amended)	Long Beach Blvd Improvement Project <u>Project:</u> Will provide for street improvements along Long Beach Blvd (Josephine Street to Tweedy Blvd) <u>Justification:</u> The capital reserve will assist in the non-lapsing of funds to provide improvements.	\$1,747,000	Proposition C 20% Local Return	6/30/19
City of Manhattan Beach #01-380 (Amended)	Sepulveda Boulevard Bridge Widening Project – Local Match <u>Project:</u> Engineering, design and construction of the Sepulveda Boulevard Bridge Widening <u>Justification:</u> Local Match to the 2007 Countywide Call for Projects program	\$3,500,000	Proposition C 20% Local Return	6/30/19

**Board Report**

File #: 2016-0406, **File Type:** Program**Agenda Number:** 17

**FINANCE, BUDGET AND AUDIT COMMITTEE
JUNE 15, 2016****SUBJECT: EXCESS LIABILITY INSURANCE PROGRAM****ACTION: PURCHASE EXCESS LIABILITY INSURANCE****RECOMMENDATION**

AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer to **negotiate and award excess liability insurance policies** with up to \$300 million in limits at a cost not to exceed \$4.25 million for the 12-month period effective August 1, 2016 to August 1, 2017.

ISSUE

The excess liability insurance policies expire August 1, 2016. Staff typically brings this item to the Board for approval in July with final carriers and pricing, however because the Board is not meeting in July we are bringing this item in June. Insurance underwriters will not commit to final pricing until roughly six weeks before our current program expires on August 1. Consequently, we are requesting a not-to-exceed amount for this renewal pending final pricing and carrier identification. Metro is required by some shared use agreements with the freight railroads (Attachment A) to carry excess liability insurance. Without this insurance, Metro would be subject to unlimited liability for bodily injury and property damage claims resulting from, primarily, bus and rail operations.

DISCUSSION

Our insurance broker, Wells Fargo Insurance Services (“Wells”), is responsible for marketing the excess liability insurance program to qualified insurance carriers. Quotes are in the process of being received by our broker from carriers with A.M. Best ratings indicative of acceptable financial soundness and ability to pay claims. We typically approach the Board in July with final firm pricing and carriers identified.

In December 2015, H.R. 22, the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, was passed, raising the liability cap for commuter rail transit providers for passenger liability from \$200 million to \$295 million. As such, our broker requested options at renewal to increase Metro’s current \$250 million limit to \$300 million to comply with the new Federal statutory requirements. Along with the impact of the FAST Act increasing required liability caps, we expect higher premiums this year because of new Gold Line and Expo Line service.

After years of positive acceptance, the casualty insurance market for the transportation sector is

undergoing change with insurers revisiting their underwriting methods. High profile transportation related fatality accidents including the February 2015 Metrolink truck/train collision, January 2015 Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority subway fire, December 2013 Metro North high speed derailment in New York, April 2014 FedEx truck/bus collision in Northern California and, most recent, May 2015 Amtrak high speed derailment in Philadelphia, are proving problematic for the transportation sector. In addition, negative nationwide transportation risk perception is increasing the difficulty in placing primary insurance coverage with the domestic markets.

Staff and Wells developed a 2016/2017 excess liability insurance renewal strategy with the following objectives. First, our insurance underwriter marketing presentations emphasized the low risk of light rail and bus rapid transit services added over the past years in order to mitigate insurer's concerns with increased operating exposures. Second, we wanted to maintain a diversified mix of international and domestic insurers to maintain competition and reduce our dependence on any single insurance carrier. Thirdly, we desired to increase total limits to \$300 million while maintaining a \$7.5 million self-insured retention.

Wells Fargo is presenting the submission to several competing insurers in order to create competition in other layers of our insurance program. We met with markets personally in April. Insurance executives both nationally and internationally expressed continuing increased underwriting discipline in particular for transportation risks. In that context, insurers asked for detailed loss information on Metro risks. We are awaiting underwriter quotes from our broker.

We have been a beneficiary of soft pricing for several years. Last year, we obtained \$250 million in coverage with a \$7.5 million retention for \$3.6 million. This year's recommended program increases coverage to \$300 million and maintains a \$7.5 million retention for an estimated \$4.25 million. The premium increase represents a 19% increase in premium expense over the prior year renewal. To put this renewal in perspective, \$100 million in limits with a \$4.5 million retention cost \$5.1 million in 2005-2006.

Attachment B provides an overview of the current program, renewal options and estimated associated premiums, and the agency's loss history. The Recommended Program, Option B, increases total limits to \$300 million with \$7.5 million retention and provides terrorism coverage at all levels.

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

Approval of this recommendation will not impact the safety of Metro's patrons or employees.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The funding for eleven months of \$4.2 million for this action is included in the FY17 budget in cost center 0531, Risk Management - Non Departmental Costs, under projects 300022 - Rail Operations - Blue Line, 300033 - Rail Operations - Green Line, 300044 - Rail Operations - Red Line, 300055 - Gold Line, 300066 - Rail Operations - Expo Line, 301012 - Metro Orange Line, 306001 - Operations Transportation, 320011 - Union Station, and 405533 - Commuter Rail in account 50602 (Ins Prem For Gen Liability). The remaining month of premiums will be included in the FY16 budget, cost center

0531, Risk Management - Non Departmental Costs, under projects under projects 300022 - Rail Operations - Blue Line, 300033 - Rail Operations - Green Line, 300044 - Rail Operations - Red Line, 300055 - Gold Line, 300066 - Rail Operations - Expo Line, 301012 - Metro Orange Line, 306001 - Operations Transportation, 320011 - Union Station, and 405533 - Commuter Rail in account 50602 (Ins Prem For Gen Liability). In FY16, an estimated \$3.6 million will be expensed for excess liability insurance.

Impact to Budget

Approval of this action has no impact on the FY17 budget. The sources of funds for this action are bus and rail operations eligible. No other sources of funds were considered because these are the activities that benefit from the insurance coverage.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Various deductibles and limits of coverage options were considered as described in Attachment B. Our estimated penetration of the excess layer and premium history is also shown in this attachment. Option A maintains \$250 million limits with a SIR of \$7.5 million. This option is not recommended because maintaining current insurance limits does not conform to the minimum \$295 million liability cap as required by the FAST Act. Option B increases our limits to \$300 million limits while maintaining a SIR of \$7.5 million and will satisfy the increased liability requirements of the FAST Act.

NEXT STEPS


Upon Board approval of this action, we will advise Wells to proceed with placement of the excess liability insurance program outlined herein effective August 1, 2016.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - Shared Use Agreements with the Freight Railroads
Attachment B - Options, Premiums and Loss History

Prepared by: Tim Rosevear, Risk Financing Manager, (213) 922-6354

Reviewed by: Greg Kildare, Executive Director, Risk, Safety and Asset Management, (213) 922-4971



Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer

ATTACHMENT A

SHARED USE AGREEMENTS WITH THE FREIGHT RAILROADS

Insurance excerpt from the Pasadena Subdivision, Los Angeles County Agreement with BNSF Railway effective March 31, 2011:

“ARTICLE 20. EAST END SEGMENT: INSURANCE

20.4 The Parties may renegotiate the limits of coverage of both Parties every 5 years upon 1 year notice, or if federal legislation limiting liability for passenger rail service is overturned, revoked or otherwise becomes ineffective as the result of a federal statutory change or a final, non-appealable, court ruling, or if federal legislation reduces liability limits. Except with respect to a change in insurance caused by the events regarding federal legislation described in the preceding sentence, any renegotiation shall be based on the national CPI-U and prevailing conditions in the liability insurance market, take into account any safety improvements or enhancements implemented by one or both parties or installed on one or more of the covered rail lines, and any dispute shall be resolved by arbitration in accordance with the procedures set forth in Article 12 of the SUA; such adjustments shall also apply to the self insured retention or deductible.

20.5 Agency shall not be required to maintain liability coverage above limits set by federal legislation applicable to passenger or commuter rail operations, but in no event shall Agency maintain coverage of less than \$200 million per occurrence, except as expressly provided in Section 20.1 above. Agency also shall not be required to maintain liability coverage in excess of \$200 million for any year that would result in its having to pay 125% of the prior year's premium amounts (except for the initial purchase pursuant to this Article 20).

ATTACHMENT B

Options, Premiums and Loss History

Current Insurance Premium and Proposed Options

	CURRENT PROGRAM	OPTIONS (Estimated)	
		A	B
Self-Insured Retention	\$7.5 mil	\$7.5 mil	\$7.5 mil
Limit of Coverage	\$250 mil	\$250 mil	\$300 mil
Terrorism Coverage	Yes	Yes	Yes
Not to Exceed Premium	\$3.65 mil	\$3.80 mil	\$4.25 mil

**Premium History for Excess Liability Policies
Ending in the Following Policy Periods**

	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2015/2016
Self-Insured Retention	\$4.5 mil	\$4.5 mil	\$4.5 mil	\$4.5 mil	\$5.0 mil	\$5.0 mil	\$7.5 mil	\$7.5 mil	\$7.5 mil
Insurance Premium	\$4.9 mil	\$4.3 mil	\$3.8 mil	\$3.8 mil	\$3.9 mil	\$3.9 mil	\$3.6 mil	\$3.7 mil	\$3.6 mil
Claims in Excess of Retention	0	3	1	0	0	2 *	1	0 (est.)	0 (est.)
Estimated Amount in Excess of Retention	0	\$14.8 mil	\$1.0 mil	0	0	\$0.5 mil *	\$1.3 mil	unknown	unknown

* 1 pending, amount undetermined at present.



Board Report

File #: 2016-0433, **File Type:** Program

Agenda Number: 18

**FINANCE AND BUDGET COMMITTEE
JUNE 15, 2016**

SUBJECT: FY 2016-17 METROLINK ANNUAL WORK PROGRAM BUDGET

ACTION: APPROVE METROLINK'S FY 2016-17 ANNUAL WORK PROGRAM AND RELATED ACTIONS

RECOMMENDATION

CONSIDER:

- A. APPROVING the **Southern California Regional Rail Authority's (SCRRA) FY 2016-17 (FY17) Annual Work Program** pursuant to their April 29, 2016, budget transmittal (Attachment A).
- B. APPROVING the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's (LACMTA) share of SCRRA FY17 Metrolink funding totaling \$88,825,701 for programs detailed in Table 1.
- C. EXTENDING the lapsing dates for funds previously allocated to SCRRA for the Rehabilitation and Renovation Program as follows:
 - FY 2010-11 from June 30, 2016 to June 30, 2017 - \$1,774,223
 - FY 2011-12 from June 30, 2016 to June 30, 2017 - \$2,830,282
 - FY 2012-13 from June 30, 2016 to June 30, 2017 - \$5,024,401
- D. APPROVING the FY17 Transfers to Other Operators payment rate of \$1.10 per boarding to LACMTA and an EZ Pass reimbursement cap to LACMTA of \$5,592,000.
- E. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements between LACMTA and the SCRRA for the approved funding.
- F. RECEIVING AND FILING update to March 24, 2016 Board Motion 40.1 on Equitable Governance on Southern California Regional Rail Authority.

ISSUE

The SCRRA Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement (JPA) requires the member agencies to annually approve their individual share of Metrolink funding.

DISCUSSION

The Metrolink system provides commuter rail service within Los Angeles County and between Los Angeles County and the surrounding counties of Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura, as well as northern San Diego County.

The SCRRA overall FY17 Budget request for new programming from all Member Agencies consists of \$243.8 million for Commuter Rail operations, \$29.8 million for Rehabilitation and Renovation projects and \$1.3 million for New Capital projects.

LACMTA Contribution

TABLE 1
Requested FY17 LACMTA Share of Metrolink Programming

Proposition C 10% - Operations	Recommended Amount
Commuter Rail Operations	\$71,795,000
Enhanced L.A. County ROW Security	2,360,551
Antelope Valley Line Fare Reduction Program	730,000
Antelope Valley Line 100% Fare Enforcement Program	1,700,000
One-Time Special Events	100,000
Subtotal Proposition C 10%	\$76,685,551
Measure R 3% - Capital	
Rehabilitation and Renovation Program	\$10,000,000
Rotem Reimbursement	1,522,150
Capital Projects Study Reports	618,000
Subtotal Measure R 3%	\$12,140,150
Total New Metrolink Programming	\$88,825,701

Proposition C 10% Funds:**Metrolink Operations - \$71,795,000**

The FY17 Metrolink budget anticipates the operation of 172 weekday and 90 weekend trains, including new service with the 24 mile extension of the 91 Line to Perris Valley in Riverside County. New service consists of three new round trips from South Perris to Los Angeles Union Station and three Riverside intra-county round trips expected to begin June 6, 2016.

For FY17, SCRRA's operating expenses are projected to increase \$3.3 million (1.4%) over FY16 levels. Much of this increase is attributable to a full year of operations on the new Perris Valley Line service, increases in parts purchased for rolling stock, increased mechanical costs, and increased administrative salaries and related fringe benefits.

However, these increases have been offset by reduced insurance costs and decreased Maintenance of Way expenditures.

METROLINK OPERATIONS BUDGET SUMMARY (\$000)				
	FY16	FY17	DIFF.	CHANGE *
Expenses	\$ 240,513	\$ 243,815	\$ 3,302	1.4%
Revenues	\$ 101,457	\$ 102,246	\$ 789	0.8%
Member Agency Subsidy	\$ 139,055	\$ 141,569	\$ 2,514	1.8%
Metro Subsidy	\$ 71,796	\$ 71,794	\$ (2)	0%
Metro Share of Subsidy	51.6%	50.7%		

* Numbers may be subject to minor rounding

For FY17, Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) will incur the majority of the \$2.5 million subsidy increase due to the new Perris Valley Line service. LACMTA's contribution for FY17 Metrolink Operations will not increase but instead remain at the FY16 funding level.

It should be noted that the Metrolink operating subsidy request has dramatically increased over the past five years: an 88% increase in Metro's subsidy since FY12. This trend is not sustainable and exceeds LACMTA's LRTP projection.

Right-of-Way (ROW) Security Services to Be Provided by L.A. Sheriffs (LASD) - \$2,360,551

SCRRA contracts with the LASD to provide core security and fare enforcement services on board trains and at stations. In addition to core security services, LACMTA provides additional subsidy to SCRRA for supplemental LASD services on Metrolink ROW owned by LACMTA. The budget amount for 9.5 full time equivalents (FTEs) is to provide a dedicated security presence along LACMTA owned ROW, and to more quickly respond to incidents along the ROW within Los Angeles County.

Antelope Valley Line Fare Reduction Program - \$730,000

The Antelope Valley Line 25% Fare Reduction Program has been successful in attracting riders to the Metrolink system. The results through March 2016 show that the ridership is up 16% over FY15. However, the revenues are only down 10% which means the program is recovering 90% of the costs.

Metrolink is requesting \$730,000 to continue this program for FY17. This program was initially estimated to cost \$2,500,000 for FY16 and the actual expenditures have resulted in a \$1.8M savings.

Antelope Valley Line 100% Fare Enforcement Program - \$1,700,000

Along with the Fare Reduction program, the 100% Fare Enforcement program has also been successful. The L.A. County Sheriff's report that fare evasion is at 0.5% or lower, down from the estimated 3.5% prior to the programs implementation. Metrolink is requesting \$1,700,000 to continue this program for FY17.

Special Event Services - \$100,000

An additional \$100,000 in funding is requested for the following special events:

- Los Angeles County Fair Trains
- Dodgers/Angels Trains
- Any other special services/events which may occur.

These services provide alternate transportation and reduce congestion for these large scale events which usually occur during peak commuter hours.

Measure R 3% Funds:

Rehabilitation and Renovation Program - \$10,000,000

The SCRRA's Rehabilitation and Renovation program funds State of Good Repair and improvements to infrastructure, the signal system, and the replacement and refurbishment of rolling stock in order to keep the railroad in a state of good repair.

For FY17, SCRRA is requesting programming authority from LACMTA of \$10,000,000 which is expected to be paid over a four year period. Please refer to Attachment A for a list of the FY17 rehabilitation projects.

LACMTA staff still has concerns with project delivery and SCRRA's identification of significant rehabilitation and renovation needs far exceeding the current funding capacities of the member agencies.

For FY16, the Board approved staff's recommendation to withhold SCRRA's \$20 million rehabilitation program funding request due to approximately \$40 million of unspent previously programmed and budgeted rehabilitation funds from LACMTA. Staff has regularly met with SCRRA over the last year and continues to see progress to resolve this issue.

To assist LACMTA in the assessment of Metro owned infrastructure and determining the highest priority rehabilitation and renovation project needs, LACMTA is procuring a consultant from the Regional Rail Bench to review, assess and work with SCRRA to prioritize and develop a scope of work and project delivery schedule to identify what rehabilitation projects can be delivered within the current fiscal year, in the next two years or what will actually require a four year program for all rehabilitation and capital projects. LACMTA staff will return to the Board with recommendations to maintain the state of good repair of the commuter rail system.

Staff will continue to collaborate and work closely with SCRRA to develop a realistic rehabilitation, renovation and state of good repair program that benefits Los Angeles County and the Metrolink system as a whole.

OCTA/Rotem Rolling Stock Acquisition - \$1,522,150

The Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) purchased 22 rails cars for inter-county service which were later incorporated into the system-wide fleet. The member agencies reached an

agreement that OCTA is to be compensated for these system-wide cars. A five year funding plan was established and payments are being made towards a total LACMTA commitment of \$19,928,150. For the fifth annual and final commitment, in FY17, LACMTA will program \$1,522,150 in Measure R 3% funds to complete the programming of this reimbursement.

New Capital Projects - \$618,000

Metrolink is requesting \$618,000 to be used for preparing project study reports and initial design for enhancement and expansion (i.e. non-good state of repair projects).

Extend Lapsing Date of Rehabilitation/Renovation Funds

SCRRA programs rehabilitation/renovation funds for multiple years. This is necessary to maximize the effectiveness of the program and take advantage of matching federal funds. In addition, several projects, such as the passenger car rehabilitation program, are expected to extend over several years. As a result, funds programmed over multiple years may not be completely invoiced prior to lapsing and LACMTA does not recognize project completion until we are invoiced.

In FY15 LACMTA extended the lapsing period to four years and extended the lapsing dates of several MOUs. LACMTA has been assured that the work is substantially complete or is in progress. SCRRA is hiring additional staff in FY17 to bring them current on their invoicing.

SCRRA's funding lapses on June 30, 2016, as follows:

FY 2010-11 from June 30, 2016 to June 30, 2017 - \$1,774,223
FY 2011-12 from June 30, 2016 to June 30, 2017 - \$2,830,282
FY 2012-13 from June 30, 2016 to June 30, 2017 - \$5,024,401

Staff is seeking Board authority to extend funding for one additional year to June 30, 2017, to allow SCRRA to continue the progress they have made with increased project delivery and to work through their accounting system issues.

Transfers to Other Operators Payment Rate to LACMTA

SCRRA reimburses LACMTA for Metrolink riders who transfer to and from LACMTA services for free, including the rail system at Union Station, through the EZ Transit Pass Program.

For FY17, staff is recommending the reimbursement rate remain at \$1.10, the same as for FY16, and that the existing EZ Transit Pass cap of \$5,592,000 be honored.

This rate has remained at the current rate for several years. However, with the recent advent of Metrolink's ticket compatibility on TAP and the changes in Metro's fare structure, staff is in the process of analyzing the actual levels of Metrolink riders on the Metro system. Staff will incorporate identified usage rates in the development of the FY18 budget to determine what, if any changes may be incorporated into the transfer agreement.

OTHER ISSUES

Additional Request for Metrolink Funding

By letter dated May 23, 2016, the SCRRA has requested additional FY17 Metro funding in the amount of \$206 thousand.

On May 13, 2016, subsequent to submittal of Metro's proposed budget, the SCRRA Board of Directors adopted a modified fare structure effective July 1, 2016, that reduces short distance fares based on miles traveled, while not increasing long distance fares. This action is estimated to reduce the total Metrolink FY17 Budgeted Farebox Revenue in the amount of \$420,800 (0.3%), and increase the total requested Member Agency operating subsidy in an equal amount. As noted Metro's share of this request is \$206 thousand.

Based on reported FY16 financial performance to date, Metrolink is experiencing a budget under-run of approximately \$13 million (9%) through January 2016, and has estimated a FY16 budget surplus of at least \$8 million. Based on current trends, staff believes that Metro will accrue an FY16 budget surplus ranging between \$3.0 and \$6.0 million.

Staff is proposing to apply these previously approved funds in the event of the realization of a potential shortfall in fare revenues during FY17 and thereby not increasing current demands on Metrolink eligible funding.

Board Motion 40.1 on Equitable Governance on Southern California Regional Rail Authority.

At its meeting of March 24, 2016, the Board adopted motion 40.1 which, among other actions, directed staff to "Work with SCRRA member agencies to revise and simplify the allocation formula structure."

At the direction of the Member Agency's Chief Executive Officers, the SCRRA was requested to procure an independent and neutral consultant to review and provide potential revisions to the current formula basis of allocation including any opportunities to simplify or streamline the current process.

The SCRRA is currently procuring a consultant to perform this review. In order to assure that each member's input and insights are included in this review and evaluation, the scope specifically highlights the requirement to consult with each member agency to identify their respective concerns, issues, priorities and perspectives:

Member Agency and Stakeholder Consultation

The consultant will meet with Member Agencies to discuss and assess perspectives related to the existing cost allocation and revenue allocation formulas in both operation and capital investment, especially as it relates to the structure, magnitude, and frequency of updates of various formulas. The consultant will develop a summary of positive attributes and issues or concerns the members may have with the current allocation.

In addition, the consultant will get feedback from Authority staff and member agency staff who implement the formulas to assess how the structure of the formulas affect internal and external business processes and how the current formulas can be evaluated according to various criteria (e.g., flexibility, adaptability, simplicity, ease of application, transparency).

Staff will work very closely with the selected consultant to ensure that issues and areas of concern previously expressed by the Board will be included in the formula review and Member Agency review process.

Finally, to ensure each Member Agency supports the allocation of Metrolink costs and revenues, the JPA requires each Member Agency to individually approve the formula basis upon which costs and revenues are allocated.

Upon receipt of the consultant's report, staff will update the Board on the status of any proposed changes in the formula structure that affect Metro's contribution to Metrolink.

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

Approval of this item will have no impact on the safety of Metro's patrons or employees

FINANCIAL IMPACT

SCRRA has requested \$88,825,701 for LACMTA's total FY17 Annual Work Program programming authority consisting of \$76,685,551 in Proposition C 10% and \$12,140,150 in Measure R 3% funding.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

There is no alternative to the recommendations if SCRRA is to operate the recommended service levels and maintain the railroad in a state of good repair.

NEXT STEPS

LACMTA staff, working collaboratively with SCRRA staff will:

- Prepare a 5-Year strategic funding plan for Metrolink pursuant to the June 25, 2015, Motion 6.1 Board request;
- Review and analyze Metrolink's rehabilitation and renovation program including project priorities, costs and schedules;
- Provide ongoing updates to the Board.


The SCRRA Board is scheduled to adopt its FY17 Budget on June 24, 2016. LACMTA staff will monitor implementation of SCRRA's budget and report back to the LACMTA Board with any issues requiring Board action. LACMTA staff will monitor implementation of SCRRA's budget and report back to the LACMTA Board with any issues requiring Board action.

ATTACHMENTS

A) SCRRRA FY 2016-17 Preliminary Budget Transmittal

Prepared by: Drew Phillips, Director of Budget, (213) 922-2109
Yvette Reeves, Transportation Planning Manager III, Regional Rail
(213) 922-4612
Jeanet Owens, Interim Executive Officer, Regional Rail
(213) 922-6877

Reviewed by: Richard Clarke, Executive Director, Program Management
(213) 922-7557
Nalini Ahuja, Executive Director, Finance & Budget
(213) 922-3088



Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer

April 29, 2016

TO: Darrell Johnson, *Chief Executive Officer, OCTA*
Darren Kettle, *Executive Director, VCTC*
Anne Mayer, *Executive Director, RCTC*
Phil Washington, *Chief Executive Officer, Metro*
Dr. Raymond Wolfe, *Executive Director, SANBAG*

FROM: Elissa K. Konove, Deputy Chief Executive Officer for
Arthur T. Leahy, *Chief Executive Officer, SCRRA*



SUBJECT: SCRRA Preliminary FY2017 Budget

The SCRRA Board of Directors acted on April 22, 2016, to authorize the transmittal to our Member Agencies the Preliminary FY 2016-17 (FY17) SCRRA Budget. After Member Agency Boards have acted on the Preliminary Budget, staff will return to the SCRRA Board in June for adoption of the final FY17 Budget.

The Preliminary FY17 Budget was presented at a Board budget workshop on February 26, 2016. Following the workshop, meetings were held with individual Member Agencies in March and April. Member Agencies indicated funding constraints for Operating and Capital Rehabilitation expenses. As a result, the Preliminary FY17 Budget amounts for Operating and Capital Rehabilitation have been reduced from the amounts initially presented on February 26. The revised Preliminary FY17 Budget was presented to the Board on April 22, 2016.

Budget Priorities for FY17

The Preliminary FY17 Budget reflects priorities consistent with the “back to basics” approach outlined in the Strategic Plan, adopted in March 2016. The budget provides funding in alignment with the Authority’s strategic goals and includes the following priorities for the upcoming fiscal year:

- Continued emphasis on safe operations, with the full implementation of Positive Train Control (PTC) as the centerpiece of our efforts.
- Improved reliability and on-time performance, by putting Tier 4 locomotives into service and providing funding necessary for required equipment maintenance, consistent with the Fleet Management Plan.



- Enhanced customer experience, by implementing upgrades to the mobile ticketing application and a modernized ticket vending system.
- Increased ridership and regional mobility, with expanded service from Riverside to Perris Valley.
- Investment in existing assets to maintain a state of good repair, by funding critical rehabilitation projects and improving processes to accelerate project delivery.
- Ongoing workforce development, by training and engaging employees.

Overall Summary

The Preliminary FY17 Budget includes new budgetary authority of \$274.9 million. The proposed budget consists of Operating Budget authority of \$243.8 million, an increase of 1.4% over the FY16 Budget. Capital Program authority totals \$31.1 million, \$29.8 million for Rehabilitation Projects and \$1.3 million for New Capital Projects. Carryover of New Capital Projects approved in prior years is \$255.1 million, and carryover of Rehabilitation Projects approved in prior years is \$37.9 million.

Operating Budget

Budget Assumptions

For the Preliminary FY17 Budget, the assumptions included no increase of current service ridership-based fare revenues and no fare increase. The only changes to Revenue were an additional 4½ months of the Perris Valley Line, and a slight decrease for Station to Station discounts. The “Big Five” major vendors (for train operations, track maintenance, signal maintenance, equipment maintenance, and security), which represent approximately 39% of the operating expense budget, were limited to the contracted escalators for current service. Diesel fuel is approximately 10% of the operating budget. The budget reflects an anticipated average price per gallon of \$2.75, with a 5% contingency to allow for any unexpected cost increase. The budget for parts for the repair of the aging fleet is \$14.0 million, which is consistent with actual costs in prior years. The budget includes a net reduction of two positions. Budgeted increases include a 1.5% Cost of Living Increase, and a Merit Pool equal to 0.5% of Payroll. The Preliminary FY17 Budget includes the three leased locomotives for PTC testing. The portion of the deductible for the 2015 Oxnard incident to be recognized this year is lower by \$1.0M to \$2.0M. BNSF Locomotives and related expenses are included through October 2016.

Operating Revenues

Operating revenues include farebox, dispatching, maintenance-of-way revenues, interest, other minor miscellaneous revenues, and are currently estimated to equal \$102.2 million, an increase of \$0.8 million, or 0.8% compared to the FY16 budget.

Fare Revenues, the largest operating revenue of the budget, have increased \$0.6 million or 0.7% compared to the FY16 budget to a total of \$85.0 million. The FY17 budget reflects no fare increase. This increase is consistent with the current forecast for FY16 actual expense.

Maintenance-of-way revenues from the freight railroads and Amtrak are estimated from existing agreements based on projections of current usage. The Preliminary FY17 Budget estimates an increase of 2.0% from the FY16 budget to a total of \$14.6 million. Dispatching Revenues were only minimally different from FY16.

Train Operations, Maintenance-of-Way (MOW), Administration, and Insurance

The Train Operations component of the budget consists of those costs necessary to provide Metrolink commuter rail services across the six-county service area, including the direct costs of railroad operations, equipment maintenance, required support costs, and other administrative and operating costs. Ordinary MOW expenditures are those costs necessary to perform the inspections and repairs needed to assure the reliable, safe operation of trains and safety of the public. The FY17 budgeted amount for Train Operations is \$144.6 million, MOW is \$39.6 million, Administration & Services is \$36.7 million, Insurance/Claims \$16.8 million, and BNSF Lease expenses \$6.1 million. Attachment B provides the detail of the Operating Budget components compared to prior years. Attachment C shows the detail of the allocation of the Operating Budget components among the five Member Agencies.

The Preliminary FY17 Budget assumes the operation of a total of 2.8 million revenue service miles through the operation of 172 weekday trains and 90 weekend trains. No incremental services were requested for FY17.

Overall, the total budgeted expenses have increased by 1.4%. This change is the result of:

- a) an increase of \$9.0M in total Train Operations and Services, driven primarily by increases in parts purchased for rolling stock (\$4.3M), an additional 4½ months of Perris Valley Service (\$1.6M), and increases to Bombardier (\$1.1M), and Other mechanical (\$1.8M).
- b) a decrease in Maintenance of Way of \$2.8 million. MOW amounts are limited to estimated prior year expenditures, with an increase of \$1.1 million primarily due by contract escalations for Veolia and MASS Electric staff additions.
- c) an increase in Administration and Services (\$3.9M), driven by an increase in the Operations and Admin Salaries and Wages caused by the removal of the vacancy factor included in last year's budget (\$0.9M) in combination with a lower percent charge of salaries to projects charged to Capital Projects (\$1.2M), FY16 hiring over the mid-point budgeted for salaries and increases (\$0.9M), an increase in fringe benefits (\$0.5M), a COLA of 1.5% and merit pool of 0.5% for FY17 (\$0.4M), increased operational PTC charges no longer covered by Grants (\$1.0M) and a reduction of professional service expense (-\$1.0M).
- d) total insurance expense lower by \$1.3M, as a result of the \$3.0M budgeted to cover Oxnard related costs in FY16 reduced to \$2.0M for FY17 (-\$1.0M), and an insurance premium reduction (-\$0.3M).

In total, the FY17 budget increase is \$3.3M, or 1.4%, over the FY16 budget. Attachment D presents the elements driving the increases in FY17.

Member Agency Subsidy

Member Agency subsidies are required to fund the difference between the total costs of operations and all available revenues. The Preliminary FY17 Budget estimates total Member Agency contributions to equal \$141.6 million, an increase of \$2.5 million or 1.8% over the FY16 budget. The subsidy increase is the net result of slightly increased farebox revenue, higher routine operating expenses as a result of a full year of the Perris Valley Line, the Shortway and Redlands route additions, lower insurance cost, and the expiration of the BNSF Lease. Attachment E reflects subsidies FY14-FY16 and provides a specific analysis of the FY16 vs. FY17 change in the Member Agency subsidy.

Capital Budget

Capital Projects are frequently multi-year endeavors. The project balances are referred to as “Carryovers” because their uncompleted balance moves to the following year. Projects authorized in prior years but “carried over” total \$37.9 million for Rehabilitation and \$255.1 million for New Capital. They are shown in detail on Attachments J and N respectively.

The Capital Rehabilitation authorization request for FY17 was identified as necessary for safe and efficient rail operations. These projects total \$29.8 million and are represented in summary in Attachment H, and in detail in Attachment I.

The information presented in detail at the Board Workshop to Member Agencies included a total Rehabilitation request of \$101.1 million. Due to Member Agency funding constraints, this amount was reduced to \$29.8 million. Those projects removed from the budget request are displayed on Attachment H-1 by project type as ‘lined out’, on Attachment H-2 by project type as removed, and on Attachment H-3 by subdivision.

The total Rehabilitation Program includes:

- Track and Structures upgrades totaling \$18.9 million;
- Locomotive and Rolling Stock upgrades of \$1.0 million;
- Signal system improvements of \$2.8 million;
- Fleet and Facility projects of \$3.6 million;
- Communications and Signage improvements of \$3.5 million.

As the Rehabilitation Program needs identified exceed the amount of funding currently included in the Preliminary FY17 Budget, SCRRRA may return to the Member Agencies and the Board during FY17 to request additional Rehabilitation funding. SCRRRA will continue to work with the Member Agencies to track the status of Rehabilitation projects and any potential request for additional funding will be coordinated with the Member Agencies.

Capital Rehabilitation projects shown for FY18 and FY19 cover many other projects critical to the safe operation of the railroad. Over a number of years, a significant backlog of deferred

maintenance has accrued, creating the large numbers shown in the FY18 and FY19 listings. The needed projects are shown on Attachments K through L.

The New Capital authorization request for FY17 was identified as necessary for safe and efficient rail operations. The only new project proposed for FY17 totals \$1.3 million and is an amount to be used for project study reports and preliminary design on high priority projects. The project is shown on Attachment M. This information was also presented to the TAC members, and at the Board Workshop.

New Capital projects that have been identified as candidates for consideration in future years are listed in their totality on Attachment O. A description of possible funding which may apply to these projects is included.

Cash flow projections for FY17, FY18, and FY19 are presented in Attachment P.

Operating and Capital Budget Projections for FY18 and FY19

Upon approval by the Board, the FY17 Budget will be transmitted to Member Agencies for consideration. FY18 and FY19 projected budgets are included in this report for informational purposes only. Operating Budget projections are outlined in Attachments F and G, and Capital Budget Projections are shown in Attachments L through O.

FY18 and FY19 Projected Operating Budgets are based upon possible requested new services in combination with an inflation factor (3%) applied to all other costs.

Next Steps

May – June: Member Agencies Consider and Approve FY17 Budget

June 7 Required Public Posting of FY17 Budget

June 24 Request Board Approval of FY17 Budget

Thank you for your ongoing support and active participation in the development of the Preliminary FY17 Budget. As in the past, our respective staffs will continue to work together throughout the adoption process to ensure all concerns you may have are addressed in anticipation of adoption of the budget by the SCRRA Board of Directors in June 2016. My staff and I will also be available at your request to attend or present at your Board Meetings considering the budget adoption.

If you have any questions, comments or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me directly at (213) 452-0269, or have any member of your staff contact Christine Wilson, Manager, Budget and Financial Analysis at (213) 452-0297.

cc: Member Agency CFOs
Member Agency TAC Members

OPERATING FUNDING ALLOCATION BY MEMBER AGENCY

(In 000's)	TOTAL FY16-17	Metro Share	OCTA Share	RCTC Share	SANBAG Share	VCTC Share
Revenues						
Gross Farebox	\$85,002	\$41,559	\$22,031	\$7,789	\$11,074	2,549
Dispatching	2,590	1,315	887	6	69	313
Other Operating	12	6	3	1	2	-
Maintenance-of-Way	14,642	9,147	2,716	677	1,575	527
Total Revenues FY17 Budget	\$102,246	\$52,027	\$25,637	\$8,473	\$12,720	\$3,389
Expenses						
Train Operations & Services	\$144,655	\$73,087	\$33,889	\$15,778	\$15,723	6,178
Maintenance-of-Way	39,592	20,864	8,125	2,887	5,438	2,278
Administration & Services	36,726	17,592	6,480	5,309	3,710	3,635
Insurance	16,787	8,990	4,062	1,227	1,954	554
BNSF	6,055	3,288	1,266	577	680	244
Total Expense FY17 Budget	\$243,815	\$123,821	\$53,822	\$25,778	\$27,505	\$12,889
Total FY17 Subsidy by Member	\$141,569	\$71,794	\$28,185	\$17,305	\$14,785	\$9,500
FY 2015-16 Budget	\$139,055	\$71,796	\$28,526	\$15,015	\$14,154	9,564
Over/(Under) Last Year Budget	2,514	(2)	(341)	2,290	631	(64)
Percent of Change	1.8%	(0.0%)	(1.2%)	13.2%	4.3%	(0.7%)

Comparative Annual Operating Budget Distribution
by Cost Component by Year

(\$000s)	FY 14-15 Actual	FY 15-16 Budget	FY 16-17 Budget	FY15-16 Budget vs FY16-17 Budget	
				Change	%
Operating Revenue					
Farebox Revenue	83,134	84,446	83,972	(474)	-0.6%
Metro Fare Reduction Subsidy	-	-	1,030	1,030	n/a
Subtotal-Pro Forma FareBox	83,134	84,446	85,002	556	0.7%
Dispatching	2,493	2,663	2,590	(73)	(2.8%)
Other Revenues	372	-	12	12	100.0%
MOW Revenues	13,207	14,348	14,642	294	2.0%
Subtotal Operating Revenue	99,206	101,457	102,246	789	0.8%
Operating Expenses					
<u>Operations & Services</u>					
Train Operations	40,569	43,979	43,942	(37)	(0.1%)
Equipment Maintenance	32,649	29,352	37,582	8,230	28.0%
Fuel	24,454	22,952	22,772	(180)	(0.8%)
Non-Scheduled Rolling Stock Repairs	1	232	100	(132)	(56.9%)
Operating Facilities Maintenance	1,120	1,182	1,418	236	20.0%
Other Operating Train Services	293	567	496	(71)	(12.5%)
Rolling Stock Lease	104	640	370	(270)	(42.2%)
Security - Sheriff	5,136	5,482	5,511	29	0.5%
Security - Guards	1,591	2,010	2,001	(9)	(0.4%)
Supplemental Additional Security	81	690	690	-	0.0%
Public Safety Program	177	260	320	60	23.1%
Passenger Relations	1,639	1,885	2,069	184	9.8%
TVM Maintenance/Revenue Collection	5,984	6,703	7,495	792	11.8%
Marketing	949	1,020	1,220	200	19.6%
Media & External Communications	234	426	395	(31)	(7.3%)
Utilities/Leases	2,622	2,677	2,777	100	3.7%
Transfers to Other Operators	7,081	7,411	6,577	(834)	(11.3%)
Amtrak Transfers	800	1,400	1,400	-	0.0%
Station Maintenance	1,121	1,464	1,641	177	12.1%
Rail Agreements	4,997	4,831	5,377	546	11.3%
Subtotal Operations & Services	131,602	135,163	144,153	8,990	6.7%
<u>Maintenance-of-Way</u>					
MoW - Line Segments	33,043	41,160	38,102	(3,058)	(7.4%)
MoW - Extraordinary Maintenance	1,235	1,228	1,490	262	21.3%
Subtotal Maintenance-of-Way	34,278	42,388	39,592	(2,796)	-6.6%
<u>Administration & Services</u>					
Ops Salaries & Fringe Benefits	11,535	11,586	14,019	2,433	21.0%
Ops Non-Labor Expenses	3,651	4,760	5,384	624	13.1%
Indirect Administrative Expenses	11,791	13,621	15,507	1,886	13.8%
Ops Professional Services	969	2,870	1,816	(1,054)	(36.7%)
Subtotal Admin & Services	27,946	32,837	36,726	3,889	11.8%
Contingency (Non-Train Ops)	14	501	502	1	0.2%
Total Operating Expenses	193,840	210,889	220,973	10,084	4.8%
Insurance Expense/(Revenue)					
Liability/Property/Auto	12,597	12,880	12,588	(292)	-2.3%
Claims / SI	1,884	4,000	3,000	(1,000)	(25.0%)
Claims Administration	1,145	1,199	1,199	-	0.0%
PLPD Revenue	(1)	-	-	-	n/a
Net Insurance Expense	15,625	18,079	16,787	(1,292)	-7.1%
Total Expense Before BNSF	209,465	228,968	237,760	8,792	3.8%
Loss Before BNSF	(110,259)	(127,511)	(135,514)	(8,003)	-6.3%
Member Subsidies					
Operations	92,252	109,432	118,727	9,295	8.5%
Insurance	17,678	18,079	16,787	(1,292)	-7.1%
Member Subsidies - Normal Ops	109,930	127,511	135,514	8,003	6.3%
Surplus / (Deficit) Before BNSF	(329)	-	-	-	

BNSF LEASED LOCOMOTIVE COSTS

			-		
Lease cost Inc. ship	-	4,275	2,526	(1,749)	-40.9%
Major Component Parts	-	800	-	(800)	(100.0%)
Labor for Maintenance	-	2,500	900	(1,600)	(64.0%)
Additional Fuel	-	5,003	1,230	(3,773)	(75.4%)
Diesel Fuel Offset	-	(7,010)	-	7,010	(100.0%)
Wheel truing, Software Mods, Brakes	-	960	-	(960)	(100.0%)
Temp Facility Mods	-	450	-	(450)	(100.0%)
PTC Costs	-	4,010	1,399	(2,611)	(65.1%)
Contingency	-	557	-	(557)	-100.0%
Total BNSF Lease Loco Expenses	-	11,545	6,055	(5,490)	(47.6%)
Member Subsidies - BNSF Lease	-	11,545	6,055	(5,490)	(47.6%)
Surplus / (Deficit) - BNSF Lease	-	-	-	-	

Total Expenses	209,465	240,513	243,815	3,302	1.4%
-----------------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	--------------	-------------

			-		
Net Loss	(110,259)	(139,055)	(141,569)	(2,514)	(1.8%)
All Member Subsidies	109,930	139,055	141,569	2,514	1.8%
Surplus / (Deficit)	(329)	-	-	-	

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY
FISCAL YEAR 2017 PROPOSED BUDGET**

Attachment D

Operational Expense Budget

(in 000's)

FY 2016 Amended Adopted Budget	\$	240,513	
FY 2017 Preliminary Budget		<u>243,815</u>	
Total Operational Expense Budget Increase	\$	<u>3,302</u>	1.4%

INCREASE DRIVERS:

New Initiatives:

Remove Effect of BNSF reduction	(5,490)	(lower than FY16)
Without Change to BNSF, increase = \$12,661,721 (this is amount analyzed below)		
Perris Valley- increase to full year	2,568	
Redlands-1st - 4 mo, Redlands & Shortway full year	598	
Mobile Ticketing	672	

Big Five

Train Operations	1,262
MOW (including 5 new MASS Positions)	1,140
MOW cut	(3,870)

Other

Material Issues	4,337
Effect of Payroll Vacancy Factor used in FY16	1,430
Variance in Pay mid-pt vs hire	1,207
Change in Salaries charged to Capital Projects	1,294
Reduction in Consultants	(1,086)
Reduction in Insurance/Claims (Oxnard)	(1,292)
FY 2017 COLA (1.5%) & Merit Pool (0.5%)	532

Total Operational Expense Budget Increase	\$	<u>3,302</u>	1.4%
--	-----------	---------------------	-------------

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY
FISCAL YEAR 2017 PROPOSED BUDGET**

Attachment E

Net Local Subsidy by Member Agency

(In 000's)

	Total Net Local Subsidy	Metro Share	OCTA share	RCTC Share	SANBAG Share	VCTC Share
FY14 ACTUAL*	\$100,003	\$54,741	\$18,522	\$7,685	\$11,654	\$7,401
FY 15 ACTUAL	\$110,257	\$59,030	\$22,251	\$9,388	\$11,605	\$7,983
FY16 BUDGET	\$139,055	\$71,796	\$28,526	\$15,015	\$14,154	\$9,564
FY17 BUDGET	\$141,569	\$71,794	\$28,185	\$17,305	\$14,785	\$9,500

*Excludes inventory write up

YEAR OVER YEAR CHANGE

	Total Net Local Subsidy	Metro Share	OCTA share	RCTC Share	SANBAG Share	VCTC Share
FY14 vs FY15						
\$ Increase	\$10,254	\$4,289	\$3,729	\$1,703	(\$49)	\$582
% Increase	10.3%	7.8%	20.1%	22.2%	-0.4%	7.9%
FY15 vs FY16						
\$ Increase	\$28,798	\$12,766	\$6,275	\$5,627	\$2,549	\$1,581
% Increase	26.1%	21.6%	28.2%	59.9%	22.0%	19.8%
FY16 vs FY17						
\$ Increase	\$2,514	(\$2)	(\$341)	\$2,290	\$631	(\$64)
% Increase	1.8%	0.0%	-1.2%	15.3%	4.5%	-0.7%

Analysis of 16 vs 17 variance:

Of the 1.8%

Of the \$2,514

-0.6% Increase in Revenue (Primarily PVL)	\$ (788)	=	-31.3%	of the variance
3.1% Material Issues	4,337	=	172.5%	of the variance
1.8% Perris Valley increase to full year	2,568	=	102.1%	of the variance
0.9% Big Five Train Operations	1,262	=	50.2%	of the variance
0.8% Big Five MOW	1,140	=	45.3%	of the variance
-2.8% MOW Cut	(3,870)	=	-153.9%	of the variance
1.0% Payroll Vacancy Factor used in FY16	1,430	=	56.9%	of the variance
0.9% Change in Salaries to Capital Projects	1,294	=	51.5%	of the variance
0.9% Payroll Variation Hire to Mid point	1,207	=	48.0%	of the variance
0.5% Mobile ticketing	672	=	26.7%	of the variance
0.4% Redlands(both) & Shortway	598	=	23.8%	of the variance
-0.8% Ops Prof Services Reduced	(1,085)	=	-43.2%	of the variance
-0.9% Reduce insurance (Oxnard incident)	(1,292)	=	-51.4%	of the variance
-3.9% BNSF decrease to partial year	(5,490)	=	-218.4%	of the variance
<u>0.4% FY17 COLA (1.5%) & Merit Pool (0.5%)</u>	<u>531</u>	=	<u>21.1%</u>	of the variance
<u>1.8%</u>	<u>\$ 2,514</u>		<u>100.0%</u>	

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY
FISCAL YEAR 2017-18 PROPOSED BUDGET

Attachment G

FY19 Forecasted Operating Budget
by Cost Component By Member Agency

(\$000s)	Total FY18-19	Metro	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC
Operating Revenue						
Farebox Revenue	89,540	42,570	24,024	8,743	11,817	2,386
Metro Fare Reduction Subsidy	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subtotal-Pro Forma FareBox	89,540	42,570	24,024	8,743	11,817	2,386
Dispatching	2,747	1,395	941	6	73	332
Other Revenues	13	7	3	1	2	-
MOW Revenues	15,533	9,704	2,881	718	1,671	559
Subtotal Operating Revenue	107,833	53,676	27,849	9,468	13,563	3,277
Operating Expenses						
<u>Operations & Services</u>						
Train Operations	49,364	25,882	11,423	4,990	5,370	1,699
Equipment Maintenance	42,325	20,824	10,291	4,775	4,657	1,778
Fuel	26,223	13,018	6,847	2,761	2,812	785
Non-Scheduled Rolling Stock Repairs	105	55	25	10	12	3
Operating Facilities Maintenance	1,504	782	357	147	169	49
Other Operating Train Services	527	248	91	79	54	55
Rolling Stock Lease	393	186	78	44	57	28
Security - Sheriff	5,847	3,289	1,295	471	650	142
Security - Guards	2,122	999	365	317	219	222
Supplemental Additional Security	732	348	196	71	97	20
Public Safety Program	339	159	58	51	35	36
Passenger Relations	2,195	1,091	556	202	270	76
TVM Maintenance/Revenue Collection	7,951	3,215	1,812	1,286	1,170	468
Marketing	1,294	664	314	115	159	42
Media & External Communications	420	198	72	63	43	44
Utilities/Leases	2,947	1,387	507	440	304	309
Transfers to Other Operators	6,978	3,754	1,620	560	811	233
Amtrak Transfers	1,485	467	945	-	-	73
Station Maintenance	1,739	1,064	264	109	224	78
Rail Agreements	6,633	2,187	1,926	1,647	516	357
Subtotal Operations & Services	161,123	79,817	39,042	18,138	17,629	6,497
<u>Maintenance-of-Way</u>						
MoW - Line Segments	40,516	21,180	8,085	3,125	5,811	2,315
MoW - Extraordinary Maintenance	1,580	909	384	17	169	101
Subtotal Maintenance-of-Way	42,096	22,089	8,469	3,142	5,980	2,416
<u>Administration & Services</u>						
Ops Salaries & Fringe Benefits	14,873	6,999	2,570	2,216	1,535	1,553
Ops Non-Labor Expenses	5,712	2,901	1,110	702	643	356
Indirect Administrative Expenses	16,451	7,742	2,831	2,458	1,696	1,724
Ops Professional Services	1,926	906	331	288	199	202
Subtotal Admin & Services	38,962	18,548	6,842	5,664	4,073	3,835
<u>Contingency (Non-Train Ops)</u>	533	252	92	80	53	56
Total Operating Expenses	242,714	120,706	54,445	27,024	27,735	12,804
Insurance Expense/(Revenue)						
Liability/Property/Auto	13,355	6,942	3,170	1,309	1,500	434
Claims / SI	3,182	1,654	756	312	357	103
Claims Administration	1,272	661	302	125	143	41
PLPD Revenue	-	-	-	-	-	-
Net Insurance Expense	17,809	9,257	4,228	1,746	2,000	578

Total Expenses	260,523	129,963	58,673	28,770	29,735	13,382
Total Loss	152,690	76,287	30,824	19,302	16,172	10,105
Member Subsidies						
Operations	134,881	67,030	26,596	17,556	14,172	9,527
Insurance	17,809	9,257	4,228	1,746	2,000	578
Member Subsidies	152,690	76,287	30,824	19,302	16,172	10,105
Surplus / (Deficit)	-	-	-	-	-	-

FY 2017 REDUCED REHABILITATION PROJECT PROPOSALS AS PRESENTED AT THE BOARD WORKSHOP 4/28/16 - WITH CHANGES MARKED

Metrolink

Attachement H-1
"before" with markup

Line	Asset Type	Subdiv	Project Type	TOTAL	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	Other
1	Structures	Valley	Bridge rehab 35.75, and design 10 bridges	\$4,020,800	\$4,020,800					
2	Structures	Valley	Culvert rehab (design for rplce up to 21 culverts)	\$867,860	\$867,860					
3	Structures	Valley	ROW Grading	\$100,000	\$100,000					
4	Structures	Ventura-VC	Bridge rehab 438.89, design 434.12 & 436.96	\$2,049,600					\$909,600	\$1,140,000
5	Structures	Ventura-VC	Culvert rehab MP 436.56	\$490,000					\$490,000	
6	Structures	Ventura-LA	Bridge design 2 bridges 458.71 & 452.1	\$616,000	\$616,000					
7	Structures	Ventura-LA	ROW Grading	\$100,000	\$100,000					
8	Structures	Orange	Bridge rehab	\$0		\$0				
9	Structures	Orange	Culvert rehab MP 201.4	\$385,000		\$385,000				
10	Structures	Orange	ROW Grading	\$100,000		\$100,000				
11	Structures	San Gabriel	Culvert rehab (Re-entered in Line 74)	\$0	\$0			\$0		
12	Structures	San Gabriel	ROW Grading	\$100,000	\$60,000			\$40,000		
13	Structures	River	ROW Grading	\$50,000	\$23,750	\$9,900	\$5,550	\$7,200	\$3,600	
14	Structures	Montalvo-W	Culvert rehab MP 404.65	\$210,000					\$210,000	
15			Sub-Total Structures	\$9,089,259	\$5,788,410	\$494,900	\$5,550	\$47,200	\$1,613,200	\$1,140,000
16	Track	Ventura-VC	Replace rail curve 437.76 (1636') plus 500' tangent	\$333,217					\$333,217	
17	Track	Ventura-LA	Transpose Curve 442.58 (1520'), Curve 442.96 (1368')	\$684,372	\$684,372					
18	Track	Ventura-LA	Replace Ties rated 3 (Poor Cond) and 4 (Failed)	\$1,007,500	\$1,007,500					
19	Track	Valley	Replace rail M1 4.62 (1026'), S 16.85 (263'), 61.20	\$1,817,400	\$1,817,400					
20	Track	Valley	Replace Ties rated 3 (Poor Cond) and 4 (Failed)	\$3,120,000	\$3,120,000					
			REVISE TO	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000					
21	Track	River*	WB-MT4 Transpose Curve 143.03 (2021'), Lead 3 MP	\$5,507,256	\$1,071,864	\$446,798	\$250,478	\$324,944	\$162,472	\$3,250,701
22	Track	River*	Replace 5,000 Ties for River EB, 3600 Spread across r	\$3,899,216	\$943,442	\$393,266	\$220,468	\$286,012	\$143,006	\$1,913,022
23	Track	San Gabriel	Upgrade aged worn 115/119 lb rail to 136 lb rail MP 4	\$1,500,000	\$900,000			\$600,000		
24	Track	San Gabriel	Upgrade aged and worn 119 lb rail to 136 lb rail MP 3	\$2,250,000	\$1,350,000			\$900,000		
25	Track	Orange	Upgrade worn 115 lb rail with 136 lb rail from MP	\$6,912,120		\$6,912,120				
26			Sub-Total Rail & Ties	\$27,031,081	\$10,894,578	\$7,752,184	\$470,945	\$2,110,956	\$638,695	\$5,163,723
			* Reference Engr dept estimates for UPRR share.							
27	Track	Ventura-LA	Turnouts & special trackwork	\$900,000	\$900,000					
28	Track	Valley	Turnouts & special trackwork	\$400,000	\$400,000					
29	Track	San Gabriel	Turnouts & special trackwork	\$1,000,000	\$600,000			\$400,000		
30	Track	River	Turnouts & special trackwork	\$1,000,000	\$475,000	\$198,000	\$111,000	\$144,000	\$72,000	
31			Sub-Total Turnouts & Trackwork	\$3,300,000	\$2,375,000	\$198,000	\$111,000	\$544,000	\$72,000	\$0
32	Signals	Olive	Train control & grade xing signal rehab	\$450,000		\$450,000				
33	Signals	Orange	Train control & grade xing signal rehab	\$450,000	\$450,000					
34	Signals	Ventura-VC	Train control rehab	\$200,000					\$200,000	
35	Signals	Ventura-LA	Train control rehab	\$200,000	\$200,000					
36	Signals	Valley	Train control & grade xing signal rehab	\$700,000	\$700,000					
			REVISE TO	\$350,000	\$350,000					

FY 2017 REDUCED REHABILITATION PROJECT PROPOSALS AS PRESENTED AT THE BOARD WORKSHOP 4/28/16 - WITH CHANGES MARKED

Metrolink

Attachement H-1
"before" with markup

Line	Asset Type	Subdiv	Project Type	TOTAL	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	Other
37	Signals	Pasadena	Train control rehab	\$200,000	\$200,000					
38	Signals	San Gabriel	Train control rehab	\$400,000	\$240,000			\$160,000		
39	Signals	PVL	Grade xing signal rehab	\$250,000			\$250,000			
40	Signals	East Bank	Train control rehab	\$500,000	\$74,100	\$30,888	\$17,316	\$22,464	\$11,232	\$344,000
41	Signals	River	Grade xing signal rehab	\$250,000	\$118,750	\$49,500	\$27,750	\$36,000	\$18,000	
42	Signals	Systemwide	Train control rehab	\$75,000	\$35,625	\$14,850	\$8,325	\$10,800	\$5,400	
43			Sub-Total Signals	\$3,675,000	\$1,568,475	\$995,238	\$303,391	\$229,264	\$234,632	\$344,000
44	Comm & PTC	Olive	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$150,000		\$150,000				
45	Comm & PTC	Orange	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$150,000		\$150,000				
46	Comm & PTC	Ventura-VC	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$237,500					\$237,500	
47	Comm & PTC	Ventura-LA	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$87,500	\$87,500					
48	Comm & PTC	Valley	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$325,000	\$325,000					
49	Comm & PTC	San Gabriel	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$175,000	\$105,000			\$70,000		
50	Comm & PTC	PVL	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$125,000			\$125,000			
51	Comm & PTC	East Bank	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$123,130	\$18,248	\$7,606	\$4,264	\$5,532	\$2,766	\$84,713
52	Comm & PTC	Systemwide	On-Board PTC systems	\$1,100,000	\$522,500	\$217,800	\$122,100	\$158,400	\$79,200	
53	Comm & PTC	Systemwide	Back office PTC systems	\$2,598,000	\$1,234,050	\$514,404	\$288,378	\$374,112	\$187,056	
54			Sub-Total Comm & PTC	\$5,071,130	\$2,292,298	\$1,039,810	\$539,742	\$608,044	\$506,522	\$84,713
55			TOTAL Infrastructure	\$48,166,470	\$22,918,760	\$10,480,133	\$1,430,628	\$3,539,464	\$3,065,049	\$6,732,436
56	Rolling Stock	Systemwide	Sentinel Rail Car Comprehensive Overhaul	\$40,500,000	\$7,371,525	\$3,072,762	\$1,722,609	\$2,234,736	\$1,117,368	\$24,981,000
57	Rolling Stock	Systemwide	Sentinel HVAC Overhaul	\$975,000	\$463,125	\$193,050	\$108,225	\$140,400	\$70,200	
58	Rolling Stock	Systemwide	Sentinel LED Lighting Replacement	\$1,170,000	\$555,750	\$231,660	\$129,870	\$168,480	\$84,240	
59	Rolling Stock	Systemwide	Rotem Coupler Overhaul (44 cars)	\$3,500,000	\$1,662,500	\$693,000	\$388,500	\$504,000	\$252,000	
60			Sub-Total Rolling Stock	\$46,145,000	\$10,052,900	\$4,190,472	\$2,349,204	\$3,047,616	\$1,523,808	\$24,981,000
61	Facilities	Systemwide	Material Handling Equipment	\$405,038	\$192,393	\$80,197	\$44,959	\$58,325	\$29,163	
62	Facilities	Systemwide	CMF Elevator Modernization	\$140,185	\$66,588	\$27,757	\$15,561	\$20,187	\$10,093	
63	Facilities	Systemwide	CMF Drainage Re-direction	\$1,593,900	\$757,103	\$315,592	\$176,923	\$229,522	\$114,761	
64	Facilities	Systemwide	EMF Parking & Track Lighting	\$586,600	\$300,253	\$125,158	\$70,164	\$91,024	\$0	
65	Vehicles	Systemwide	3 Hy-Rails, 2 MOW, 1 gang truck	\$670,475	\$318,476	\$132,754	\$74,423	\$96,548	\$48,274	
66			Sub-Total Facilities & Vehicles	\$3,396,198	\$1,634,812	\$681,458	\$382,030	\$495,606	\$202,291	\$0
67	IT	Systemwide	Replace switch equipment	\$249,700	\$118,608	\$49,441	\$27,717	\$35,957	\$17,978	
68	IT	Systemwide	Enhance VM Infrastructure	\$539,000	\$256,025	\$106,722	\$59,829	\$77,616	\$38,808	
69	IT	Systemwide	Desktop management systems	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
70			Sub-Total IT	\$788,700	\$374,633	\$156,163	\$87,546	\$113,573	\$56,786	\$0
70.5	Facilities	Systemwide	LAUPT Platform & Canopy Upgrades	\$2,700,000	\$987,525	\$411,642	\$230,769	\$299,376	\$149,688	\$621,000

FY 2017 REDUCED REHABILITATION PROJECT PROPOSALS AS PRESENTED AT THE BOARD WORKSHOP 4/28/16 - WITH CHANGES MARKED

Metrolink

Attachement H-1
"before" with markup

Line	Asset Type	Subdiv	Project Type	TOTAL	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	Other
			REVISE TO ONLY 2 PLATFORMS (2 & 3)	\$1,266,000	\$475,000	\$198,000	\$111,000	\$144,000	\$72,000	\$266,000
71			TOTAL Other Assets	\$53,029,898	\$13,049,870	\$5,439,735	\$3,049,548	\$3,956,171	\$1,932,573	\$25,602,000
LA Co; LA County Portion of FY 2016 San Gabriel Sub projects (Required to match SANBAG funding already approved in FY 2016):										
72	Comm	San Gabriel	Comm system rehab	\$105,000	\$105,000			\$0		
73	Signal	San Gabriel	Signal system rehab	\$594,000	\$594,000			\$0		
74	Structures	San Gabriel	Rehab culvert 28.23	\$120,000	\$120,000			\$0		
75	Structures	San Gabriel	ROW grading/ditching	\$48,000	\$48,000			\$0		
76	Track	San Gabriel	Rail grinding	\$119,700	\$119,700			\$0		
77	Track	San Gabriel	Tie rehab, turnout replace, track panels @ Grand, pec	\$1,185,600	\$1,185,600			\$0		
78			Sub-Total LA Portion of FY 2016	\$2,172,300	\$2,172,300	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
79	REHAB PROJECT PROPOSALS	GRAND TOTAL		\$103,368,668	\$38,140,930	\$15,919,868	\$4,480,177	\$7,495,635	\$4,997,622	\$32,334,436

New Totals	\$29,779,628	\$9,991,444	\$10,215,192	\$1,284,374	\$1,664,052	\$2,876,831	\$3,747,735
-------------------	--------------	-------------	--------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

FUNDING:

Notes:

- 1) "Other" funds in FY 2017 are anticipated from CalTrans UPRR, and Amtrak
- 2) \$43,268 of projected UPRR budget was removed from FY 2016
- 3) Platform Repair not in original presentation are included here.

FY 2017 REDUCED REHABILITATION PROJECT PROPOSALS AS PRESENTED AT THE BOARD WORKSHOP 4/28/16 - WITH CHANGES

Metrolink

Attachment H-2

After reductions

Line	Asset Type	Subdiv	Project Type	TOTAL	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	Other
2	Structures	Valley	Culvert rehab (design to replce up to 21 culverts)	\$867,860	\$867,860					
4	Structures	Ventura-VC	Bridge rehab 438.89, design 434.12 & 436.96	\$2,049,600					\$909,600	\$1,140,000
5	Structures	Ventura-VC	Culvert rehab MP 436.56	\$490,000					\$490,000	
9	Structures	Orange	Culvert rehab MP 201.4	\$385,000		\$385,000				
10	Structures	Orange	ROW Grading	\$100,000		\$100,000				
15	Sub-Total Structures			\$3,892,460	\$867,860	\$485,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,399,600	\$1,140,000
16	Track	Ventura-VC	Replace rail curve 437.76 (1636') plus 500' tangent	\$333,217					\$333,217	
20	Track	Valley	Replace Ties rated 3 (Poor Cond) and 4 (Failed)	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000					
22	Track	River*	Replace 5,000 Ties for River EB, 3600 Spread across rest o	\$3,899,216	\$943,442	\$393,266	\$220,468	\$286,012	\$143,006	\$1,913,022
25	Track	Orange	Upgrade worn 115 lb rail with 136 lb rail from MP 201.1-	\$6,912,120		\$6,912,120				
26	Sub-Total Rail & Ties			\$12,544,553	\$2,343,442	\$7,305,386	\$220,468	\$286,012	\$476,223	\$1,913,022
* Reference Engr dept estimates for UPRR share.										
30	Track	River	Turnouts & special trackwork	\$1,000,000	\$475,000	\$198,000	\$111,000	\$144,000	\$72,000	
31	Sub-Total Turnouts & Trackwork			\$1,000,000	\$475,000	\$198,000	\$111,000	\$144,000	\$72,000	\$0
32	Signals	Olive	Train control & grade xing signal rehab	\$450,000		\$450,000				
34	Signals	Ventura-VC	Train control rehab	\$200,000					\$200,000	
36	Signals	Valley	Train control & grade xing signal rehab	\$350,000	\$350,000					
38	Signals	San Gabriel	Train control rehab	\$400,000	\$240,000			\$160,000		
40	Signals	East Bank	Train control rehab	\$500,000	\$74,100	\$30,888	\$17,316	\$22,464	\$11,232	\$344,000
41	Signals	River	Grade xing signal rehab	\$250,000	\$118,750	\$49,500	\$27,750	\$36,000	\$18,000	
42	Signals	Systemwide	Train control rehab	\$75,000	\$35,625	\$14,850	\$8,325	\$10,800	\$5,400	
43	Sub-Total Signals			\$2,225,000	\$818,475	\$545,238	\$53,391	\$229,264	\$234,632	\$344,000
44	Comm & PTC	Olive	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$150,000		\$150,000				
45	Comm & PTC	Orange	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$150,000		\$150,000				
46	Comm & PTC	Ventura-VC	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$237,500					\$237,500	
50	Comm & PTC	PVL	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$125,000			\$125,000			
51	Comm & PTC	East Bank	Wayside comm & CIS rehab	\$123,130	\$18,248	\$7,606	\$4,264	\$5,532	\$2,766	\$84,713
53	Comm & PTC	Systemwide	Back office PTC systems	\$2,598,000	\$1,234,050	\$514,404	\$288,378	\$374,112	\$187,056	
54	Sub-Total Comm & PTC			\$3,383,630	\$1,252,298	\$822,010	\$417,642	\$379,644	\$427,322	\$84,713
55	TOTAL Infrastructure			\$23,045,643	\$5,757,075	\$9,355,635	\$802,501	\$1,038,920	\$2,609,777	\$3,481,735
57	Rolling Stock	Systemwide	Sentinel HVAC Overhaul	\$975,000	\$463,125	\$193,050	\$108,225	\$140,400	\$70,200	
60	Sub-Total Rolling Stock			\$975,000	\$463,125	\$193,050	\$108,225	\$140,400	\$70,200	\$0
62	Facilities	Systemwide	CMF Elevator Modernization	\$140,185	\$66,588	\$27,757	\$15,561	\$20,187	\$10,093	
63	Facilities	Systemwide	CMF Drainage Re-direction	\$1,593,900	\$757,103	\$315,592	\$176,923	\$229,522	\$114,761	

FY 2017 REDUCED REHABILITATION PROJECT PROPOSALS AS PRESENTED AT THE BOARD WORKSHOP 4/28/16 - WITH CHANGES

Metrolink

Attachment H-2

After reductions

Line	Asset Type	Subdiv	Project Type	TOTAL	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	Other
64	Facilities	Systemwide	EMF Parking & Track Lighting	\$586,600	\$300,253	\$125,158	\$70,164	\$91,024	\$0	
66			Sub-Total Facilities & Vehicles	\$2,320,685	\$1,123,944	\$468,507	\$262,648	\$340,732	\$124,854	\$0
70.5	Facilities	Systemwide	LAUPT Platform & Canopy Upgrades <i>REVISE TO ONLY 2 PLATFORMS (2 & 3)</i>	\$1,266,000	\$475,000	\$198,000	\$111,000	\$144,000	\$72,000	\$266,000
71			TOTAL Other Assets	\$4,561,685	\$2,062,069	\$859,557	\$481,873	\$625,132	\$267,054	\$266,000
LA County LA County Portion of FY 2016 San Gabriel Sub projects (Required to match SANBAG funding already approved in FY 2016):										
72	Comm	San Gabriel	Comm system rehab	\$105,000	\$105,000			\$0		
73	Signal	San Gabriel	Signal system rehab	\$594,000	\$594,000			\$0		
74	Structures	San Gabriel	Rehab culvert 28.23	\$120,000	\$120,000			\$0		
75	Structures	San Gabriel	ROW grading/ditching	\$48,000	\$48,000			\$0		
76	Track	San Gabriel	Rail grinding	\$119,700	\$119,700			\$0		
77	Track	San Gabriel	Tie rehab, turnout replace, track panels @ Grand, ped xin	\$1,185,600	\$1,185,600			\$0		
78			Sub-Total LA Portion of FY 2016	\$2,172,300	\$2,172,300	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
79	REHAB PROJECT PROPOSALS	GRAND TOTAL		\$29,779,628	\$9,991,444	\$10,215,192	\$1,284,374	\$1,664,052	\$2,876,831	\$3,747,735

FUNDING:

Notes:

1) "Other" funds in FY 2017 are anticipated from CalTrans UPRR, and Amtrak

ATTACHMENT "H-3"								
FY2016-17 Rehabilitation New Authority Projects - Summary - by Subdivision								
<i>(\$ Thousands)</i>								
Subdivision	Project Type	TOTAL	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	Other
Olive	Communication & PTC	150	-	150	-	-	-	-
Olive	Signals	450	-	450	-	-	-	-
Orange	Communication & PTC	150	-	150	-	-	-	-
Orange	Structures	485	-	485	-	-	-	-
Orange	Track	6,912	-	6,912	-	-	-	-
Perris Valley	Communication & PTC	125	-	-	125	-	-	-
San Gabriel	Communication & PTC	105	105	-	-	-	-	-
San Gabriel	Signals	994	834	-	-	160	-	-
San Gabriel	Structures	168	168	-	-	-	-	-
San Gabriel	Track	1,306	1,306	-	-	-	-	-
Valley	Signals	350	350	-	-	-	-	-
Valley	Structures	868	868	-	-	-	-	-
Valley	Track	1,400	1,400	-	-	-	-	-
Ventura-VC	Communication & PTC	238	-	-	-	-	238	-
Ventura-VC	Signals	200	-	-	-	-	200	-
Ventura-VC	Structures	2,540	-	-	-	-	1,400	1,140
Ventura-VC	Track	333	-	-	-	-	333	-
East Bank	Communication & PTC	123	18	8	4	5	3	85
East Bank	Signals	500	74	31	17	22	11	344
River	Signals	250	119	50	28	36	18	-
River	Track	4,899	1,418	591	332	430	215	1,913
Systemwide	Communication & PTC	2,598	1,234	515	288	374	187	-
Systemwide	Facilities	3,586	1,599	666	373	485	197	266
Systemwide	Rolling Stock	975	463	193	108	141	70	-
Systemwide	Signals	75	36	15	8	11	5	-
CURRENT PROPOSED FY2016-17 REHAB BUDGET		29,779	9,991	10,215	1,284	1,664	2,877	3,748
ROTEM SETTLEMENT AMOUNTS (YEAR 5)		-	1,936	(3,773)	500	1,000	337	-
TOTAL PROPOSED FY 2016-17 REHAB BUDGET		29,779	11,927	6,442	1,784	2,664	3,214	3,748
PRIOR YEAR CARRYOVERS		37,863	8,148	16,199	2,070	5,069	3,550	2,827
TOTAL FY 16-17 AUTHORITY INCLUDING CARRYOVERS		67,643	20,075	22,641	3,854	7,733	6,764	6,575

ATTACHMENT "I"

FY2016-17 Rehabilitation New Authority Projects - Detail

(\$ Thousands)

Project Title	Subdivision	Project Type	TOTAL	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	Other
Wayside comm & CIS rehab	Olive	Communication & PTC	150	-	150	-	-	-	-
Train control & grade xing signal rehab	Olive	Signals	450	-	450	-	-	-	-
Wayside comm & CIS rehab	Orange	Communication & PTC	150	-	150	-	-	-	-
Culvert rehab MP 201.4	Orange	Structures	385	-	385	-	-	-	-
ROW Grading	Orange	Structures	100	-	100	-	-	-	-
Orange Subdivision Rail Rehab Program	Orange	Track	6,912	-	6,912	-	-	-	-
Wayside comm & CIS rehab	PVL	Communication & PTC	125	-	-	125	-	-	-
Comm system rehab	San Gabriel	Communication	105	105	-	-	-	-	-
Signal system rehab	San Gabriel	Signal	594	594	-	-	-	-	-
Train control rehab	San Gabriel	Signals	400	240	-	-	160	-	-
Rehab culvert 28.23	San Gabriel	Structures	120	120	-	-	-	-	-
ROW grading/ditching	San Gabriel	Structures	48	48	-	-	-	-	-
Rail grinding	San Gabriel	Track	120	120	-	-	-	-	-
Tie rehab, turnout replace, track panels @ Grand, ped xing par	San Gabriel	Track	1,186	1,186	-	-	-	-	-
Train control & grade xing signal rehab	Valley	Signals	350	350	-	-	-	-	-
Culvert rehab (up to 21 pipe culverts)	Valley	Structures	868	868	-	-	-	-	-
Replace Ties rated 3 (Poor Cond) and 4 (Failed)	Valley	Track	1,400	1,400	-	-	-	-	-
Wayside comm & CIS rehab	Ventura-VC	Communication & PTC	238	-	-	-	-	238	-
Train control rehab	Ventura-VC	Signals	200	-	-	-	-	200	-
Bridge rehab 438.89, design 434.12 & 436.96	Ventura-VC	Structures	2,050	-	-	-	-	910	1,140
Culvert rehab MP 436.56	Ventura-VC	Structures	490	-	-	-	-	490	-
Replace rail curve 437.76 (1636') plus 500' tangent	Ventura-VC	Track	333	-	-	-	-	333	-
Wayside comm & CIS rehab	East Bank	Communication & PTC	123	18	8	4	5	3	85
Train control rehab	East Bank	Signals	500	74	31	17	22	11	344
Grade xing signal rehab	River	Signals	250	119	50	28	36	18	-
River Tie Rehabilitation	River	Track	3,899	943	393	220	286	143	1,913
Turnouts & special trackwork	River	Track	1,000	475	198	111	144	72	-
Back office PTC systems	Systemwide	Communication & PTC	2,598	1,234	514	288	374	187	-
CMF Drainage Re-direction	Systemwide	Facilities	1,594	757	315	177	230	115	-
CMF Elevator Modernization	Systemwide	Facilities	140	67	28	16	20	10	-
EMF Parking & Track Lighting	Systemwide	Facilities	587	300	125	70	91	-	-
Stabilizing Canopies and Platforms at LAUS	Systemwide	Facilities	1,266	475	198	111	144	72	266
Sentinel HVAC Overhaul	Systemwide	Rolling Stock	975	463	193	108	140	70	-
Train control rehab	Systemwide	Signals	75	36	15	8	11	5	-
CURRENT PROPOSED FY2016-17 REHAB BUDGET (INCLUDING AMOUNTS UNALLOCATED IN FY2016)			\$29,779	\$9,991	\$10,215	\$1,284	\$1,664	\$2,877	\$3,748
ROTEM SETTLEMENT AMOUNTS (YEAR 5)			-	\$1,936	-\$3,773	\$500	\$1,000	\$337	\$0
TOTAL PROPOSED FY 2016-17 REHAB BUDGET			29,779	11,927	6,442	1,784	2,664	3,214	3,748
PRIOR YEAR CARRYOVERS			37,863	8,148	16,199	2,070	5,069	3,550	2,827
TOTAL FY 16-17 AUTHORITY INCLUDING CARRYOVERS			67,643	20,075	22,641	3,854	7,733	6,764	6,575

ATTACHMENT "J"

FY2016-17 Rehabilitation Carryover Projects

By subdivision and by category

(\$ Thousands)

Subdivision	Category	Carryover June-16 - End	Metro	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	UPRR\PTMISEA	VCTC
	Communication	75	-	-	75	-	-	-
	Signal	175	-	-	175	-	-	-
	Track	322	-	-	322	-	-	-
Olive Total		572	-	-	572	-	-	-
	Communication	225	-	-	225	-	-	-
	Signal	1,710	-	-	1,710	-	-	-
	Signal & Communication	38	-	-	38	-	-	-
	Structures	7,328	-	-	7,328	-	-	-
	Track	3,967	-	-	3,967	-	-	-
Orange Total		13,268	-	-	13,268	-	-	-
	Signal & Communication	117	-	-	117	-	-	-
	Structures	490	-	-	490	-	-	-
Orange & Olive Total		607	-	-	607	-	-	-
	Signal & Communication	62	62	-	-	-	-	-
	Track	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
Pasadena Total		63	63	-	-	-	-	-
	Communication	125	-	-	125	-	-	-
	Signal	790	-	-	790	-	-	-
PVL		915	-	-	915	-	-	-
	Track	300	-	-	-	300	-	-
Redlands Total		300	-	-	-	300	-	-
	Facilities	172	-	-	172	-	-	-
Riverside Total		172	-	-	172	-	-	-
	Communication	70	-	-	-	70	-	-
	Signal	396	-	-	-	396	-	-
	Signal & Communication	2,344	1,406	-	-	938	-	-
	Structures	112	-	-	-	112	-	-
	Track	2,226	351	-	-	1,874	-	-
San Gabriel Total		5,148	1,758	-	-	3,390	-	-
	Signal & Communication	538	538	-	-	-	-	-
	Structures	109	109	-	-	-	-	-
	Track	317	317	-	-	-	-	-
Valley Total		964	964	-	-	-	-	-
	Signal & Communication	892	892	-	-	-	-	-
	Structures	83	83	-	-	-	-	-
	Track	17	17	-	-	-	-	-
Ventura (LA Co) Total		991	991	-	-	-	-	-
	Signal	245	-	-	-	-	-	245
	Signal & Communication	469	-	-	-	-	-	469
	Structures	1,681	-	-	-	-	-	1,681
	Track	523	-	-	-	-	-	523
Ventura (Ven Co) Total		2,918	-	-	-	-	-	2,918
	Signal & Communication	756	359	150	84	109	-	54
	Structures	125	59	25	14	18	-	9
	Track	1,928	285	119	67	87	1,327	43
River Total		2,809	704	293	165	213	1,327	107
	Equipment	351	173	67	38	49	-	24

Facilities	1,484	707	295	165	214	-	102
IT	1,369	650	271	152	197	-	99
Mechanical	2,338	1,111	463	260	337	-	168
Other	5	4	1	0	0	-	0
Rolling Stock	1,500	-	-	-	-	1,500	-
Security	500	238	99	56	72	-	36
Signal & Communication	1,354	676	216	121	262	-	79
Track	236	112	47	26	34	-	17
Systemwide Total	9,137	3,670	1,459	818	1,166	1,500	525
Grand Total	37,863	8,148	16,199	2,070	5,069	2,827	3,550

ATTACHMENT "K"

FY 2017-18 NEW AUTHORITY REHABILITATION PROJECTS

PROJECTS BY SUBDIVISION (\$Thousands)

Subdivision	Project Type	Proposed Rehabilitation Projects
All	Facilities	Station Signage Rehab
All	Facilities	Customer Information System Replacement at Stations
All	Communication & PTC	SCRRRA Positive Train Control Lab Systems Support and Testing
All	Communication & PTC	Backoffice Hardware & Software Replacement (DOC & MOC)
All	Communication & PTC	SCRRRA Production Backoffice Systems Upgrades and Testing Support
All	Signals	Rehab AC Units
All	Signals	Rehab Signal Maint Vehicles
All	Business Systems	Vehicle Track Interaction
All	Track	San Gabriel Grade Cross Rehab
All	Business Systems	Systemwide
All	Communication & PTC	PTC Update & Repairs
All	Business Systems	Systemwide Rail Grinding
All	Vehicles	MOW VEHICLE REPLACEMENT
PVL	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
Olive	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables
Olive	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
Olive	Track	Olive Sub Cross Rehab
Olive	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace Olive
Olive	Track	OLIVE CROSSTIE REHAB
Orange	Signals	C&S Corrosion Mitigation
Orange	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables
Orange	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
Orange	Track	Orange Sub Turnout Replace
Orange	Track	Orange Sub Crossing Replacement
Orange	Structures	Orange Sub Culvert Replace
Orange	Structures	Orange Sub ROW Maint
Orange	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace Orange
Orange	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Mitigation Orange
Orange	Business Systems	Wysde Com Replace OrangeOlive
Orange	Track	Orange Track Rehab
Pasadena	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
Pasadena	Signals	Pole Line Rehab
Pasadena	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
River	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
River	Signals	Signal System Rehab
River	Signals	Signal System Rehab
River	Signals	CP Dayton Signal Sys Rehab
River	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables
River	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace River
River	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Mitigation River
River	Track	RIVER TRACK REHAB
River	Track	RIVER CROSSTIE REHAB
River Sub - East Bank	Track	River East Turnout Replacement
River Sub - East Bank	Facilities	REPLACE PUBLIC ADDRESS SYSTEM

Subdivision	Project Type	Proposed Rehabilitation Projects
San Gabriel - LA County	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
San Gabriel - LA County	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables
San Gabriel - LA County	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables
San Gabriel - LA County	Structures	San Gabriel LA Sub ROW Maint
San Gabriel - LA County	Track	San Gab Track Rehab LA
San Gabriel - LA County	Track	SAN GAB CROSSTIE REHAB
San Gabriel - SB County	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables
San Gabriel - SB County	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
San Gabriel - SB County	Structures	San Gabriel Bridge Replace
San Gabriel - SB County	Structures	San Gabriel SB Sub ROW Maint
San Gabriel - SB County	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace San Gab
San Gabriel - SB County	Track	San Gab Track Rehab SB
San Jacinto (PVL)	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace PVL
San Jacinto (PVL)	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Mitigation PVL
San Jacinto (PVL)	Track	PERRIS VALLEY TRACK REHAB
Valley	Track	Valley Tie Rehabilitation
Valley	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
Valley	Signals	Signal System Rehab
Valley	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables
Valley	Track	Valley Sub Turnout Replacement
Valley	Track	Valley Sub Cross Replacement
Valley	Structures	Valley Bdrge Desgn Constrct
Valley	Structures	Valley Culvert Replace/Abandon
Valley	Structures	Valley Sub Culvert Replace
Valley	Structures	Valley Sub Row Maint
Valley	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace Valley
Valley	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Mitigation Valley
Valley	Business Systems	Rehab Update CIS Valley
Valley	Track	Valley Track Rehab
Valley	Track	VALLEY CROSSTIE REHAB
Valley	Track	TUNNEL REHAB
Ventura - LA County	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
Ventura - LA County	Signals	Signal System Rehab
Ventura - LA County	Track	Ventura Sub Grade Cross Rehab
Ventura - LA County	Structures	Ventura (LA) Sub ROW Maint
Ventura - LA County	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace Ventura - LA
Ventura - LA County	Business Systems	Wayside Mtigation Ventura LA
Ventura - LA County	Track	VENTURA TRACK REHAB LA
Ventura - LA County	Track	VENTURA CROSSTIE REHAB LA
Ventura - VC County	Signals	Grade Crossing Rehab
Ventura - VC County	Signals	Signal System Rehab

Subdivision	Project Type	Proposed Rehabilitation Projects
Ventura - VC County	Structures	Ventura Sub Bridge Replace
Ventura - VC County	Business Systems	Rehab CIS Ventura
Ventura - VC County	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace Ventura
Ventura - VC County	Business Systems	Wayside Mtgation Ventura Ven
Ventura - VC County	Track	VENTURA TRACK REHAB VC
		PROPOSED FY 2017-18 REHAB BUDGET
		Deferred Rehab from FY17
		TOTAL PROPOSED FY 2017-18 REHAB BUDGET

TOTAL COST	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	OTHER
\$242	\$115	\$48	\$27	\$35	\$17	\$
\$1,276	\$606	\$253	\$142	\$184	\$92	\$
\$948	\$450	\$188	\$105	\$136	\$68	\$
\$1,130	\$537	\$224	\$125	\$163	\$81	\$
\$598	\$284	\$118	\$66	\$86	\$43	\$
\$237	\$113	\$47	\$26	\$34	\$17	\$
\$198	\$94	\$39	\$22	\$28	\$14	\$
\$68	\$32	\$13	\$7	\$10	\$5	\$
\$1,852	\$880	\$367	\$206	\$267	\$133	\$
\$449	\$213	\$89	\$50	\$65	\$32	\$
\$1,100	\$522	\$218	\$122	\$158	\$79	\$
\$1,091	\$518	\$216	\$121	\$157	\$79	\$
\$1,013	\$481	\$201	\$112	\$146	\$73	\$
\$250	\$	\$	\$250	\$	\$	\$
\$237	\$	\$237	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$500	\$	\$500	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$4,275	\$	\$4,275	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$75	\$	\$75	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$475	\$	\$475	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$162	\$	\$162	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$237	\$	\$237	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,030	\$	\$1,030	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,852	\$	\$1,852	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,781	\$	\$1,781	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,715	\$	\$1,715	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$210	\$	\$210	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$75	\$	\$75	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$125	\$	\$125	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$75	\$	\$75	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,624	\$	\$1,624	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,028	\$1,028	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$504	\$504	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,028	\$1,028	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$248	\$118	\$49	\$28	\$36	\$18	\$
\$1,006	\$478	\$199	\$112	\$145	\$72	\$
\$500	\$238	\$99	\$56	\$72	\$36	\$
\$1,498	\$712	\$297	\$166	\$216	\$108	\$
\$237	\$113	\$47	\$26	\$34	\$17	\$
\$100	\$48	\$20	\$11	\$14	\$7	\$
\$75	\$36	\$15	\$8	\$11	\$5	\$
\$1,160	\$551	\$230	\$129	\$167	\$84	\$
\$998	\$474	\$198	\$111	\$144	\$72	\$
\$4,703	\$2,234	\$931	\$522	\$677	\$339	\$
\$120	\$57	\$24	\$13	\$17	\$9	\$

TOTAL COST	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	OTHER
\$1,006	\$604	\$	\$	\$403	\$	\$
\$237	\$142	\$	\$	\$95	\$	\$
\$237	\$142	\$	\$	\$95	\$	\$
\$67	\$40	\$	\$	\$27	\$	\$
\$3,050	\$1,830	\$	\$	\$1,220	\$	\$
\$1,747	\$1,048	\$	\$	\$699	\$	\$
\$237	\$142	\$	\$	\$95	\$	\$
\$1,036	\$622	\$	\$	\$415	\$	\$
\$1,400	\$840	\$	\$	\$560	\$	\$
\$44	\$27	\$	\$	\$18	\$	\$
\$100	\$60	\$	\$	\$40	\$	\$
\$4,880	\$2,928	\$	\$	\$1,952	\$	\$
\$50	\$	\$	\$50	\$	\$	\$
\$75	\$	\$	\$75	\$	\$	\$
\$4,400	\$	\$	\$4,400	\$	\$	\$
\$7,458	\$7,458	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,028	\$1,028	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,000	\$1,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$237	\$237	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,589	\$1,589	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$2,223	\$2,223	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$6,370	\$6,370	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$420	\$420	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,820	\$1,820	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$224	\$224	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$100	\$100	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$75	\$75	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$150	\$150	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,855	\$1,855	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$3,320	\$3,320	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$10,000	\$10,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$998	\$998	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,006	\$1,006	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$855	\$855	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$224	\$224	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$50	\$50	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$38	\$38	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$750	\$750	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,603	\$1,603	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,018	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$1,018	\$
\$1,006	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$1,006	\$

TOTAL COST	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	OTHER
\$3,850	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$3,850	\$
\$150	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$150	\$
\$50	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$50	\$
\$38	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$38	\$
\$500	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$500	\$
\$106,672	\$64,276	\$18,576	\$7,089	\$8,618	\$8,112	\$
\$231,838	\$77,784	\$79,517	\$9,999	\$12,955	\$22,408	\$29,175
\$338,509	\$142,060	\$98,092	\$17,088	\$21,573	\$30,521	\$29,175

ATTACHMENT "L"

FY 2018-19 NEW AUTHORITY REHABILITATION PROJECTS

PROJECTS BY SUBDIVISION (\$Thousands)

Subdivision	Project Type	Proposed Rehabilitation Projects	TOTAL COST	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	OTHER
All	Stations	Station Signage Rehab	\$242	\$115	\$48	\$27	\$35	\$17	\$
All	Stations	Customer Information System Replacement at Stations	\$1,276	\$606	\$253	\$142	\$184	\$92	\$
All	Backoffice	Backoffice Hardware & Software Replacement (DOC & MOC)	\$1,020	\$485	\$202	\$113	\$147	\$73	\$
All	Backoffice	SCRRA Production Backoffice Systems Upgrades and Testing Support	\$547	\$260	\$108	\$61	\$79	\$39	\$
All	Labratory Testing	SCRRA Positive Train Control Lab Systems Support and Testing	\$848	\$403	\$168	\$94	\$122	\$61	\$
All	Signals	Rehab AC Units	\$237	\$113	\$47	\$26	\$34	\$17	\$
All	Signals	Rehab Signal Maint Vehicles	\$198	\$94	\$39	\$22	\$28	\$14	\$
All	Track	Vehicle Track Interaction	\$68	\$32	\$13	\$7	\$10	\$5	\$
All	Business Systems	Systemwide	\$470	\$223	\$93	\$52	\$68	\$34	\$
All	Business Systems	Wayside Com Mitigation Valley	\$75	\$36	\$15	\$8	\$11	\$5	\$
All	Business Systems	PTC UPDATE & REPAIRS	\$1,100	\$522	\$218	\$122	\$158	\$79	\$
Olive	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables	\$237	\$	\$237	\$	\$	\$	\$
Olive	Grade Crossing	Grade Crossing Rehab	\$500	\$	\$500	\$	\$	\$	\$
Olive	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace Olive	\$75	\$	\$75	\$	\$	\$	\$
Orange	Signals	C&S Corrosion Mitigation	\$162	\$	\$162	\$	\$	\$	\$
Orange	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables	\$237	\$	\$237	\$	\$	\$	\$
Orange	Grade Crossing	Grade Crossing Rehab	\$1,030	\$	\$1,030	\$	\$	\$	\$
Orange	Business Systems	Orange Sub Bridge Replace	\$9,800	\$	\$9,800	\$	\$	\$	\$
Orange	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace Orange	\$75	\$	\$75	\$	\$	\$	\$
Orange	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Mitigation Orange	\$125	\$	\$125	\$	\$	\$	\$
Orange and Olive	Business Systems	Wayside Replace OrangeOlive	\$75	\$	\$75	\$	\$	\$	\$
Pasadena	Signals	Pole Line Rehab	\$504	\$504	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Pasadena	Grade Crossing	Grade Crossing Rehab	\$1,028	\$1,028	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Pasadena	Business Systems	Pasadena Sub Bridge Replace	\$1,120	\$1,120	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Redlands	Business Systems	Redlands Sub Bridge Replace	\$1,750	\$	\$	\$	\$1,750	\$	\$
River	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables	\$237	\$113	\$47	\$26	\$34	\$17	\$
River	Signals	Signal System Rehab	\$1,006	\$478	\$199	\$112	\$145	\$72	\$
River	Signals	Signal System Rehab	\$500	\$238	\$99	\$56	\$72	\$36	\$
River	Signals	CP Dayton Signal Sys Rehab	\$1,498	\$712	\$297	\$166	\$216	\$108	\$
River	Business Systems	River Sub Bridge Replace	\$28,000	\$13,300	\$5,544	\$3,108	\$4,032	\$2,016	\$
River	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace River	\$100	\$48	\$20	\$11	\$14	\$7	\$
River	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Mitigation River	\$75	\$36	\$15	\$8	\$11	\$5	\$
River Sub - East Bank	Business Systems	River East Turnout Replacement	\$2,137	\$1,015	\$423	\$237	\$308	\$154	\$
San Gabriel - LA County	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables	\$237	\$142	\$	\$	\$95	\$	\$
San Gabriel - LA County	Grade Crossing	Grade Crossing Rehab	\$1,006	\$604	\$	\$	\$403	\$	\$
San Gabriel - LA County	Business Systems	San Gabriel Grade Cross Reha	\$2,993	\$1,796	\$	\$	\$1,197	\$	\$
San Gabriel - LA County	Business Systems	San Gabriel LA Bridge Replace	\$770	\$462	\$	\$	\$308	\$	\$
San Gabriel - SB County	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables	\$237	\$142	\$	\$	\$95	\$	\$
San Gabriel - SB County	Grade Crossing	Grade Crossing Rehab	\$1,036	\$622	\$	\$	\$415	\$	\$
San Gabriel - SB County	Business Systems	San Gabriel Turnout Replace	\$2,422	\$1,453	\$	\$	\$969	\$	\$
San Gabriel - SB County	Business Systems	Wayside Com Mitigation San Gab	\$75	\$45	\$	\$	\$30	\$	\$
San Jacinto (PVL)	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace PVL	\$50	\$	\$	\$50	\$	\$	\$
San Jacinto (PVL)	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Mitigation PVL	\$75	\$	\$	\$75	\$	\$	\$
SB Shortway	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace San Gab	\$100	\$	\$	\$	\$100	\$	\$

Valley	Ties	Valley Tie Rehabilitation	\$7,458	\$7,458	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Valley	Signals	Rehab Worn or Defective Cables	\$237	\$237	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Valley	Grade Crossing	Grade Crossing Rehab	\$1,028	\$1,028	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Valley	Signals	Signal System Rehab	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Valley	Business Systems	Valley Sub Turnout Replacement	\$4,909	\$4,909	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Valley	Business Systems	Valley Sub Crossing Rehab	\$4,447	\$4,447	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Valley	Business Systems	Valley Sub Bridge Replace	\$15,260	\$15,260	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Valley	Business Systems	Wayside Comm Replace Valley	\$100	\$100	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Valley	Business Systems	Rehab CIS Valley	\$150	\$150	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
ventura - LA County	Grade Crossing	Grade Crossing Rehab	\$998	\$998	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
ventura - LA County	Signals	Signal System Rehab	\$1,006	\$1,006	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
ventura - LA County	Business Systems	Ventura Sub Grade Cross Rehab	\$2,850	\$2,850	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
ventura - LA County	Business Systems	Ventura LA Sub Bridge Replace	\$16,520	\$16,520	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
ventura - LA County	Business Systems	WAYSIDE COM REPLACE VENTURA	\$50	\$50	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
ventura - LA County	Business Systems	WAYSIDE COM MITIGATION VENTURA	\$38	\$38	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
ventura - VC County	Grade Crossing	Grade Crossing Rehab	\$1,018	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$1,018	\$
ventura - VC County	Signals	Signal System Rehab	\$1,006	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$1,006	\$
ventura - VC County	Business Systems	Ventura Sub Turnout Replace	\$4,909	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$4,909	\$
ventura - VC County	Business Systems	Rehab CIS Ventura Ven	\$150	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$150	\$
ventura - VC County	Business Systems	WAYSIDE COM REPLACE VENTURA	\$50	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$50	\$
ventura - VC County	Business Systems	WAYSIDE COM MITIGATION VENTURA	\$38	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$38	\$
PROPOSED FY 2018-19 REHAB BUDGET			\$128,574	\$82,794	\$20,164	\$4,524	\$11,068	\$10,024	\$
DEFERRED REHAB FROM FY17			\$231,838	\$77,784	\$79,517	\$9,999	\$12,955	\$22,408	\$29,175
TOTAL PROPOSED FY 2018-19 REHAB BUDGET			\$360,412	\$160,578	\$99,681	\$14,523	\$24,022	\$32,433	\$29,175

ATTACHMENT "M"

FY2016-17 New Capital New Authority Projects

(\$ Thousands)

Project Description	TOTAL BUDGET	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	OTHER
Project Studies	\$ 1,300	\$ 618	\$ 257	\$ 144	\$ 187	\$ 94	\$ -
TOTAL FY 2016-17 AUTHORITY FOR NEW FUNDING	\$ 1,300	\$ 618	\$ 257	\$ 144	\$ 187	\$ 94	\$ -
PRIOR YEAR CARRYOVERS	\$ 255,128	\$ 33,784	\$ 8,389	\$ 5,940	\$ 6,574	\$ 3,500	\$ 196,943
TOTAL FY 2016-17 AUTHORITY INCLUDING CARRYOVERS	\$ 256,428	\$ 34,402	\$ 8,646	\$ 6,084	\$ 6,761	\$ 3,593	\$ 196,943

ATTACHMENT "N"

FY2016-17 New Capital Carryover Projects

(\$Thousands)

Subdivision	Category	Project	Total Carryover	LACMTA	OCTA	RCTC	SANBAG	VCTC	Lease\Other	State
San Gabriel & Valley	Track	860892	15,708	7,000	-	-	-	-	-	8,708
San Gabriel	Track	860885	345	-	-	-	245	-	100	-
San Gabriel	Track	860893	275	275	-	-	-	-	-	-
Valley	Structures	414002	9,330	4,656	-	-	-	-	-	4,674
Valley	Track and Structure	409006	5,009	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,009
Systemwide	IT	TBD	30,488	12,985	6,857	4,822	4,024	1,800	-	-
Systemwide	Rolling Stock	Various	7,208	4,096	-	-	785	-	-	2,326
Systemwide	Rolling Stock	613001	4,785	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,785
Systemwide	Rolling Stock	613003	10,050	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,050
Systemwide	Rolling Stock	613005	76,956	3,047	812	826	1,140	1,438	244	69,450
Systemwide	Rolling Stock	613006	267	-	-	-	-	-	-	267
Systemwide	Rolling Stock	616001	88,162	1,250	521	292	379	190	-	85,530
Systemwide	Other	TBD	745	475	198	-	-	72	-	-
Systemwide	Security	TBD	5,800	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,800
TOTAL			255,128	33,784	8,389	5,940	6,574	3,500	344	196,599

ATTACHMENT "O"

New Capital Projects Proposed for Future Consideration

For Future Consideration - Not Seeking Approval in the FY17 Budget - Funding Not Yet Identified				
Project Type	Subdivision	Project Name	Total Estimated Cost	Candidate Funding Sources - see key below
Communications	All	On-board Wireless Communications Network Phase I	\$10,164	4
Track	Valley	Palmdale Passing Siding	\$11,580	1,2,3,4
Stations	Ventura - LA County	Chatsworth Station Pedestrian Grade Separation	\$10,950	4,10, 5
Business Systems	All	Central Maintenance Facility West Entrance	\$11,699	1,2,4
Track	Valley	Second Main Track Between CP Humphreys and CP Lang	\$17,400	1,2,3,4
Structures	Ventura - VC County	Arroyo Simi 1st Crossing Scour Protection with Concrete Pile Collar and Debris Removal	\$1,120	4,7,8
Facilities	SB Shortway	Eastern Area Maintenance Facility Locomotive and Car Shop, Wheel TruerMachine, storage and S&I Tracks	\$60,181	1,2,4
Track	Valley	Brighton Siding Replacement	\$9,488	1,2,3,4
Structures	Valley	Verdugo Wash (8.12) Bridge Deck Replacement	\$1,485	4,7,8
Business Systems	All	Arroyo Seco (480.82) Bridge Replacement	\$10,462	4,7,8
PTC Systems	All	Interoperable Positive Train Control Rung II Non-Vital to Vital System Upgrade	\$10,500	4,9
Structures	Valley	CP Canyon Safe Access	\$215	4,7,8
Facilities	All	Purchase Hy-Rail Bucket Truck	\$198	4
Track	San Gabriel - LA County	CP Barranca to Lone Hill-Second Main Track-PSR and Environmental Clearance	\$1,101	1,2,4
Track	San Gabriel - SB County	CP Rochester to CP Nolan-Second Main Track-PSR and Environmental Clearance	\$1,101	1,2,4
Track	San Gabriel - LA County	CP Beech to CP Locust-Second Main Track-PSR and Environmental Clearance	\$1,690	1,2,4
Track	San Gabriel - LA County	CP Amar to CP Irvin-Second Main Track-PSR and Environmental Clearance	\$1,690	1,2,4
Facilities	Orange	Irvine Maintenance Facility Phase I	\$50,100	1,2,3,4
Business Systems	All	Automated Wheel and Brake Inspection	\$3,082	4
Business Systems	All	Automatic Passenger Counters	\$5,000	4,5,10
Communications	All	On-board Wireless Communications Network Phase II	\$9,144	
Facilities	SB Shortway	EMF ADDITIONAL UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	\$2,627	
Rolling Stock	All	Refurbish 9 passenger cars for expanded service**	\$6,075	
Communications	All	On-board Wireless Communications Network Phase III	\$9,144	
Rolling Stock	All	Refurbish 10 passenger cars for expanded service**	\$6,750	
Total			\$252,944	

Notes:

** Total cost to refurbish a passenger car is \$1.35M/unit; the amount shown is 50% of the total cost as TIRCP grant is anticipated to cover the other 50%. Final allocation formula TBD

Funding Keys:

- 1 Federal Core Capacity
- 2 State Cap and Trade Transit & Intercity Rail Program
- 3 High Speed Rail Funding
- 4 Member Agency
- 5 State Interregional Rail Transportation Program

- 7 Federal FASTLANE
- 8 State Bonds
- 9 Federal PTC Commuter Rail
- 10 State Active Transportation Program

Exhibit 6.7
CAPITAL SUMMARY AND CASH FLOW

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY
ALL AGENCIES

(\$ Thousands)

FISCAL YEAR	REHABILITATION PROJECTS	NEW CAPITAL PROJECTS	TOTAL
2016/17 ¹	\$29,780	\$1,300	\$31,080
2017/18	\$338,509	\$	\$338,509
2018/19	\$360,412	\$	\$360,412
TOTALS	\$728,701	\$1,300	\$730,001

1. Excludes prior year budget carryover amounts
2. Assumption for budget will be that the remainder of FY17 originally submitted rehab amount will be divided equally between FY18 and FY19.

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY CONSOLIDATED CASH FLOW BY FISCAL YEAR							
(\$ Thousands)							
BUDGET FISCAL YEAR	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	TOTAL
2016/2017							
REHABILITATION	\$9,968	\$18,010	\$1,786	\$16	\$	\$	\$29,780
NEW CAPITAL	\$324	\$649	\$327				\$1,300
SUBTOTAL	\$10,292	\$18,659	\$2,113	\$16	\$	\$	\$31,080
2017/2018							
REHABILITATION		\$125,720	\$198,763	\$13,903	\$123	\$	\$338,509
NEW CAPITAL		\$	\$				\$
SUBTOTAL		\$125,720	\$198,763	\$13,903	\$123	\$	\$338,509
2018/2019							
REHABILITATION			\$120,169	\$193,278	\$46,843	\$123	\$360,412
NEW CAPITAL			\$				\$
SUBTOTAL			\$120,169	\$193,278	\$46,843	\$123	\$360,412
TOTALS							
REHABILITATION	\$9,968	\$143,731	\$320,718	\$207,196	\$46,965	\$123	\$728,701
NEW CAPITAL	\$324	\$649	\$327	\$	\$	\$	\$1,300
TOTAL PROJECTED CASH FLOW BY FISCAL YEAR	\$10,292	\$144,380	\$321,045	\$207,196	\$46,965	\$123	\$730,001
PROJECT BUDGETS BY FISCAL YEAR	\$31,080	\$338,509	\$360,412	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Exhibit 6.7

LACMTA- CAPITAL SUMMARY AND CASH FLOW

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY LACMTA			
(\$ Thousands)			
FISCAL YEAR	REHABILITATION PROJECTS	NEW CAPITAL PROJECTS	TOTAL
2016/17	\$9,991	\$618	
ROTEM SETTLEMENT	\$1,936		
TOTAL 2016/17	\$11,927	\$618	\$12,545
2017/18	\$142,060	\$	\$142,060
2018/19	\$160,578	\$	\$160,578
TOTALS	\$314,566	\$618	\$315,183
1. 17/18 AND 18/19 REHAB BUDGETS EXCLUDE ROTEM SETTLEMENT			

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY LACMTA CASH FLOW BY FISCAL YEAR							
(\$ Thousands)							
BUDGET FISCAL YEAR	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	TOTAL
2016/2017							
REHABILITATION	\$2,704	\$6,691	\$581	\$16			\$9,991
ROTEM SETTLEMENT	\$648	\$1,171	\$116	\$1			\$1,936
NEW CAPITAL	\$154	\$308	\$155	\$			\$618
SUBTOTAL	\$3,506	\$8,170	\$852	\$17			\$12,545
2017/2018							
REHABILITATION		\$56,260	\$81,095	\$4,665	\$41		\$142,060
NEW CAPITAL		\$	\$	\$	\$		\$
SUBTOTAL		\$56,260	\$81,095	\$4,665	\$41		\$142,060
2018/2019							
REHABILITATION			\$55,130	\$79,658	\$25,748	\$41	\$160,578
NEW CAPITAL			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
SUBTOTAL			\$55,130	\$79,658	\$25,748	\$41	\$160,578
TOTALS							
REHABILITATION AND ROTEM	\$3,352	\$64,121	\$136,922	\$84,340	\$25,790	\$41	\$314,566
NEW CAPITAL	\$154	\$308	\$155	\$	\$	\$	\$618
TOTAL PROJECTED CASH FLOW BY	\$3,506	\$64,430	\$137,077	\$84,340	\$25,790	\$41	\$315,183
PROJECT BUDGETS BY FISCAL YEAR	\$12,545	\$142,060	\$160,578	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Note: EXCLUDES ROTEM SETTLEMENT AMOUNTS FOR FY 17/18 AND 18/19							

Exhibit 6.7

OCTA- CAPITAL SUMMARY AND CASH FLOW

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY OCTA			
(\$ Thousands)			
FISCAL YEAR	REHABILITATION PROJECTS	NEW CAPITAL PROJECTS	TOTAL
2016/17	\$10,214	\$257	
ROTEM SETTLEMENT LACMTA	-\$1,936		
ROTEM SETTLEMENT RCTC	-\$500		
ROTEM SETTLEMENT SANBAG	-\$1,000		
ROTEM SETTLEMENT VCTC	-\$337		
TOTAL 16/17	\$6,441	\$257	\$6,698
2017/18	\$98,092	\$	\$98,092
2018/19	\$99,681	\$	\$99,681
TOTALS	\$204,214	\$257	\$204,471

1. EXCLUDES ROTEM SETTLEMENT FOR FY 17/18 AND 18/19

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY OCTA CASH FLOW BY FISCAL YEAR							
(\$ Thousands)							
BUDGET FISCAL YEAR	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	TOTAL
2016/17							
REHABILITATION	\$4,161	\$5,806	\$247	\$	\$		\$10,214
ROTEM SETTLEMENT LACMTA	-\$648	-\$1,171	-\$116	-\$1	\$		-\$1,936
ROTEM SETTLEMENT RCTC	-\$167	-\$302	-\$30	\$	\$		-\$500
ROTEM SETTLEMENT SANBAG	-\$335	-\$605	-\$60	-\$1	\$		-\$1,000
ROTEM SETTLEMENT VCTC	-\$113	-\$204	-\$20	\$	\$		-\$337
NEW CAPITAL	\$64	\$129	\$65	\$	\$		\$257
SUBTOTAL	\$2,962	\$3,653	\$85	-\$2	\$		\$6,698
2017/2018							
REHABILITATION		\$34,547	\$58,734	\$4,769	\$42		\$98,092
NEW CAPITAL		\$	\$	\$	\$		\$
SUBTOTAL		\$34,547	\$58,734	\$4,769	\$42		\$98,092
2018/2019							
REHABILITATION			\$32,729	\$56,745	\$10,164	\$42	\$99,681
NEW CAPITAL			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
SUBTOTAL			\$32,729	\$56,745	\$10,164	\$42	\$99,681
TOTALS							
REHABILITATION NET OF ROTEM	\$2,898	\$38,072	\$91,484	\$61,512	\$10,206	\$42	\$204,214
NEW CAPITAL	\$64	\$129	\$65	\$	\$	\$	\$257
TOTAL PROJECTED CASH FLOW BY	\$2,962	\$38,200	\$91,549	\$61,512	\$10,206	\$42	\$204,471
PROJECT BUDGETS BY FISCAL YEAR	\$6,698	\$98,092	\$99,681	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Note: EXCLUDES ROTEM SETTLEMENT FOR FY 17/18 AND 18/19

Exhibit 6.7

RCTC- CAPITAL SUMMARY AND CASH FLOW

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY RCTC			
(\$ Thousands)			
FISCAL YEAR	REHABILITATION PROJECTS	NEW CAPITAL PROJECTS	TOTAL
2016/17	\$1,284	\$144	
ROTEM SETTLEMENT	\$500		
TOTAL 16/17	\$1,784	\$144	\$1,929
2017/18	\$17,088	\$	\$17,088
2018/19	\$14,523	\$	\$14,523
TOTALS	\$33,395	\$144	\$33,540

1. EXCLUDES ROTEM SETTLEMENT FOR FY 17/18 AND 18/19

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY RCTC CASH FLOW BY FISCAL YEAR							
(\$ Thousands)							
BUDGET FISCAL YEAR	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	TOTAL
2016/2017							
REHABILITATION	\$468	\$767	\$49				\$1,284
ROTEM SETTLEMENT	\$167	\$302	\$30	\$			\$500
NEW CAPITAL	\$36	\$72	\$36				\$144
SUBTOTAL	\$672	\$1,141	\$115				\$1,929
2017/2018							
REHABILITATION		\$6,542	\$9,941	\$600	\$5		\$17,088
NEW CAPITAL							
SUBTOTAL		\$6,542	\$9,941	\$600	\$5		\$17,088
2018/2019							
REHABILITATION			\$4,782	\$7,960	\$1,776	\$5	\$14,523
NEW CAPITAL							
SUBTOTAL			\$4,782	\$7,960	\$1,776	\$5	\$14,523
TOTALS							
REHABILITATION AND ROTEM	\$636	\$7,611	\$14,802	\$8,559	\$1,781	\$5	\$33,395
NEW CAPITAL	\$36	\$72	\$36	\$	\$	\$	\$144
TOTAL PROJECTED CASH FLOW BY	\$672	\$7,683	\$14,839	\$8,559	\$1,781	\$5	\$33,540
PROJECT BUDGETS BY FISCAL	\$1,929	\$17,088	\$14,523	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Note: EXCLUDES ROTEM SETTLEMENT FOR FY 17/18 AND 18/19

Exhibit 6.7

SANBAG- CAPITAL SUMMARY AND CASH FLOW

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY SANBAG			
(\$ Thousands)			
FISCAL YEAR	REHABILITATION PROJECTS	NEW CAPITAL PROJECTS	TOTAL
2016/17	\$1,664	\$187	
ROTEM SETTLEMENT	\$1,000		
TOTAL 16/17	\$2,664	\$187	\$2,851
2017/18	\$21,573	\$	\$21,573
2018/19	\$24,022	\$	\$24,022
TOTALS	\$48,260	\$187	\$48,447

1. EXCLUDES ROTEM SETTLEMENT FOR FY 17/18 AND 18/19

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY SANBAG CASH FLOW BY FISCAL YEAR							
(\$ Thousands)							
BUDGET FISCAL YEAR	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	TOTAL
2016/2017							
REHABILITATION	\$526	\$1,074	\$63				\$1,664
ROTEM SETTLEMENT	\$335	\$605	\$60	\$1			\$1,000
NEW CAPITAL	\$47	\$93	\$47				\$187
SUBTOTAL	\$908	\$1,772	\$171	\$1			\$2,851
2017/2018							
REHABILITATION		\$7,922	\$12,867	\$777	\$7		\$21,573
NEW CAPITAL							\$
SUBTOTAL		\$7,922	\$12,867	\$777	\$7		\$21,573
2018/2019							
REHABILITATION			\$7,598	\$12,722	\$3,695	\$7	\$24,022
NEW CAPITAL							\$
SUBTOTAL			\$7,598	\$12,722	\$3,695	\$7	\$24,022
TOTALS							
REHABILITATION NET OF ROTEM	\$861	\$9,601	\$20,589	\$13,499	\$3,702	\$7	\$48,260
NEW CAPITAL	\$47	\$93	\$47	\$	\$	\$	\$187
TOTAL PROJECTED CASH FLOW BY	\$908	\$9,695	\$20,636	\$13,499	\$3,702	\$7	\$48,447
PROJECT BUDGETS BY FISCAL YEAR	\$2,851	\$21,573	\$24,022	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Note: EXCLUDES ROTEM SETTLEMENT FOR FY 17/18 AND 18/19

Exhibit 6.7

VCTC- CAPITAL SUMMARY AND CASH FLOW

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY VCTC SUMMARY			
(\$ Thousands)			
FISCAL YEAR	REHABILITATION PROJECTS	NEW CAPITAL PROJECTS	TOTAL
2016/17	\$2,878	\$94	
ROTEM SETTLEMENT	\$337		
TOTAL 16/17	\$3,216	\$94	\$3,309
2017/18	\$30,521	\$	\$30,521
2018/19	\$32,433	\$	\$32,433
TOTALS	\$66,169	\$94	\$66,263

1. 17/18 AND 18/19 REHAB BUDGETS EXCLUDE ROTEM SETTLEMENT

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY
VCTC CASH FLOW BY FISCAL YEAR

(\$ Thousands)

BUDGET FISCAL YEAR	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	TOTAL
2016/2017							
REHABILITATION	\$864	\$1,537	\$478				\$2,878
ROTEM SETTLEMENT	\$113	\$204	\$20	\$			\$337
NEW CAPITAL	\$23	\$47	\$24				\$94
SUBTOTAL	\$1,000	\$1,788	\$522				\$3,309
2017/2018							
REHABILITATION		\$10,683	\$18,482	\$1,344	\$12		\$30,521
NEW CAPITAL							\$
SUBTOTAL		\$10,683	\$18,482	\$1,344	\$12		\$30,521
2018/2019							
REHABILITATION			\$10,162	\$18,549	\$3,710	\$12	\$32,433
NEW CAPITAL							\$
SUBTOTAL			\$10,162	\$18,549	\$3,710	\$12	\$32,433
TOTALS							
REHABILITATION AND ROTEM	\$976	\$12,424	\$29,142	\$19,892	\$3,722	\$12	\$66,170
NEW CAPITAL	\$23	\$47	\$24	\$	\$	\$	\$94
TOTAL PROJECTED CASH FLOW BY	\$1,000	\$12,471	\$29,166	\$19,892	\$3,722	\$12	\$66,263
PROJECT BUDGETS BY FISCAL YEAR	\$3,309	\$30,521	\$32,433	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Note: EXCLUDES ROTEM SETTLEMENT FOR FY 17/18 AND 18/19

Exhibit 6.7

OTHER- CAPITAL SUMMARY AND CASH FLOW

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY OTHER SUMMARY			
(\$ Thousands)			
FISCAL YEAR	REHABILITATION	NEW CAPITAL	TOTAL
2016/17	\$3,748	\$	\$3,748
2017/18	\$29,175	\$	\$29,175
2018/19	\$29,175	\$	\$29,175
TOTALS	\$62,097	\$	\$62,097

CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY OTHER CASH FLOW BY FISCAL YEAR							
(\$ Thousands)							
BUDGET FISCAL YEAR	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	TOTAL
2016/2017							
REHABILITATION	\$1,244	\$2,135	\$368				\$3,748
NEW CAPITAL							\$
SUBTOTAL	\$1,244	\$2,135	\$368				\$3,748
2017/2018							
REHABILITATION		\$9,766	\$17,644	\$1,750	\$15		\$29,175
NEW CAPITAL							\$
SUBTOTAL		\$9,766	\$17,644	\$1,750	\$15		\$29,175
2018/2019							
REHABILITATION			\$9,766	\$17,644	\$1,750	\$15	\$61,132
NEW CAPITAL							\$
SUBTOTAL			\$9,766	\$17,644	\$1,750	\$15	\$61,132
TOTALS							
REHABILITATION	\$1,244	\$11,900	\$27,778	\$19,394	\$1,765	\$15	\$62,097
NEW CAPITAL	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
TOTAL PROJECTED CASH FLOW BY FISCAL YEAR	\$1,244	\$11,900	\$27,778	\$19,394	\$1,765	\$15	\$62,097
PROJECT BUDGETS BY FISCAL YEAR	\$3,748	\$29,175	\$29,175	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Board Report**

File #: 2016-0449, **File Type:** Program**Agenda Number:** 19.

**FINANCE, BUDGET AND AUDIT COMMITTEE
JUNE 15, 2016****SUBJECT: ACCESS SERVICES PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2017 BUDGET****ACTION: APPROVE FUNDING FOR ACCESS SERVICES FOR FISCAL YEAR
2017 (FY17)****RECOMMENDATION**

APPROVE local funding request for **Access Services** (Access) in an amount not to exceed \$84,124,902 for FY17. This amount includes:

- A. \$74M in Operating and Capital funds from Proposition C 40% Discretionary (PC 40%);
- B. \$8M in Operating and Capital unspent carry-over PC 40% funds from FY16; and
- C. \$2.1M in funds paid directly to Metrolink for its participation in Access' Free Fare Program from Proposition C 10% Commuter Rail (PC 10%)

ISSUE

Access provides paratransit services on behalf of Metro and 43 other Los Angeles County fixed route operators, as mandated by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Access' annual operating and capital requirements are funded by Metro's regional funds. In coordination with Metro staff, Access has determined that a total of \$163.2M is needed to fund its FY17 operating and capital requirements. Of this amount, a total of \$81.2M will be funded from fares and federal grants. The remaining \$84.1M will be funded as follows: \$82M from Metro's PC 40% funds and \$2.1M from PC 10% programmed to Metrolink for its participation in Access' Free Fare Program. See Attachment A.

DISCUSSION

With the demographic shifts of an aging population of baby boomers and reductions in human services transportation funding, Access ridership projections are expected to increase. Access' passenger trips are projected to increase by 3.6% in FY17 and will accordingly increase operating costs. In FY17, total operating costs are increasing by \$8.6M or 5.9%, higher than the growth in

passenger trips. This is a result of increased insurance costs for Beyond the Curb (BTC) service, a federally mandated Origin to Destination service implemented last year, as well as prepaying for FY18 auto liability insurance. In FY17, this increase in operating costs of \$8.6M is offset by a reduction in vehicle acquisitions of \$4.8M, resulting in a net increase of \$3.9M or 2.4% in Access' budget. See table below.

Access Services Budget		(in thousands)			
	FY16 Budget	FY17 Proposed	\$ Change	% Change	
Expenses					
Direct Operations	\$ 106,230.00	\$ 113,230.00	\$ 7,000.00	6.6%	
Contracted Support	21,656.00	22,705.00	1,049.00	4.8%	
Management/Administration	17,237.00	17,837.00	600.00	3.5%	
Total Operating Costs	145,123.00	153,772.00	8,649.00	5.9%	
Total Vehicle Purchases/Cap	14,228.00	9,430.00	(4,798.00)	(0.34)	
Total Expenses	\$ 159,351.0	\$ 163,202.0	\$ 3,851.0	2.4%	
Carry Over/(Shortfall)	\$ 8,000.0		\$ (8,000.0)	-100.0%	

FY16 Carry Over Funds of \$8M

In FY16, Access requested approximately \$8M in additional funds in order to implement a new “dynamic fare” structure and for the BTC service. The “dynamic fare” issue was resolved favorably and did not require implementation of the new fare structure. For BTC, Access projected a utilization level in the 5-10% range; however, utilization through April 2016 was less than 1%. Rather than returning the FY16 unspent funds to Metro, Access has requested to carry over the \$8M into FY17 proposed budget.

BACKGROUND

Access administers and manages the delivery of regional ADA paratransit services on behalf of Metro and 43 other public fixed route operators in Los Angeles County consistent with the adopted Countywide Paratransit Plan. The provision of compliant ADA-mandated paratransit service is considered a civil right under federal law and must be appropriately funded.

Access' system provides more than 4.6M passenger trips per year to more than 170,000 qualified ADA paratransit riders in a service area covering over 1,950 square miles of Los Angeles County utilizing over 600 vehicles. Access' service area is divided into six regions to ensure efficiency and

effectiveness of the service.

Access' budget details, organizational structure, business plan and other relevant information can be found in Access Proposed Annual Budget Fiscal Year 2016-2017. ~~Book Attachment A~~

PERFORMANCE, COMPLIANCE AND OVERSIGHT

Access has adopted Key Performance Indicators (KPI) to ensure that the agency provides quality ADA paratransit service. For FY15 Access met their performance goals. For FY16 (data through May 2016), Access has not met performance goals in the areas of On-Time Performance and Late 4 trips at this time. Metro will work with Access to ensure they meet the KPIs going forward. See table of Access' KPIs below.

Access Key Performance Indicators

	Goals	FY15	Goals Met	FY16-YTD	Goals Met?
On-Time Performance	≥91.0%	91.9%	Yes	90.5%	No*
"Late 4" trips (+45 mins late)	≤0.10%	0.09%	Yes	0.14%	No*
Denials	≤1%	0.2%	Yes	0.2%	Yes
Average Initial Hold Times	≤120 secs	83 secs	Yes	91 secs	Yes

Metro, in coordination with Access, will continue to develop and monitor standards to ensure system effectiveness, cost efficiency and accountability. In FY17, Metro will work with Access staff to:

- Evaluate the benefits of a centralized reservations and routing model and eligibility criteria to improve system efficiency
- Review all key performance standards to ensure compliance as mandated by the ADA, follow up on On-Time Performance and Late 4 trips and continue to monitor financial aspects of the service, including cost per trip
- Continue to audit for Access as part of the ongoing annual consolidated financial audit
- Continue Metro's oversight through participation on Access' Board of Directors, Budget and

Audit subcommittees

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

Approval of this recommendation does not have a negative impact on the safety of Metro's customers, its employees or the general public.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Access' local funding will come from PC 40% for \$82M and PC 10% for \$2.1M. There will be no financial impact on Metro's bus and rail operations.

Impact to Budget

Metro's FY17 budget will include \$74M from PC 40% under project number 410011 and \$2.1M from PC 10% under project number 410011. The \$8M carry-over has already been budgeted in FY2015-2016.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Not fully funding Access to provide the mandated paratransit services for FY17 would place Metro and the other 43 Los Angeles County fixed route operators, to be in violation of the ADA, which mandates that fixed route operators provide complementary paratransit service within $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile of a local rail or bus line or consequently lose federal funding.

NEXT STEPS

After the Board of Directors approves the recommended funding, we will work with Access to ensure proper disbursement of funds.

Staff will also continue to work collaboratively with Access to identify funding sources, including other grants, Medi-Cal reimbursements for eligible customers and inclusion in the potential 2016 sales tax ballot measure to ensure future enhancements and continuation of Access-provided service.

Attachment A - Access Funding Sources for Fiscal Year 2016-2017

Prepared by: Carlos Vendiola, Transportation Planning Manager V
(213) 922-4527
Giovanna M. Gogreve, ADA Paratransit Program Administrator
(213) 922-2835

Reviewed by: Nalini Ahuja, Executive Director, Finance and Budget
(213) 922-3088



Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer

ATTACHMENT A

Access Funding Sources - Fiscal Year 2016-2017

(\$ in millions)	FY17 Funding Sources
Federal grants, fares, and other income	
Federal grants	\$ 71.2
Passenger fares and other income	10.0
Federal grants, fares, and other income Subtotal	81.2
Prop C 40%	
Operating and Capital Funds	74.0
Operating and Capital (FY16 Carryover)	8.0
PC40 Subtotal	82.0
Federal, fares, and PC40 Subtotal	\$ 163.2
Prop C 10%	
Funds paid directly to Metrolink for participation in Access' Free Fare Program	2.1
Total Funding	\$ 165.3
Total Requested Funding	\$ 84.1