

213068  
L.A.C.T.C.

1992 APR 23 AM 7:04



## Agenda

### **BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE**

Thursday, April 2, 1992 - 9:30 a.m.

Long Beach Room, 11th Floor

818 West Seventh Street

Los Angeles, CA 90017

	DISPOSITION
Call to Order	ACTION
1. Approval of Minutes for Meeting of March 5, 1992 (Item #1, Page 2)	ACTION
2. Proposed 30-Year Integrated Transportation Plan (Item #2, Page 6)	INFORMATION (S. Gleason)
3. Proposition A 40% Discretionary - Restructuring of Base Shares, "Proposed Amendments" (To be distributed at meeting)	ACTION (J. Austin)
4. Proposition C Guidelines (Attachment #1, Page 13)	ACTION (B. Cardwell)
5. ADA - Coordinated Complementary Paratransit Plan (Item #3, Page 23)	INFORMATION (D. Barrett)
6. New Business	
7. Adjournment	



Los Angeles County  
Transportation  
Commission

818 West Seventh Street  
Suite 1100  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Tel 213 623-1194

*Leading the Way to Greater Mobility*

0 1 3 0 J 4 1 0 0 0 2



# Minutes

## BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE MARCH 5, 1992

### MEMBERS PRESENT

Name	Agency
Stephanie Griffin (Chair)	Santa Monica
Birgit Brazill (Vice Chair)	Foothill Transit
Hector Bordas	Antelope Valley
David Feinberg	Arcadia
Tom Bachman	Commerce
Susan Rizenman	Culver City
Jim Mills	Gardena
Michael Uyeno	L.A. D.O.T.
Mark Malone	Long Beach
Anne Dauda	Montebello
Mike Prior	Santa Clarita
Al Reyes	SCRTD
Bob Hildebrand	Torrance

### OTHERS PRESENT

Tom Nohle	PVTA
Angeli Menses	SCAG

### LACTC STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Nalini Ahuja	Jim Ortner
Kim Belcher	Jim Parker
Renee Berlin	Norma Salcido
Brent Cardwell	Michael Tanner
Bryce Little	Larry Torres
Samantha Mock	



BOS Minutes  
Meeting of March 5, 1992  
Page Two

CALL TO ORDER

The Meeting was called to order at 9:45 a.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Subcommittee approved the Minutes of the February 6, 1992 BOS Meeting as amended, including:

- Additional member was present at meeting - Jim Mills, Gardena
- Corrected spelling of name - Susan Rizenman
- Prop A Discretionary - Restructuring of Base Shares. The BOS members tabled a motion that transit services added in FY 1990-91 by included operators are funded by operator with Incentive Funds or Prop A Local Return Funds, and approved in their SRTPs, .....

ECONOMIC RECOVERY PROGRAM

Brief discussion regarding Finance Committee Workshop regarding SCRTD budget shortfall.

ERP will be discussed at March 16th, LACTC meeting.

CLEAN FUELS MEETING

Jim Ortner is having a special meeting for BOS members on March 12, 9:30 a.m., to discuss air quality issues and urban bus procurement.

PROPOSITION A 40% DISCRETIONARY - RESTRUCTURING OF BASE

Staff reviewed proposed guidelines with BOS members, including clarification of funding policy for service added during FY 1991 and FY 1992. Does service added through efficiency of operation automatically become part of FAP?

Language regarding adding an operator (Scenario II) as it relates to Foothill Transit will be developed by staff.

BOS Minutes  
Meeting of March 5, 1992  
Page Three

SCRTD concerned regarding reduced service (Scenario III) criteria.

Motion to approve guidelines as amended was passed by the BOS.

Approve 8  
Opposed 3

### PROPOSITION C GUIDELINES

LACTC staff updated staff on status of the following guidelines:

- Rail System Capacity Expansion
- Mandated Programs
- Service Quality and Customer Convenience

SCRTD concerns have been reviewed by LACTC including revising Bus System Capacity Expansion guidelines.

Motion to table guidelines for April 1992 meeting was approved by BOS.

### ELECTRIC TROLLEY BUS (ETB) ROUTE INFORMATION

Staff discussed ETB candidate routes and briefed BOS on route selection criteria, including headways, cost effectiveness, etc. Also, staff showed video developed for community outreach. Community support and geographic location will be considered in terms of final route recommendations.

### ADVANCE COMMUNICATION FOR VEHICLES

Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) for transit vehicles was discussed as an information item by staff. Further updates to follow.

### REVENUE VEHICLE REPLACEMENT STUDY

User manual for computer program is not ready. Therefore, staff requested item be tabled until special meeting on March 12th.

BOS Minutes  
Meeting of March 5, 1992  
Page Four

AB 152 - REORGANIZATION OF LACTC AND SCRTD

Bill passed Senate Transportation Committee. Municipal Operator amendments to be incorporated by author. Bill goes to Senate Appropriation's Committee on March 16, 1992.

NEW BUSINESS

Staff announced that a Private Sector Forum Meeting will be held on March 17, 1992 to review Operators' FY 1993 Private Sector Involvement Policy.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon.

BOS:MINUTES.BOS  
DR:db

0 1 3 0 4 0 0 0 6



March 4, 1992

**TO:** PLANNING & MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE -  
3/11/92 Meeting

**FROM:** NEIL PETERSON

**SUBJECT:** PROPOSED 30-YEAR INTEGRATED TRANSPORTATION PLAN

**ISSUE**

The August 1991 30-Year Integrated Transportation Plan has been revised to reflect extensive public input and updated revenue forecasts.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff will present the revised 30-Year Plan for information and discussion purposes. With the Commission's concurrence, it is anticipated that the proposed Plan will be scheduled for action in April 1992.

**RELATIONSHIP TO LACTC GOALS**

The LACTC 30-Year Integrated Transportation Plan is a strategic planning tool which provides the planning and financial framework necessary to develop and evaluate the most effective means of improving mobility in Los Angeles County.

**BACKGROUND**

In the past 12 months, there have been three releases of full multi-modal 30-Year Plan alternatives. These alternatives have been progressively shaped to reflect substantial public review.

In March 1991, staff presented the Joint LACTC and SCRTD Board Meeting with a highway scenario and three alternative transit scenarios: a baseline scenario representing the minimum bus and rail investment already in existence or approved by the Commission; an aggressive rail investment scenario accompanied by a moderate increase in bus service; and a scenario recommended by the Bus Operations Subcommittee (BOS) representing an accelerated bus



procurement program with less emphasis on rail development.

In May 1991, an approach consolidating the baseline scenario and BOS scenario was presented to the LACTC. The proposed Plan funded a basic network of rail service and, consistent with the BOS recommendation, accelerated the growth of bus service in the early years of the Plan while the rail system is being constructed. These improvement strategies were recommended in concert with an aggressive Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program and a Highway Program including 260 miles of carpool lanes.

Subsequent review of this proposal at three successive PMIC meetings revealed considerable local jurisdiction support for rail projects removed from the March 1991 Plan. Some cities offered to contribute as much as 30% of construction costs to have rail projects serving their communities built.

Based on this input, the PMIC requested staff to investigate the financial feasibility of including additional rail projects in the 30-Year Plan by assuming greater local jurisdiction contributions and, if necessary, shifting modal investment priorities.

In August 1991, staff presented a revised 30-Year Plan to the Commission reflecting PMIC direction. This Plan proposed a 50% expansion in the bus fleet (relative to the 68% expansion proposed in the May 1991 Plan), restoring six "Candidate" Rail Projects to the Plan, and maintaining the aggressive Highway and TDM program found in the May 1991 Plan.

The public review period for the August 1991 30-Year Plan was extended from November 1, 1991 to January 1, 1992 in response to requests by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and cities in the San Gabriel Valley. This review period included numerous public meetings, presentations to local, regional, and state agencies, and cooperative efforts with several organizations to research and evaluate possible alternative approaches to the Plan.

The principal issues raised during this period include:

- Concern that the relative level of investment in conventional bus transit is too low.
- Concern that the relative level of investment in the rail program is too low.
- Concern that the role of highways is underrepresented.
- Concern that some areas of the County would not

receive an equitable share of the overall transportation investment.

In addition, LACTC staff worked closely with SCRTD staff and Supervisor Kenneth Hahn's Office to evaluate the proposed 30-Year Plan and provide technical support in developing SCRTD's "Transit Now" proposal. Staff also worked with the San Gabriel Valley Transportation Coalition to evaluate the adequacy of proposed transportation investment in the San Gabriel Valley.

#### ANALYSIS

These three iterations of the 30-Year Plan and the extensive review process involved have provided staff with important information for improving the Plan. The result is reflected in the revised 30-Year Plan proposed here.

The revised 30-Year Plan emphasizes:

1. The critical role which the Highway Program performs in support of the overall transportation system in Los Angeles County, and enhancing this role through the implementation of carpool lanes, signal synchronization, incident management, and other system improvements.
2. The need to expand bus service early-on while the rail system is being built, as well as the critical role performed by the bus system in improving local circulation, providing service on the extensive carpool lane network, and supporting the rail system with feeder service to stations.
3. The strong public support expressed during the review period for maintaining the August 1991 Plan's commitment to rail system development.
4. Preserving the flexibility to select non-rail alternatives in designated corridors if the planning process and affected communities so elect.

In addition, in response to an extensive evaluation of the Plan by the San Gabriel Valley Transportation Coalition, the revised 30-Year Plan advances the proposed construction schedules for the San Bernardino Freeway and Route 60 carpool lanes, moves the Azusa to San Bernardino County Line project to the Expanded Plan, and adds two north-south candidate projects and a potential extension along Route 30 to the Unconstrained Plan.



Other changes made since the August 1991 30-Year Plan are summarized below:

#### GENERAL CHANGES

##### New Sales Tax Forecasts

New UCLA sales tax forecasts reflecting the impact of the recession are incorporated in 30-Year Plan. Sales tax revenues were down approximately 15% overall. The share of sales tax revenues programmed by the LACTC decreased by approximately \$7.6 billion over the 30-year period.

##### Regional Impact Fees Deleted

All Regional Impact Fees are removed from the Plan, consistent with Commission action on this issue. This reduces revenues by approximately \$6 billion over the 30-Year Plan.

##### New Federal ISTEA Revenues Added

The availability of new Federal ISTEA Revenues added approximately \$670 million to the Plan during the FY 1991-92 through FY 1996-97 authorization period. The Plan assumes re-authorization of these revenues for the balance of the 30 years, adding a total of \$5.4 billion in new revenue to the 30-Year Plan.

##### 10-Year Implementation Program

To account for the uncertainty of long-range revenue and cost projections without compromising the LACTC's ability to move forward rapidly with critical investment decisions, the 30-Year Plan includes a 10-Year Implementation Program. Spanning the first 10 years of the Plan (FY 1991-92 through FY 2000-01), this program begins the process of translating the overall 30-Year Plan strategy into reality.

In the 10-Year Implementation Program, (1) resource projections are based on current economic conditions and existing revenue bases; and (2) programs and projects are identified based on existing LACTC commitments, construction schedules, and the latest planning and engineering studies.

In the second and third decades of the 30-Year Plan, programs and projects are scheduled in such that any surpluses and shortfalls are contained to within 5% of revenue projections. This flexibility reflects the increased uncertainty associated with long-range revenue and cost estimates.

As a fully-integrated component of the overall 30-Year Plan, the 10-Year Implementation Program ensures that short-term decisions with long-term consequences are consistent with, and contribute towards, achieving the long-range objectives of the Commission.

Plan Timeframe Updated

The timeframe of the 30-Year Plan was updated: FY 1989-90 and FY 1990-91 were deleted, and FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21 were added. Because of the enormous impact of inflation in the latter years of the Plan, the net impact of this change is to add approximately \$19 billion to the 30-Year Plan.

PROGRAM CHANGES

Highway Program

The addition of ISTEA funds to the 30-Year Plan Highway Program largely offsets the impact of reduced sales tax forecasts. Moreover, the completion dates of the following Carpool Lane segments have been advanced:

- I-10 (San Bernardino Freeway) from FY 2002-03 to FY 1999-00
- Route 14 (I-5 to Avenue P-8) from FY 2003-04 to FY 1999-00
- Route 60 (San Bernardino County Line to Route 710) from FY 2010-11 to FY 2001-02
- Route 60 (Route 710 to Route 101) from FY 2017-18 to FY 2008-09
- Route 405 (Orange County Line to I-5) from FY 2006-07 to FY 2001-02

The Harbor Transitway Downtown Extension has also been added to the Fundable Plan.

Bus Program

The potential impact of reduced sales tax forecasts on the Bus Program is fully mitigated in the 30-Year Plan by the addition of ISTEA revenues and shifting the remaining shortfall to the Rail Program. In fact, the growth in the peak bus fleet was adjusted to increase by 100 buses in each of the first six years of the Plan. The balance of the Bus Program is essentially unchanged from the August 1991 Plan.

Rail Program

The impact of reduced sales tax forecasts is felt most in the Rail Program. The principal means of mitigating the impact of the reduced sales tax revenues is project delays. However, intermediate openings of minimum operating segments are incorporated in order to bring service on line as early as possible:

- The first segment of the Pasadena Line from Downtown Los Angeles to Del Mar opens in FY 1996-97, one year after the August 1991 Plan schedule. The second segment, completing the project to Sierra Madre Villa, opens in FY 1997-98, two years after the August 1991 Plan schedule.
- The first candidate project is also delayed and segmented. The first segment of the first Candidate Project opens in FY 1997-98, consistent with the August 1991 Plan schedule. The second segment, completing the project, opens in FY 1999-00, two years after the August 1991 Plan schedule.
- The scheduled opening of the North Coast Extension is delayed three years to FY 1998-99. The scheduled opening of the Blue Line Downtown Connector is delayed two years to open in FY 2005-06.

All Candidate Rail Projects are now classified as "Candidate Corridor Projects", introducing the flexibility to develop high-capacity alternatives to rail in these corridors if the planning process and affected communities so elect.

TDM Program

There is no significant change to the TDM Program.

0 1 3 0 0 4 2 0 0 1 2

PLANNING & MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE - 3/11/92 MEETING  
Page 7

SUMMARY

Over the past 12 months, three detailed iterations of the 30-Year Integrated Financial Plan have been produced and undergone extensive public review. The product of this effort is represented in the revised 30-Year Plan accompanying this memorandum. Staff believes the Plan provides a valuable framework for the LACTC to use in guiding its effort to improve mobility in Los Angeles County.

With the Commission's concurrence, it is anticipated that the proposed Plan will be scheduled for action in April 1992.

PREPARED BY: STEVE GLEASON, Program Manager

*Linda Bohlinger*  
SWG

LINDA BOHLINGER  
Director  
Capital Planning and Programming

*Neil Peterson*  
NEIL PETERSON  
Executive Director

pmic1 3/4/92 swg

01300420012

## DRAFT

## PROPOSITION C 40% DISCRETIONARY POLICY GUIDELINES:

- \* RAIL SYSTEM CAPACITY EXPANSION
- \* MANDATED PROGRAMS
- \* SERVICE QUALITY AND CUSTOMER CONVENIENCE

Candidates for Discretionary funding fall into four major eligibility groups: (1) Bus System Expansion projects, (2) Guideway System Expansion projects, (3) Service Quality and Customer Convenience projects and (4) Mandated Program Projects. Since this portion of Proposition C is totally discretionary, the Commission can distribute these funds as it deems appropriate.

**I. Discretionary funding goals common to all eligibility groups**

- Strengthen and improve the regional transportation system.
- Promote an integrated, coordinated transportation network throughout Los Angeles County, as represented by the goals and objective set for by the Commission.
- Implement and/or improve service in a cost efficient manner (i.e. a proposed project's success in achieving the eligibility group's goals).
- Encourage the maximizing and leveraging of federal, state and local funding sources.
- Maximize use of Proposition C funds by applying the Discretionary funds to projects that have exhausted all other reasonable funding opportunities. Proposition C Discretionary funds are designated "funds of last resort".

**II. Discretionary funding goals specific to each eligibility group****A. Bus System Expansion projects.**

- Expand bus system capacity by adding more service to existing bus lines.
- Expand bus system capacity by providing service to an area not previously served by existing bus

**Proposition C 40% Discretionary Guidelines**

March 4, 1992

Page 2

lines.

- Expand bus system capacity by reconfiguring service to an area.
- B. Rail System Capacity Expansion projects.
- Expand rail system by adding more service to existing guideways.
  - Expand rail system by providing new service to an area not previously served by existing guideways.
- C. Service Quality and Customer Convenience projects.
- Improve transit service quality and increase customer convenience and comfort (i.e., improve service reliability, speed, and commodiousness.)
  - Enhance access to transit and promote easy interface with other transportation modes including driving, walking, bicycling, and ridesharing.
  - Improve the cleanliness and appearance of transit vehicles, stations, stops and facilities.
- D. Mandated Program projects
- Enable the region to achieve compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP.)
  - Enable transit operators to achieve compliance with the ADA and the AQMP.

**III. Project Eligibility****Eligible Projects: Criteria common to all eligibility groups**

- A candidate project should advance most or all of the Discretionary funding goals common to all eligibility groups, as well as the funding goals of the eligibility group into which the project falls.
- Leverage of non-Proposition C funds in any Discretionary Program funding request will be favorably evaluated.

**Proposition C 40% Discretionary Guidelines**

March 4, 1992

Page 3

1. In those cases where projects are co-proposed under another Proposition C component, a local match may be required where appropriate. If a rail expansion project, for example, originally requesting funds under the Proposition C Commuter Rail and Transit Center Component requests additional Discretionary Program funding, a 25% local match could be required to receive Discretionary Program funding.
2. Good faith efforts to provide local contributions are required. High local contributions are stressed and will be appropriately considered in project evaluation. Local contribution includes the TDA and TPM definitions, including auxiliary income.

- The applicant must provide documentation and certification that all available funding sources have been committed and are unavailable for the project(s) requested.
- Financial capacity certification for all projects, as per Federal Transit Administration definitions and standards. Applicants must demonstrate current and future financial capacity to sustain all new operating costs. All capital projects are subject to the TIP review and approval process.

**A. Eligible Rail System Capacity Expansion Projects**

- Priority will be given to funding all existing guideway operating (defined as Base Service) and capital funding shortfalls prior to funding any service expansion or new guideway extension.
  1. Base or existing guideway service, will be defined as the level of annual service miles and hours determined by the Commission and the contracted guideway operator every two fiscal years. As guideway extensions are added, base service will be redefined under the terms set forth in each subsequent Rail Operating Agreement.
  2. For commuter (or heavy) rail, all Proposition

## Proposition C 40% Discretionary Guidelines

March 4, 1992

Page 4

C 10% Commuter Rail funds must be exhausted before any commuter rail projects can be eligible for Discretionary funding.

All rail operating and capital costs (base, extension and expansion) are eligible for Proposition C Discretionary funds.

1. Rail Extensions involve major capital expansion (e.g., additional track miles.)
  - a. The Rail Construction Corporation is the only agency eligible to apply for rail extension funding.
  - b. Operators may apply for other types of alternative guideway extensions (e.g., electric trolley bus routes).
2. Rail Expansion projects involve service enhancements along an existing-length guideway (e.g., headway reduction, service hour extension, and station modifications.)
3. All demonstrated relevant expansion or extension operating costs are eligible for funding. These include: direct labor, propulsion power and overhead costs.
4. Eligible Rail (or Guideway) Extension capital costs include:
  - a. Right-of-way acquisition
  - b. All EIR efforts and preliminary engineering
  - c. Construction
  - d. Rolling stock
5. Eligible Rail Service Expansion capital costs include additional marginal capital costs such as:
  - a. Station modifications
  - b. New stations
  - c. Signalization improvements at grade crossings
  - d. Facility modifications/expansion
  - e. Grade separations
  - f. Other capital expenses required to



**Proposition C 40% Discretionary Guidelines**

March 4, 1992

Page 5

- g. support increased service  
Vehicle rehabilitation and replacement of expansion vehicles are eligible after all other funding sources are exhausted.

- For all Rail Extensions, and Rail Expansion projects that are specifically aimed at increasing systemwide patronage, priority will be given to projects that demonstrate how:

1. Operating cost efficiencies and farebox recovery will improve from the base level of service over the life of the project (and/or demonstration period).
2. The service will have a lower local operating subsidy (from Proposition C funds only) than base rail service. Targets for local operating subsidy per linked rider will be established on a case-by-case basis.

**B. Eligible Service Quality and Customer Convenience Projects**

- All capital and operating expenditures to improve and augment existing services are eligible. These include:

- a. Service reliability projects
- b. Signal pre-emption and other transit flow projects
- c. Crowd and pass-up reduction projects
- d. Farebox equipment
- e. Passenger counters
- f. Bicycle parking and interface/access projects (including costs for lockers, racks, permit administration, marketing, station area circulation improvements and maintenance)
- g. Transit station and park-&-ride lot improvements
- h. Transit stop improvements
- i. Graffiti prevention and removal projects

**C. Eligible Mandated Program Projects**

- To be eligible, a project must be related to the added extraordinary marginal cost of complying with either the ADA or the AQMP:

Proposition C 40% Discretionary Guidelines  
March 4, 1992  
Page 6

1. Extraordinary marginal capital costs associated with ADA compliance. Extraordinary cost items are defined as those that increase the price of equipment or facilities by more than 20%. These cost include:
  - a. operators' capital and operations modifications to meet service, maintenance and administrative requirements which go beyond the current levels of accessible service delivery expectations;
  - b. mandated provision of complimentary paratransit services which mirror the fixed route system for those individuals who cannot use that system;
  - c. provision of social service transportation beyond the current levels of social service delivery expectations
    - 1) The Consolidated Transit Services Agency (CTSA) was established under Government Code 159f50 et seq to coordinate social service transportation in Los Angeles County. Non-fixed route paratransit providers in Los Angeles County are not required to participate in the CTSA Paratransit Plan. However, by not participating, the operator may forego the opportunity to receive additional Commission operating assistance with complying with the ADA.
2. AQMP compliance costs associated with:
  - a. The marginal capital and operating cost (over a standard revenue or non-revenue vehicle) of an alternatively powered vehicle.
    - 1) The alternatively powered vehicle may either be new or retrofitted.
    - 2) Marginal operating costs include the cost differential in providing alternative fuel technology.
  - b. The marginal capital and operating costs

Proposition C 40% Discretionary Guidelines  
March 4, 1992  
Page 7

associated with facility modifications that accommodate alternative fuels or power sources and alternatively powered fleet operations.

1) Under some circumstances Electric Trolley Bus (ETB) operations, including the purchase and deployment of catenary, can be considered eligible (e.g., when the ETB operation essentially replaces a standard bus line operation).

c. The capital and operating costs that any public transit agency incurs in complying with AQMP requirements for employers.

- Following the mandate of the ADA, priority will be given to ADA applications for mainstream operations; paratransit is to provide a supplement, serving those who cannot be mainstreamed. Where applicable, funds for ADA projects are a supplement to Local Return funds for the purposes of complying with the ADA and providing supplemental paratransit services.

#### IV. Funding procedures

- Once a project for new or expanded service is approved, the Commission will commit to the level of funding provided for the specific project for the agreed demonstration period (one to three years.) Applicants must submit annual reports on project status prior to funding authorization for the next demonstration year. Each status report will be evaluated against the original project application. Any material deviations from the original project proposal and any substantial deviation from stated project objectives will be evaluated on an individual project basis. Based on the project annual performance review, the Commission can suspend or cancel any future demonstration funding (capital and operating.)
- Normally, operating and capital funds are provided as costs are incurred. However, funding can also be advanced under special circumstances. Project implementation is required within six months of the agreed schedule start-up date. If project start-up exceeds six months, the Commission can suspend, cancel or decrease project funding.

Proposition C 40% Discretionary Guidelines  
March 4, 1992  
Page 8

• Should the Commission decide to continue operating funding for the project beyond the demonstration period, funds will be provided annually, adjusted for inflation. Capital funds supporting these ongoing services are eligible projects for funding.

1. Automatic growth adjustments beyond the demonstration period are subject to the same growth restrictions as those imposed on Proposition A Discretionary fund adjustments allocated to included municipal operators.
2. Continued funding for Bus System Expansion projects will be pooled with other funds in the Proposition C Base service.
3. Continued funding for Rail System Capacity Expansion projects will be incorporated into the Proposition C base service; permanent funding and new base service levels will be reflected in the subsequent two-year Rail Operating Agreement.
4. Where applicable, continued funding for Service Quality and Customer Convenience projects will be pooled with the base Proposition C service for either bus or rail.
5. Mandated projects shall be funded for marginal costs of extraordinary capital items on a one time per project basis. Funding may be provided for a single project over a multi-year period if the LACTC determines that such an arrangement is in the interests of countywide mobility.

V. Project Submittal and Approval Process

• Applications: Depending on the applicant, new or revised project applications will be submitted annually and approved or disapproved by the Commission policy board. Application forms, procedures and schedules will be distributed annually. Applications should contain the following information:

- A. Details showing how the candidate project will advance the Discretionary funding goals listed in Section I of these guidelines as well as the funding goals of the eligibility group into which the project falls as listed in Section II.

## Proposition C 40% Discretionary Guidelines

March 4, 1992

Page 9

- B. Details showing how the candidate project will meet the applicable eligibility criteria listed in Section III for the eligibility group into which the project falls.
- C. Certification that Proposition C Discretionary funds applied for under this category are supplemental to federal, State and existing local funding and revenue sources. Documentation and certification that all available funding sources have been committed and are unavailable for the project(s) requested. Applications should show additional funding sources including estimated farebox recovery - if there are any.
- D. When applicable, for demonstration projects by bus and rail operators certification that Proposition A and Proposition C base service will be maintained by existing funding sources. Except when specified by the project itself, project funds will not subsidize existing services. For mandated projects by paratransit operators, analogous Maintenance of Effort certification that current service levels funded from Proposition A local return funds will be maintained.
- E. Full detail on capital and operating costs and revenue.
- F. An implementation schedule.
- G. Adequate information to support Commission funding analysis, but should not be an excessive administrative burden. Applications should be clear and concise. Application forms will request service statistics and other project parameters. In most cases will not require any operating statistics from fixed-route operators beyond that normally required for TPM and Section 15 submittal.
- H. Service delivery data such as:
- \* Linked and unlinked passengers
  - \* Service hours and miles
  - \* Headways
- I. A statement indicating that the submittal

**Proposition C 40% Discretionary Guidelines**

March 4, 1992

Page 10

represents the agency's best estimates and that backup data is available should it be required.

- J. Project conformance documentation with all appropriate local, state and federal rules and regulations.
- K. Financial capacity certification for all projects according to Federal Transit Administration definitions and standards. Applicants must demonstrate current and future financial capacity to sustain all new operating costs.
- L. The final application must be approved by the applicant's governing board; however, a preliminary application may be submitted if it is signed by the Chief Executive Officer or General Manager. If the Board of Directors has transferred the authority for funding requests and service adjustments within the parameters of the proposal, the Chief Executive Officer's signature alone will suffice.

**V. Reporting and Auditing Requirements**

- All claimants will be subject to an annual audit and must comply with UMTA Section 15 reporting requirements.
- The operator must submit a project evaluation and financial review four months prior to the end of each funded year. Any proposed or foreseen changes to project scope, cost and schedule must be included in the evaluation.
  - A. The Commission will annually review and evaluate each demonstration project based on the agreed project performance criteria. The Commission will determine if the project should continue to receive demonstration funding and/or permanent funding.
  - B. Claimants receiving Proposition C base service funding (i.e., permanent Proposition C funding) must annually submit Transit Performance Measurement (TPM) reporting forms, and annual warranties will be required, as described in the Proposition A 40% Discretionary Guidelines.



March 26, 1992

TO: BUS OPERATORS SUBCOMMITTEE

FROM: Donna L. Barrett  
Program Manager, CTSA

RE: Americans with Disabilities Act  
Los Angeles County  
Coordinated Complementary Paratransit Plan

We are currently refining elements of the interim plan and will send the draft first year plan to you within a few weeks. I will attend the May BOS meeting to answer questions and obtain input, or you may submit written comments to Deidre Heitman.

Following is the LACTC timeline for plan submission to the U.S. Department of Transportation:

Early April	Final plan released for public comment
April 14, 15, 16	ADA Workshops
May 5, 6, 7	Public Hearings
June 15	Deadline for public comment
June 24	LACTC adopts final plan
July	Final plan submitted to SCAG for conformity review
July 26, 1992	Final plan filed with U.S. DOT

If you have any questions, please contact me or Deidre at 213-244-6284.

