The Orangeline Development Authority is a joint powers agency formed to pursue deployment of the Orangeline Maglev system in Southern California. The Authority is composed of the following public agencies:

City of Artesia
City of Bell
City of Bellflower
City of Cerritos
City of Cudahy
City of Downey
City of Huntington Park
City of Los Alamitos
City of Maywood
City of Palmdale
City of Paramount
City of Santa Clarita
City of South Gate
City of Vernon

Chairman
Scott Larsen
Councilmember, City of Bellflower

Secretary
Art Gallucci
City Manager, City of Cerritos

General Counsel
Michael Colantuono
Colantuono & Levine, PC

Treasurer/Auditor
Jack Joseph
Gateway Cities COG

Executive Director
Albert Perdon, P.E.

Supporting Agencies
Gateway Cities Council of Governments
Southern California Association of Governments
City of Garden Grove
City of Huntington Beach
City of Long Beach
City of Stanton

TO: Members of the Orangeline Development Authority
FROM: Scott A. Larsen, Chairman
DATE: April 14, 2006
SUBJECT: Special Meeting of the Board of Directors

As you know, the regularly scheduled April 7, 2006 meeting of the Board of Directors was cancelled.

I am calling a Special Meeting of the Board to be held on April 19, 2006 at the time and place of the Authority’s regular Board meetings to consider the matters appearing on the attached Meeting Notice and Agenda.

Scott A. Larsen
ORANGELINE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

SPECIAL MEETING

Wednesday, April 19, 2006

Cerritos Sheriff’s Station/Community Center
Community Meeting Room
18135 Bloomfield Avenue
Cerritos

Buffet Dinner – 6:00 p.m.
Special Meeting – 6:30 p.m.

A G E N D A

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Introduction of Attendees
4. Public Comments
5. Approval of Meeting Minutes of March 11, 2005
7. Public Outreach and Advocacy – ARCADIS
8. Status of State Legislation
9. Report on Shanghai Maglev Inspection
10. Approval of Warrants
11. Communication Items to the Board
12. Communication Items from the Board
MINUTES OF THE
ORANGELINE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (OLDA) MEETING
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 2006

CALL TO ORDER

City of Bellflower Councilmember and Board Chair Scott Larsen called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

City of Downey Councilmember Kirk Cartozian led the assembly in the salute to the flag.

INTRODUCTION OF ATTENDEES

Albert Perdon – OLDA Executive Director
Scott Larsen – Councilmember, City of Bellflower
Fred Freeman – Mayor, City of Los Alamitos
Yvette Abich – Legal Counsel, Colantuono & Levin
John Crawley – Mayor, City of Cerritos
Jack Joseph – Deputy Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG
Kirk Cartozian – Councilmember, City of Downey
W. Michael McCormick – Councilmember, City of Vernon
Gene Daniels – Councilmember, City of Paramount
Sharad Mulchand – Transportation Planning Manager, MTA
Gary Milliman – City Manager, City of South Gate
Elba Guerrero – Vice Mayor, City of Huntington Park
Katie Townley – MBI Media
Gregory Nord – Transportation Analyst, OCTA
Ryan Carey – Management Analyst, City of Cerritos
Frank Gurule – Vice Mayor, City of Cudahy
Erika Ramirez – Director of Transportation Services, Oldtimers Foundation
Jose Hernandez – Assistant Planner, City of Artesia
Bill DeWitt – Councilmember, City of South Gate
Laura Biery – Analyst, City of Palmdale
Steve Hofbauer – Councilmember, City of Palmdale
Steve Lefever – Director of Community Development, City of South Gate
Charlene Palmer – Area Manager/Vice President, ARCADIS

PUBLIC COMMENTS

City of Bellflower Councilmember and OLDA Chair Scott Larsen opened public comments for those in the audience who wished to address the Authority. There was no response and the public comments section of the meeting was closed.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 8, 2006

MOTION: City of Cudahy Vice Mayor Gurule moved to approve the minutes of the OLDA meeting of February 8, 2006, as presented. City of Downey Councilmember Kirk Cartozian seconded the motion, which carried, unanimously.
CONSIDER MILESTONE 5 – SYSTEM OPERATIONS DRAFT REPORT – ARCADIS

OLDA Executive Director Perdon provided brief background on the milestone process and presented details of Milestone 5 – System Operations Draft Report. He noted this report is for information purposes and deferred to ARCADIS representatives for the presentation.

In the absence of ARCADIS representatives, it was reported that a recent meeting took place regarding various operating methods and procedures. It was noted that the first model run will occur shortly. Over the next few days, in-depth decisions by the Executive Director and key members of the ARCADIS team will be made to review the last set of parameters regarding headway, structure and station stops for tests. The tests will reveal what the system will look like, in what environment it will operate, other ground transportation improvements needed and intermodal connections.

Discussion followed regarding incorporation of OCTA projects within the model. It was reported that OCTA plans to intensify service from Fullerton, south, to 30-minute headways, which will be its final corridor. Money has been budgeted to have other communities within the county, look at how they can link themselves to Metrolink stations. It was noted that at this juncture, OCTA plans will not be included in the modeling, however, there are already some intermodal connections incorporated into the model.

A report was not received in time to include in the agenda packet or to distribute at the meeting. However, copies will be distributed to Board Members as soon as possible. Adoption of the report will be scheduled at the next meeting.

City of Los Alamitos Mayor Fred Freeman reported on OCTA plans including providing grants to each city in Orange County to develop transportation priorities. He added that OCTA is focusing on rail and Metrolink issues and that it is difficult for them look ahead long-term. Mr. Freeman added that his discussions with other cities have had positive results, however, OCTA will present some challenges.

ARCADIS representative Charlene Palmer presented a synopsis of the report including system performance, capacity, trip times, reliability, head ways, minimum operating frequencies, speed, safety, passenger comfort, accessibility, availability, amenities, geometrics and constraints, expansion capabilities, power energy requirements, capital costs and, operations and maintenance costs. Preliminary information is also available on structural issues related to the project.

MOTION: City of Los Alamitos Mayor Fred Freeman moved to receive and file the report. City of Palmdale Councilmember Hofbauer seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

CONSIDER MILESTONE 6 – CARGO AND FREIGHT DRAFT REPORT – ARCADIS

ARCADIS representatives explained Milestone 6 – Cargo and Freight Draft Report including three cargo/freight scenarios for consideration. These include passenger only (including limited cargo), passenger and heavy cargo containers (including airport and express cargo) on the same guideway system and separate guideway systems for passenger and freight service. In addition related costs and revenue and design implications were discussed for each scenario. Decisions will need to be made which will need to be carried through for the life of the system.
Discussion followed regarding utilizing airline cargo style containers, head ways, and passenger operations. It was noted that the movement of light-weight freight will be part of the revenue stream.

Discussion continued regarding the feasibility of a Maglev cargo system with the Port of Long Beach and the Port of Los Angeles.

Additional information is provided in the Agenda Report dated March 8, 2006 as well as on the website.

Mr. Perdon referenced the Port Terminal/Maglev concept within the report. He explained the diagram in detail noting this is a fully-automated system which will dramatically change the container-handling process. He noted that if it is shown that cargo is feasible and can be an important source of revenue, it will be significant for potential investors.

Discussion followed regarding right-of-way areas, stations and parking structures for the different scenarios. Other issues including railway, safety and environmental must be given consideration. It was noted that the demand for freight is increasing, providing greater opportunity for the Maglev.

ARCADIS representatives requested copies of individual City General Plans and Maps and suggested someone from the Board be designated to collect the information from all of the Member Cities. It was suggested that City of South Gate Director of Community Development Steve Lefever be designated for the task.

Mr. Perdon reported that the information is needed to present a case to potential investors.

**MOTION:** City of Palmdale Councilmember Hofbauer moved to receive and file the report. City of Vernon Councilmember Mike McCormick seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

**PUBLIC OUTREACH AND ADVOCACY – ARCADIS**

Mary McCormick, MBI Media, reported on marketing and branding of the Orangeline Maglev system. She reviewed the process in detail including focus groups and brainstorming sessions. Steps include identification of target markets, determination of most probable customer, location of trading areas, determination of customer perceptions, differentiation, and developing Unique Selling Proposition (USP).

Regarding the Orangeline, the name has been used throughout the nation and has been connected with negative media. She noted that the word "Maglev" helps to differentiate the Orangeline. She presented various logo options for consideration including the "O Line" as well as several media outreach strategies to use. She reported that MBI Media has created a video DVD that uses the Orangeline Maglev name and presented it for review by the Board. Members made suggestions and commented on the information presented.

Ms. McCormick reported that once the tool is completed, it can be used for various media outreach programs. In addition, it is a great educational tool for various groups and venues. She reported on recent meetings that have presented the opportunity to talk about the Maglev technology and take advantage of the new environment regarding the transportation issue. She reported that Maglev is being mentioned more and more by industry leaders. In addition, she referenced an internet archival library that has been created for Board Members to use for community outreach.
Discussion followed regarding the need to communicate from "the bottom, up", getting past the negative media with the name "Orangeline Maglev" and the opportunity presented by the name, to explain the technology. It was noted that the focus should be on the outreach and marketing, rather than the name.

**CONSENSUS:** Board Members concurred to place consideration of the name on a future agenda.

**MOTION:** City of South Gate Councilmember DeWitt moved to receive and file the report. City of Vernon Councilmember McCormick seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

**CONSIDER ADOPTION OF AUTHORITY AMENDED BYLAWS**

Legal counsel Yvette Abich explained the changes made to the Authority's Bylaws.

**MOTION:** City of Los Alamitos Mayor Freeman moved to approve the changes to the Bylaws recommended by the Authority's Counsel and receive and file the report. City of Palmdale Councilmember Hofbauer seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

**STATUS OF STATE LEGISLATION**

Mr. Perdon presented a status report of State legislation relative to the Maglev and defined details of AB2882.

**MOTION:** City of Downey Councilmember Cartozian moved to receive and file the report. City of Palmdale Councilmember Hofbauer seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

**SHANGHAI MAGLEV INSPECTION – AUTHORIZATION FOR TRAVEL**

Mr. Perdon presented a report regarding a second trip to enable members to experience the Shanghai Maglev and allow key members of the legislature to participate as well. He presented a preliminary schedule and itinerary and added that the trip would be effective in enabling Board Members to network with Members of the Legislature and gain their support for the project.

Discussion followed regarding the number of participants and determining what members of the legislature should attend.

**MOTION:** City of South Gate Councilmember DeWitt moved to adopt the resolution defined in the Agenda Report dated March 8, 2006, which was amended to enable designation of five Board Members and five others (legislators) and two staff members to attend. City of Palmdale Councilmember Hofbauer seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

**CONSIDER APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT WITH CRAIG ACCOUNTANCY FOR ACCOUNTING SERVICES**

Mr. Perdon reported that in order for the Authority to secure funding earmarked in SAFTEA-LU for the Orangeline Maglev, a separate accounting system must be in place. Therefore, he recommended that Craig Accountancy provide accounting services to the Authority.
MOTION: City of Palmdale Councilmember Daniels moved to authorize the Chair to execute an agreement with Craig Consulting for accounting services as described in the Agenda Report dated March 8, 2006 and to receive and file the report. City of Huntington Park Vice Mayor Guerrero seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

REMEMDER TO BOARD REGARDING SUBMITTAL OF FORM 700 – ANNUAL STATEMENT OF ECONOMIC INTERESTS

Board Members were reminded to submit completed Forms 700 – Annual Statement of Economic Interests to the Authority's legal counsel on or before April 3, 2006.

CONSENSUS: Board Members concurred to receive and file the report.

APPROVAL OF WARRANTS

MOTION: City of Los Alamitos Mayor Freeman moved to approve warrants listed in the Agenda Report dated March 8, 2006. City of Huntington Park Vice Mayor Elba Guerrero seconded the motion, which carried, unanimously.

ASSUMPTIONS FOR PREPARATION OF FY 2006-07 AUTHORITY BUDGET

Mr. Perdon presented a report on the initiation of the budget for FY 2006-07. He identified the Authority Funding Schedule as well as a proposed schedule for contributions from Member Cities and indicated that the goal is to provide communication to Member Cities as they begin the budget preparation process.

Discussion followed regarding the proposed Member Investment Contributions comprised of the current year's contribution plus 4%. It was noted that some Member Cities may not agree with the 4% increase.

MOTION: City of Los Alamitos Mayor Freeman moved to use a 2.5% increase rather than the proposed 4% increase for Member City contributions. City of Huntington Park Vice Mayor Elba Guerrero seconded the motion, which carried, unanimously.

It was noted that this information will be used to present to the cities and is not a determination of what the budget will be. Mr. Perdon will build a budget around the information.

COMMUNICATION ITEMS TO THE BOARD

Mr. Perdon presented communication items to the Board including the Treasurer's Report along with recent and upcoming meetings and a report of the Member and Financial status.

MOTION: City of South Gate Councilmember Bill DeWitt moved to receive and file the report. City of Palmdale Councilmember Hofbauer seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.
COMMUNICATION ITEMS FROM THE BOARD

City of Downey Councilmember Cartozian presented a report on a recent meeting with the City of Anaheim. He stated opportunities and challenges as a result of the meeting. Mr. Perdon commented on the meeting as well. He added that the Orangeline Maglev will not compete with Metrolink since there is growing demand for transportation of all sorts.

Discussion followed regarding advantages to the City of Anaheim.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Orangeline Development Authority, the meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m. to the next scheduled meeting of April 12, 2006.

Attest:

Art Gallucci, Secretary

Scott Larsen, Chair

Approved:
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

AGENDA REPORT

TO: Members of the Orangeline Development Authority

FROM: Albert Perdon, Executive Director

DATE: April 19, 2006

SUBJECT: Milestone 5 – Systems Operations

To date, the Board has approved Milestone Reports 1 through 4 and Milestone Report 6. The draft Milestone 5 Report is being presented today for Board consideration.

Milestone 5 – Systems Operations establishes the operations parameters for this phase of project development. Board approval of the Milestone 5 report would provide the basis for further engineering, cost and ridership analyses, as well as for financial planning.

The draft Milestone 5 report is shown in Attachment A. As with all key milestones, decisions made during this phase are subject to further consideration during the next phase of project development as project details are optimized.

RECOMMENDATION

The following is recommended to the Board:

1. Review and discuss the information provided;
2. Approve the attached Milestone 3 – Alignment and Station Locations Report
3. File this report

Attachment:

Orangeline Development Authority – ARCADIS

A Public-Private Partnership

Orangeline Corridor Development Project

Draft Milestone 5 – System Operations

April 19, 2006
Operating Scenario

The Orangeline Maglev Operating Scenario defines the key features of how the system will be operated and the factors of operating envelope, system profile, operating speed and system technology.

The operating scenario for this phase of study includes variations in certain parameters for comparison purposes in order to optimize the design and achieve an operating plan that maximizes net revenues for the system.

Ridership estimating model runs (four) will be conducted using a combination of operating scenarios, fare policies, land use and demographic assumptions and other factors to test the impacts of differing assumptions on ridership and revenues. The operating scenario for the initial model run will assume the operating scenarios shown in Table 1, below. Alternative operating scenarios will be assumed in subsequent model runs.

Table 1
Operating Scenario for Model Run #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headway</th>
<th>5 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours of Operation</td>
<td>6 AM to 11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skip-stop</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Economic Assumption</td>
<td>SCAG RTP Horizon Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Background</td>
<td>SCAG RTP excluding all other Maglev Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeder Bus</td>
<td>Ensure coverage at each station; to the extent possible match OLDA proposal; fare to be free for Maglev transfers, but $1 for others if possible; starting at 5:30 AM and ending at 11:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maglev Fares</td>
<td>Double that of Metrolink (peak hour and zones)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Typical Operating Envelope

The operating envelope defines the space requirements for the Orangeline Maglev operating system. Guideway spans (the distance between two adjacent columns) will vary over the length of the route. It is projected that span lengths will generally be 100 feet or less. Spans longer than 100’ may require special structure, which may, in turn, affect the clearances and support diameters. Poor soil conditions and higher guideways may also affect these elements.

The general parameters for the guideway and supporting structure design are shown in the illustration on the following page.
Initial Projection of Guideway Grades

Grade profiles have been developed from the base route layout contained in the Milestone 3 – Orangeline Maglev Alignment and Stations Report. Alternative alignment options are included for the purposes of comparative analysis. Grade profiles for the Orangeline Maglev system are as follows:

- The maximum grades appear to be about 5.0% in various locations from Palmdale, south to I-5/SR-14.
- From about San Fernando to Anaheim the grade is very flat (~0.2%).
- South of Tustin to the ITC, the grade is about 0.5%.
- Grades at interchanges and other features will be greater.
- The maximum grade for the Transrapid technology is 10%.
System Speed

System speed along any segment of the alignment is directly dependent on route layout (horizontal and vertical curves), distance between stations, dwell time at each station, environmental mitigation (noise suppression) and safety factors. Other factors may also influence speed. The system speed will be set to achieve an optimum balance among these factors, with the goal of maximizing ridership and net operating revenues.

Orangeline Maglev System Technology Features

Table 2 provides a summary of Transrapid International-USA, Inc. Maglev system features. The Orangeline Maglev is based on Transrapid maglev technology as is currently operating in Shanghai. Transrapid is developing technology improvements that may result in better operating performance and reduced costs. Results of current technology development work will be incorporated into future planning during Phase 2 and beyond.

The Orangeline Maglev would operate as an automated system, meaning that all operating features are computer-controlled with operating oversight provided at a central control facility. A key aspect of the Transrapid maglev technology is not only speed but also quick acceleration and deceleration. Table 3 provides a comparison of operating performance for two different acceleration profiles. It is assumed that the Orangeline Maglev will be capable of operating at the higher acceleration profile of 1.5 meters/second/second or 4.9 feet/sec/sec.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Technology</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Vehicle           | Vehicle versions for intercity, suburban/airport connector, and cargo/freight transport  
|                   | Non-contact, electromagnetic levitation and guidance; Attractive principle with 10 mm air gap (nominal) |
| Propulsion        | Synchronous long stator linear motor; Motor mounted on underside of guideway |
| Energy Supply     | Electric supply from public network (i.e. 138 kV, 50/60 Hz) |
| Operation Control System | Fully automatic Command, Communication, and Control System; Digital radio transmission; Driver and on-board personnel optional |
| Guideway          | At-grade or Elevated guideway; High-precision guideway beams made of steel, concrete or hybrid materials; Mounted on standard guideway substructures made of reinforced concrete or on railroad-style bridges or in tunnels; |
| Stations          | Airport-style stations with at-grade, elevated, or underground platforms and guideway; Secure platforms featuring platform doors and controlled access |
| Operation & Maintenance Facilities | Central and decentralized operation & maintenance (O&M) facilities for daily and periodic scheduled and unscheduled maintenance |
| Qualities         | High-speed, high performance, high capacity passenger and cargo/freight transportation system |
| Features          | Low noise and energy consumption; Low environmental impact; Low - medium space requirements  
|                   | Flexible alignment and operating characteristics; Minimal maintenance and personal requirements result in low operating costs;  
|                   | Investment costs comparable to high-speed rail systems  
|                   | Safest mass transportation system available |
Table 2 (continued)
System Technology Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Features</th>
<th>Maglev Transrapid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Track / Guideway</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vertical Radii</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 km/h</td>
<td>5,145 m (16,890 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 km/h</td>
<td>11,575 m (37,976 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 km/h</td>
<td>20,575 m (67,503 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 km/h</td>
<td>32,150 m (105,470 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ride Comfort</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Longitudinal Acceleration</td>
<td>1.5 m/s² (4.9 ft./s²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Lateral Acceleration</td>
<td>1.5 m/s² (4.9 ft./s²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Vertical Acceleration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crest</td>
<td>0.6 m/s² (2.0 ft./s²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sag</td>
<td>1.2 m/s² (3.9 ft./s²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example Route Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Area, Double Track</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated</td>
<td>1.5 m³/m (4.3 ft³/ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-grade</td>
<td>11.8 m³/m (38.7 ft³/ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ground Area, Double Track</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Case</td>
<td>12.0 m³/m (39.4 ft³/ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountainous Region</td>
<td>22.8 m³/m (74.8 ft³/ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthworks, During Construction, Double Track (w/o Tunnels)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated</td>
<td>13,700 m³/m (16,385 cy/yr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-grade</td>
<td>47,200 m³/m (56,451 cy/yr)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3
Operating Performance Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Speeds (Local Service):</th>
<th>Union Station - Santa Ana (Operations without station dwell times)</th>
<th>Distance (mi)</th>
<th>33.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (h)</td>
<td>0.36 (min)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed (without dwell) (mph)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Including station dwell times):</td>
<td>Intermediate Stations: 7 (one minute each dwell time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Trip Time (min)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed (with stops) (mph)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Speeds (Express Service):</th>
<th>Union Station - Santa Ana (Operations without station dwell times)</th>
<th>Distance (mi)</th>
<th>33.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (h)</td>
<td>0.29 (min)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed (without dwell) (mph)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Including station dwell times):</td>
<td>Intermediate Stations: 7 (one minute each dwell time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Trip Time (min)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed (with stops) (mph)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Speeds (Local Service):</th>
<th>Union Station - Lancaster (Operations without station dwell times)</th>
<th>Distance (mi)</th>
<th>112.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (h)</td>
<td>0.59 (min)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed (without dwell) (mph)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Including station dwell times):</td>
<td>Intermediate Stations: 17 (one minute each dwell time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Trip Time (min)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed (with stops) (mph)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Speeds (Express Service):</th>
<th>Union Station - Lancaster (Operations without station dwell times)</th>
<th>Distance (mi)</th>
<th>112.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (h)</td>
<td>0.25 (min)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed (without dwell) (mph)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Including station dwell times):</td>
<td>Intermediate Stations: 17 (one minute each dwell time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Trip Time (min)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed (with stops) (mph)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Speeds (Local Service):</th>
<th>Union Station - Lancaster (Operations without station dwell times)</th>
<th>Distance (mi)</th>
<th>112.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (h)</td>
<td>0.55 (min)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed (without dwell) (mph)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Including station dwell times):</td>
<td>Intermediate Stations: 17 (one minute each dwell time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Trip Time (min)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed (with stops) (mph)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

AGENDA REPORT

TO: Members of the Orangeline Development Authority
FROM: Albert Perdon, Executive Director
DATE: April 19, 2006

SUBJECT: Public Outreach and Advocacy - ARCADIS

At the Board meeting of March 8, 2006, Mary McCormick, President of MBI Media, a member of the ARCADIS Team, made a presentation to the Board on public outreach and advocacy. The presentation included a discussion on naming options for the Orangeline Maglev, as requested by the Board at the previous meeting.

The Board requested that this item be brought back to the Board for further discussion and possible action. Ms. McCormick and staff will be prepared to respond to any further questions the Board may have and to offer additional comments or recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION

The following is recommended to the Board:

1. Review and discuss the information provided; and,
2. Provide direction to staff; and
3. Receive and file the report.
AGENDA REPORT

TO:   Members of the Orangeline Development Authority

FROM:   Albert Perdon, Executive Director

DATE:   April 19, 2006

SUBJECT:   Status of State Legislation – AB 2882

Assembly Member Hector De La Torre has introduced Assembly Bill 2882. This bill would allow any local agency or other entity of local government that has authority to issue bonds to request a loan from the Pooled Money Investment Account. Currently only a state agency or an agency of state government may request such a loan.

AB 2882 is intended to enable the Authority to apply for a loan to fund the next phase of project development.

A copy of AB 2882 as introduced on February 23, 2006 is attached. The bill is scheduled to be heard in the Assembly Banking and Finance Committee on April 17, 2006. The Author has asked that letters of support from Authority member cities be sent to him to demonstrate support for this bill.

A support letter from the Authority has been sent to the Author.

RECOMMENDATION

The following is recommended to the Board:

1. Review and discuss the information provided; and,
2. Provide further direction to staff; and
3. Receive and file the report.

ATTACHMENT

1. AB2882 as introduced on February 24, 2006
2. AB2882 Bill Status
BILL NUMBER: AB 2882  INTRODUCED
BILL TEXT

INTRODUCED BY  Assembly Member De La Torre

FEBRUARY 24, 2006

An act to amend Section 16312 of the Government Code, relating to
state funds.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 2882, as introduced, De La Torre  State government: fiscal
affairs: state funds.

Existing law allows the Pooled Money Investment Board to make a
loan from the Pooled Money Investment Account to any special fund to
carry out a program or project that is authorized to be financed by
issuing bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness, subject to
those terms and conditions as the board determines with interest to
be determined as provided by law. Any state agency or other entity of
state government that has authority to issue bonds may request a
loan from the Pooled Money Investment Account, and execute the
necessary documents to obtain and repay the loan.

This bill would allow any local agency or other entity of local
government that has authority to issue bonds to request a loan from
the Pooled Money Investment Account, and execute the necessary
documents to obtain and repay the loan.

State-mandated local program: no.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1.  Section 16312 of the Government Code is amended to
read:
16312.  (a) Notwithstanding and in addition to any other provision
of law permitting withdrawal of moneys from the General Fund for
deposit into a special fund for the purpose of carrying out a program
or project with repayment to the General Fund to come from the
proceeds of the later sale of state bonds or notes, the Pooled Money
Investment Board may instead make a loan from the Pooled Money
Investment Account directly to any such special fund, on such terms
and conditions as the board may determine, upon request made to the
board by an appropriate official. Any official authorized by law to
seek, authorize, or approve a withdrawal of moneys from the General
Fund for these purposes may in the alternative request a loan from
the board as provided in this section and execute such documents as
are required by the board to obtain and repay the loan. Interest on
the loan shall be determined as provided in Section 16314.
(b) The Pooled Money Investment Board may also make a loan from
the Pooled Money Investment Account to any special fund for the
purpose of carrying out a program or project that is authorized to be financed by issuing bonds, notes, or other evidence of indebtedness, where the special fund does not qualify under subdivision (a). Any loan shall be subject to those terms and conditions as the board shall determine and interest shall be determined as provided in Section 16314.

Any state or local agency or other entity of state or local government that has authority to issue bonds may request a loan from the Pooled Money Investment Account and execute such documents as are required by the board to obtain and repay the loan.

(c) When a loan is made pursuant to subdivision (a) or (b) to a special fund to carry out a state general obligation bond program, other than a program adopted pursuant to an initiative statute prior to August 22, 1988, or Chapter 27, 30, 48, or 49 of the Statutes of 1988, the special fund shall pay the loan interest out of the proceeds derived from bond sales. For non-self-liquidating programs adopted pursuant to an initiative statute prior to August 22, 1988, or Chapter 27, 30, 48, or 49 of the Statutes of 1988, the General Fund shall pay the loan interest.

(d) Notwithstanding Section 13340, amounts required to pay interest on loans made to non-self-liquidating general obligation bond programs are hereby continuously appropriated from the General Fund.

The Legislature hereby finds and declares that these appropriations for interest payments regarding general obligation bond programs are appropriations for debt service as defined in Section 8 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution and therefore are exempt from the appropriations limit set by that article.
CURRENT BILL STATUS

MEASURE :  A.B. No. 2882
AUTHOR(S) :  De La Torre.
TOPIC :  State government: fiscal affairs: state funds.
HOUSE LOCATION :  ASM

TYPE OF BILL :

Active
Non-Urgency
Non-Appropriations
Majority Vote Required
Non-State-Mandated Local Program
Fiscal
Non-Tax Levy

LAST HIST. ACT. DATE:  03/30/2006
LAST HIST. ACTION :  Referred to Com. on  B. & F.
COMM. LOCATION :  ASM BANKING AND FINANCE
HEARING DATE :  04/17/2006

TITLE :  An act to amend Section 16312 of the Government Code, relating to state funds.
AGENDA REPORT

TO: Members of the Orangeline Development Authority
FROM: Albert Perdon, Executive Director
DATE: April 19, 2006
SUBJECT: Report on Shanghai Maglev Inspection

From April 10 to April 13, 2006, A delegation of Board members, state and local elected officials and staff conducted an inspection of the Shanghai Maglev and met with a number of government officials and business executives to observe the world’s first commercial high speed maglev system in operation and to study city planning and development in one of China’s leading cities, with a population of 19 million people.

Authority Board members and staff who participated in this delegation study trip will give a report on what was observed and learned and describe its relevance to the Orangeline Maglev project.

RECOMMENDATION

The following is recommended to the Board:

1. Consider the information to be provided by the delegation members
2. Provide direction to staff
3. Receive and file this report:
AGENDA REPORT

TO: Members of the Orangeline Development Authority
FROM: Albert Perdon, Executive Director
DATE: April 19, 2006

SUBJECT: Approval of Warrants

Staff recommends that the Board approve payment of the following invoice:

1. ARCADIS - $8,453.70.
   Progress payment for February 2006 for Phase 1 project development work scope
   For professional management and administrative services rendered to support the Authority as Executive Director for the month of March 2006.
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

AGENDA REPORT

TO: Members of the Orangeline Development Authority

FROM: Albert Perdon, Executive Director

MEETING DATE: April 19, 2006

SUBJECT: Communication Items to the Board

Treasurer’s Report

The Treasurer’s Report for the month of March 2006 is shown in Attachment 1.

Member and Financial Status

The Member and Financial Status Report is shown as Attachment 2.

Meetings

The Executive Director participated in, or will attend, the following meetings:

- **City of Cerritos** – March 21, 2006; presentation by SCAG re Regional Transportation Plan
- **City of Maywood** – March 23, 2006; Southeast Mayor’s and Council dinner meeting hosted by Maywood and Commerce
- **City of Artesia** – April 5, 2006; meeting with City Manager and staff regarding project issues
- **Gateway Cities COG** – April 5, 2006; monthly status report to Executive Committee
- **City of Shanghai** – April 10-13, 2006; meetings with various government and private industry officials and inspection of Shanghai Maglev with Orangeline Development Authority delegation

RECOMMENDATION

The following is recommended to the Board:

1. Review and discuss the information provided; and
2. Receive and file the report.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Treasurer’s March 2006 Report
2. Member and Financial Status Report
TREASURER’S REPORT
ORANGELINE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
March 2006

Beginning Balance (3-1-06) $441,269.18

Receipts:

Expenditures:

  Board Member Meeting Stipends (Mar. Meeting)  1,000.00
  Albert Perdon & Associates (Jan. & Feb. Services)  26,666.00
  Albert Perdon & Associates (Travel Advance for
    April Shanghai Trip)  24,000.00

51,666.00

Ending Balance (3-31-06) $389,603.18

Jack M. Joseph
Treasurer
ORANGELINE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
MEMBER AND FINANCIAL STATUS

Currently, there are fourteen cities that have adopted the Orangeline Development Authority Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement, effectively forming the joint powers authority. The Authority’s administrative operations are funded from member agency investment contributions, as shown in the table below. A portion of the amounts received from member cities during FY2005-2006 is used to match a $1.1 million in-kind investment contribution by the Authority’s development partner. The Authority is seeking additional funding from both public and private sources.

Authority Member Agency Investment Contributions
for FY 2005-2006
(as of March 31, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Cities</th>
<th>Total Amount Due</th>
<th>Amount Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artesia</td>
<td>$12,707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>$10,277</td>
<td>$10,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellflower</td>
<td>$37,322</td>
<td>$37,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerritos</td>
<td>$35,604</td>
<td>$35,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cudahy</td>
<td>$11,711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>$21,300</td>
<td>$21,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Park</td>
<td>$21,747</td>
<td>$21,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos</td>
<td>$3,950</td>
<td>$3,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maywood</td>
<td>$7,296</td>
<td>$7,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmdale</td>
<td>$66,865</td>
<td>$66,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramount</td>
<td>$29,671</td>
<td>$29,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita</td>
<td>$80,645</td>
<td>$80,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>$49,456</td>
<td>$49,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>$14,488</td>
<td>$14,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Member Cities</td>
<td>$403,039</td>
<td>$378,625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>