ORANGELINE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
REGULAR MEETING
Wednesday, September 12, 2007
16401 Paramount Boulevard
Paramount, CA 90723
Buffet Dinner – 6:00 p.m.
Regular Meeting – 6:30 p.m.

A G E N D A

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call and Introduction of Attendees
4. Public Comments
5. Approval of Meeting Minutes of August 8, 2007
6. Report on Authority efforts to secure additional cities as participating members of the Orangeline Development Authority
7. Approval of input to the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority regarding the 2007 Long Range Transportation Plan Update
8. Approval of input to the Southern California Association of Governments regarding the Regional Transportation Plan Update
9. Report of the Authority Board Ad-hoc Contract Negotiating Committee and possible action regarding the professional services agreement with Albert Perdon & Associates
10. Approval of Warrant Register
11. Communication Items to the Authority Board
12. Communication Items from the Authority Board
13. Adjournment – Next meeting October 10, 2007
CALL TO ORDER

City of Downey Councilman and Authority Board Chair Kirk Cartozian called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

City of Los Alamitos Councilmember and Authority Vice-Chair Troy Edgar led the assembly in the salute to the flag.

ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTION OF ATTENDEES

Authority Board Members:
- Kirk Cartozian – Authority Chair, Councilmember, City of Downey
- Troy Edgar – Authority Vice Chair, Councilmember, City of Los Alamitos
- Diane J. Martinez – Councilmember, City of Paramount
- Tony Lima – Councilmember, City of Artesia
- Frank Gurulé – Mayor, City of Cudahy
- Laura Lee – Mayor, City of Cerritos
- Scott A. Larsen – Mayor, City of Bellflower
- Thomas Martin – Mayor, City of Maywood
- Maria Davila – Councilmember, City of South Gate
- Marsha McLean – Mayor, City of Santa Clarita

Others:
- Albert Perdon – Executive Director, Orangeline Development Authority
- Sharad Mulchand – Transportation Planning Manager, MTA
- Eduardo Vega – City of Cerritos
- Charlene Palmer – ARCADIS
- Maria Shafer – Minute Secretary

PUBLIC COMMENTS

City of Downey Councilman and Authority Board Chair Kirk Cartozian opened public comments for those in the audience who wished to address the Authority on other than agenda items. There was no response and the public comments section of the meeting was closed.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 11, 2007

MOTION: City of Bellflower Mayor Scott Larsen moved to approve the meeting minutes from July 11, 2007, as presented. City of Artesia Councilmember Tony Lima seconded the motion, which carried, unanimously.

APPROVE FORMATION OF AUTHORITY BOARD COMMITTEES

The Chair reported the formation of two committees was discussed at the July meeting of the Orangeline Development Authority at which time it was the consensus of the Authority Board to consider formal action establishing a Development and a Governmental Affairs Committee
and that the item be presented for final action during tonight's meeting. He presented a
description of the proposed ad hoc committees including Purpose and Objectives,
Membership and Operating Procedures for each.

In addition, the Chair recommended formation of a Contract Negotiating Committee which
would have the specific responsibility to negotiate an amendment to the current contract
with Albert Perdon & Associates which covers services until October 31, 2007. He noted that
it is in the Authority's best interest to continue receiving services from Albert Perdon &
Associates in order to maintain progress in advancing the Authority's program. He also
addressed the Purpose and Objective, Membership and Operating Procedure for this
additional committee.

**MOTION:** City of Bellflower Mayor Scott Larsen moved to approve formation of the above-
mentioned ad hoc committees with membership in the Negotiating Committee including
himself, the Authority Board Chair and Vice Chair. City of Cerritos Mayor Laura Lee seconded
the motion, which carried unanimously.

The Chair added that members of the Negotiating Committee will set a date to begin the
negotiations with Albert Perdon & Associates.

**ADOPT A RESOLUTION OF THE ORANGELINE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY BOARD OF
DIRECTORS APPROVING SIGNATURE AUTHORITY FOR DESIGNATED AUTHORITY OFFICERS**

Executive Director Perdon reported that during the last meeting, the Authority Board elected
new officers including the positions of Chair, Vice Chair, Treasurer and Finance Director.
Authority Board approval is needed to authorize those four positions signature authority to
the Authority Board’s banking documents. He added that the Authority Board's policy has
been to designate two signatures on checks.

Mr. Perdon presented Resolution No. 07-08 for consideration and approval.

**RESOLUTION NO. 07-08**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE ORANGELINE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS APPROVING SIGNATURE AUTHORITY FOR DESIGNATED AUTHORITY OFFICERS**

**MOTION:** City of Cudahy Mayor Frank Gurulé moved to adopt Resolution No. 07-08 as
presented. City of Bellflower Mayor Scott Larsen seconded the motion, which carried
unanimously.

**ADOPT A RESOLUTION OF THE ORANGELINE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY BOARD OF
DIRECTORS APPROVING THE MEMBER AGENCY EQUITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF
INVESTMENT EARNINGS POLICY**

Mr. Perdon introduced the item noting the issue dated back to the formation of the Authority.
He reported on a discussion with Authority Board Member Larsen who requested the item be
brought before the Authority Board for consideration. Mr. Perdon presented background on
policies relative to Milestones 2, 3 and 4, referenced statements with the approved Fiscal
Year 2007-2008 Budget and Business Plan and deferred to Mr. Larsen.
Mr. Larsen felt it was important to discuss the item in order to gain input from Members regarding Member Agency equity and distribution of investment earnings policies. He suggested two components; one representing the same formula used for Member investment contributions as well as taking into account the length of time a City has been a Member of the Authority. He added that the item will be critical as more cities join the Authority.

City of Cerritos Mayor Lee agreed with Mr. Larsen’s suggestions and felt that the two components would serve as an incentive for other cities to join.

Mr. Perdon explained the investment balance and formula as presented in the Agenda Report dated August 8, 2007. He noted the Authority Board could come up with variations, if it so desired and that once the system was up and running, it would be similar to owning shares within a corporation. He added that the project should be seen as a private enterprise noting this was a "voluntary" Authority.

City of Santa Clarita Mayor McLean suggested each Member should consult with their corresponding city to review possible similar practices.

Authority Board Vice Chair Edgar felt consistency was important and that the recommendation, as presented was a good starting point.

City of Bellflower Mayor Larsen agreed that Members should consider the issue, obtain input from staff and discuss the item again at a subsequent meeting.

Chair Cartozian commented that the Milestones could be used as determinations.

City of Artesia Councilman Lima expressed concerns regarding practices after private investors become involved in the project.

Mr. Larsen responded that the Authority will not be selling stock but rather, bonds.

Mr. Cartozian suggested consideration of the total number of equity shares by Member Cities and projections based on future memberships as well as current status of Member Cities. He recommended the Authority Board always be in a quest to encourage new Member Cities.

Ms. Lee commented the policy would serve to encourage other cities to participate.

Mr. Cartozian agreed but felt in the future, the later might discourage new entrants.

Mr. Lima suggested projections on future profits could be stressed.

Mr. Perdon opined that new members would be motivated by the value generated by the Orangeline High Speed Maglev. He explained the need to determine how Member Cities will share in the profits and benefits being created. He stressed the issue must be given careful consideration. As the project moves forward, he added the need to figure out Member Agency equity.

Mr. Perdon impressed upon the Authority Board members that the value the Orangeline High Speed Maglev project creates will be as a result of the work of the Authority’s Member Cities.
The Chair felt this was a good first step. Mr. Larsen agreed that Members should obtain input from their respective staff and consider the item at a future Authority Board meeting. It was noted that the overall emphasis should be on what’s good for everybody.

**REVIEW OF FREIGHT MAGLEV PROPOSAL**

Mr. Perdon reported the item as an informational report recently presented to the Southern California Association of Governments and referenced a study regarding the possibility of using MAGLEV technology for freight. He added that this issue could be seen as an opportunity as well as a threat and proposed the project as a good way to introduce MAGLEV as a freight system. He felt Members should be aware of the vision of others.

Cerritos Mayor Lee suggested consideration of adding freight to the Authority’s MAGLEV proposal, suggesting that the system could carry freight during the night and passengers during the day.

Mr. Perdon noted that the issue would be considered during the next project development phase and he offered various possibilities.

Ensuing discussion pertained to re-emphasizing the project as one that includes freight and passenger revenue; it was suggested that the Authority schedule another meeting with Senator Lowenthal to secure his support for the project, and to emphasize the project’s benefit in addressing the issue of freight.

Santa Clarita Mayor McLean agreed that the issues of freight and passengers should parallel.

ARCADIS Representative Charlene Palmer reported projections for passenger travel on the Orangeline High Speed Maglev are at capacity during peak hours and that it is easier to accommodate freight during non-peak hours. She added that there are ways to address the issue, that alternative design and engineering solutions for moving both freight and passengers would be considered during the next project development phase.

It was noted that Senator Alan Lowenthal is looking at ways to alleviate the traffic congestion problems related to truck movements from the ports along the Alameda Corridor.

Cerritos Mayor Lee requested technical education on the issue.

**MOTION:** City of Bellflower Mayor Larsen moved to receive and file the report. City of South Gate Mayor Davila seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

**APPROVE ATTENDANCE AT THE 2ND ANNUAL NORTH AMERICAN PPP AND INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE CONFERENCE**

Mr. Perdon presented details of the item noting that there will be an increased concentration of investment bankers and pertinent others attending the 2nd Annual North American Public Private Partnership (PPP) and Infrastructure Finance Conference. He reported that once attendance is approved, he will continue efforts to set individual appointments with possible project investors and felt the Authority would benefit from the conference. He added that although the Authority Board had previously authorized travel, he was seeking approval for the registration fee.
The Chair reported he encouraged Vice Chair Edgar to attend. Mr. Edgar asked if anyone else wanted to attend.

Mr. Perdon reiterated he will be setting up meetings before the conference and added the event would offer a great opportunity to showcase the MAGLEV project to the investment community.

City of Cerritos Mayor Lee suggested the Chair or Vice Chair should attend.

Mr. Edgar offered to provide a list of contacts to Executive Director Perdon.

**MOTION:** City of Bellflower Mayor Larsen moved to approve attendance at the 2nd Annual North American PPP and Infrastructure Finance Conference for Executive Director Perdon, the Chair and Vice Chair. City of Cerritos Mayor Lee seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Brief discussion followed regarding preparing appropriate flier, portfolios and marketing collateral material to present at the conference.

**APPROVAL OF WARRANTS**

**MOTION:** City of Los Alamitos Councilmember and Authority Vice Chair Troy Edgar moved to approve the warrant register as presented. City of Cudahy Mayor Frank Gurulé seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

**COMMUNICATION ITEMS TO THE AUTHORITY BOARD**

Mr. Perdon presented the standard report including the Treasurer’s report, News/Events and meetings held during the month of July. Highlights included a meeting with LA County Supervisor and Metro Board Member Gloria Molina who was impressed with the initiative of Member Cities to move this project forward. Mr. Perdon encouraged Authority Board Members whose cities are in her district to call her office and note this is a high-priority project.

Vice Chair Edgar reported on upcoming meetings, including one with the OCTA and another with the City of Santa Ana City Council. In addition, he stated that discussions are beginning with the City of Garden Grove.

Mr. Perdon referenced an attachment to the Agenda Report dated August 8, 2007 summarizing a recent teleconference with Governor Schwarzenegger advisor David Crane. He added that the project should start appearing in the media and that information material detailing the facts about the Orangeline High Speed Maglev need to be prepared.

Chair Cartozian reported on a recent meeting with the city council members of the Cities of Glendale and Los Angeles.

City of Santa Clarita Mayor McLean offered to speak with City of Burbank Mayor Marsha Ramos.

**COMMUNICATION ITEMS FROM THE AUTHORITY BOARD**
City of Artesia Councilmember Lima inquired regarding designing informational literature and Chair Cartozian indicated staff had that direction from previous discussions.

Vice Chair Edgar requested that Mr. Perdon distribute materials that have been developed for "road shows" by the next meeting of the Authority Board. Mr. Perdon will move forward with physical deliverables that Authority Board Members can use.

The Chair reported on recent conference calls of the Orangeline Development Committee. He reported that the direction of the Committee is to move forward with outreach and Members are compiling a list of developers to target.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Orangeline Development Authority, the meeting was adjourned at 8:07 p.m. The next regularly scheduled meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 11, 2007.

_______________________________

Secretary

Attest:

_______________________________

Chair

Approved:
AGENDA REPORT

TO: Members of the Orangeline Development Authority
FROM: Albert Perdon, Executive Director
DATE: September 12, 2007

SUBJECT: Report on Authority efforts to secure additional cities as participating members of the Orangeline Development Authority

RECOMMENDATION

That the Authority Board considers the information in this report and provides guidance to staff.

DISCUSSION

The Authority’s focused efforts on securing additional cities as members of the Authority are showing positive results. On August 20, 2007, the City of Santa Ana City Council approved a motion in support of staff recommended actions leading to the City of Santa Ana becoming a member of the Orangeline Development Authority. A copy of the staff report approved by the City Council is attached.

Santa Ana Mayor Miguel Pulido stated his intent to encourage other Orange County cities, such as Irvine and Garden Grove, to join with Santa Ana in support of the Orangeline High Speed Maglev. The Mayor met with Garden Grove Mayor Bill Dalton on August 30, 2007. It appears from the report on this meeting that Mayor Dalton is supportive of Mayor Pulido’s proposal.

Meetings with Los Angeles City Council members are progressing. Meetings have been held with four City Council offices and additional meetings are being scheduled for September and October.

A meeting was held with Los Angeles County Supervisor Gloria Molina. Additional meetings will be scheduled with the other Supervisors.

A meeting was held with Glendale City Council Member Frank Quintero.

The Authority’s meetings with each of the city representatives are aimed at requesting their support for their city to join the Authority as a participating member agency. These efforts will continue with the hope that all cities along the 108-mile corridor will join the Authority.

ATTACHMENT:
REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE:
AUGUST 20, 2007

TITLE
RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE ORANGELINE MAGLEV PROJECT AND AUTHORIZATION TO SEEK FUNDING TO BECOME A MEMBER AGENCY IN THE ORANGELINE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

CITY MANAGER

RECOMMENDED ACTION

1. Adopt a resolution supporting the Orangeline Project with the Orangeline Development Authority for the purpose of promoting the High Speed Maglev system from North Los Angeles County to Orange County.

2. Authorize staff to seek Measure M funding in the amount of $52,320 in Fiscal Year 2007-08 to pay for the annual membership fee in the Orangeline Development Authority and to seek future funding to cover the annual fee.

3. Direct the City Attorney to prepare and authorize the City Manager and Clerk of the Council to execute the First Amended Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement with the Orangeline Development Authority for the purpose of promoting the development of the Orangeline High Speed Maglev system from North Los Angeles County to Orange County.

DISCUSSION

The Orangeline Development Authority ("Authority") is a joint exercise of powers authority currently comprised of fourteen Los Angeles and Orange County cities, which has been established to examine the feasibility of constructing a high speed maglev (magnetic levitation) system in Southern California (Exhibit 1).

As currently planned, the Orangeline Maglev Project (Orangeline) would travel on an elevated guideway above existing highway or railroad corridors at up to 240 miles per hour, with an average speed of 90 miles per hour in urban areas. Orangeline officials estimate that trains
would cover the 108 miles between Palmdale and Irvine in approximately one hour, making 18 station stops every 5-10 minutes throughout the day.

Maglev is an advanced ground transportation technology under development for the past 30 years and is currently operating in Shanghai, China. Built in just three years and beginning operation in 2003, the Shanghai Maglev has carried over 11 million people along its 19-mile route connecting Pudong Airport with the city center. Maglev technology has several key advantages over conventional high speed trains and urban rail systems. It is quieter, more energy efficient, and more cost-effective due to lower operating costs and higher quality of service.

In December 2005, the Authority entered into a public private partnership agreement with a private consortium led by the Dutch infrastructure engineering and development firm ARCADIS. The team contributed $1.1 million to a Phase 1 preliminary engineering and financial planning study completed in November 2006.

The Authority has met with investment bankers and is currently focused on securing private funding to undertake Phase 2 engineering, environmental and financial planning work. The Authority has also submitted a funding proposal to the California Transportation Commission and is working with Legislative leaders and the Administration to secure state support for the project. Upon completion of this Phase 2 project development work, which is estimated to take 3 years, the Authority would sell bonds to finance the cost of constructing the 108-mile, $19 billion high speed maglev system. The system could begin operation as early as 2014.

Orangeline officials have proposed running maglev service down the Pacific Electric (PE) Railroad right-of-way on much of the route between Los Angeles and Orange County. A map showing possible alignments through the City of Santa Ana is shown in Exhibit 2. The Orangeline could be extended as a subway segment from the PE Railroad right-of-way to the train station or via an elevated guideway along Seventeenth Street.

By supporting the Orangeline the City of Santa Ana can play a major role in advancing a project that will directly serve the city and provide a viable alternative to the California High-Speed Train system that doesn’t provide service to our city. It is also in the City’s best interest to enter into the Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement with the Orangeline Development Authority to ensure that the City maximizes its benefits from this project. Further, by joining the Orangeline Development Authority the City is able to participate in an already existing entity and increase the potential for private sector funding to achieve the goal of implementing the project.
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, the recommended action is statutorily exempt from further review. Statutory exemption ER 2007-125 will be filed for this project.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact associated with this action.

James G. Ross
Executive Director
Public Works Agency
Orangeline High Speed Maglev

--- Elevated guideway along 17th Street

--- Subway segment from PE right-of-way

EXHIBIT 2
RESOLUTION NO. 2007-___

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA ANA SUPPORTING THE ORANGELINE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROMOTING THE HIGH SPEED MAGNETIC LEVITATION SYSTEM FROM NORTH LOS ANGELES COUNTY TO ORANGE COUNTY AND AUTHORIZING CITY STAFF TO SEEK FUNDING TO PAY THE ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP FEE TO ENTER INTO THE ORANGELINE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA ANA AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The City Council of the City of Santa Ana hereby finds, determines and declares as follows:

A. The Orange Development Authority ("Authority") is a joint exercise of powers authority currently comprised of fourteen Los Angeles County and Orange County cities. The Authority has been established in order to examine the feasibility of constructing a high speed magnetic levitation ("Maglev") system in Southern California.

B. As currently planned the Orangeline Maglev Project ("Orangeline") would travel on an elevated guideway above existing highway or railroad corridors at up to 240 miles per hour, with an average speed of 90 miles per hour in urban areas. Orangeline officials estimate that trains would cover the 108 miles between Palmdale and Irvine in approximately one hour, making 18 station stops every 5-10 minutes throughout the day.

C. The Orangeline officials have proposed running Maglev service down the Pacific Electric ("PE") Railroad right-of-way on much of the route between Los Angeles and Orange County. Maglev technology has several key advantages over conventional high speed trains and urban rail systems. It is quieter, more energy efficient, and more cost effective due to lower operating costs and higher quality of service.

D. By supporting the Orangeline, the City of Santa Ana can play a major role in advancing a project that will directly serve the city and provide a viable alternative to the California High Speed Train system that does not provide service to our City.
E. It is also in the City’s best interest to enter into the Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement with the Authority in order to ensure that the City maximizes its benefits from this project. Further, by joining the Authority, the City will be able to participate in an already existing entity and increase the potential for private sector funding to achieve the goal of implementing the project.

Section 2. In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act, the proposed project is exempt from further review pursuant to section 15262, which involves a feasibility and planning study of a transportation system. Categorical Exemption Environmental Review No. 07-125 will be filed for this project.

Section 3. The City Council of the City of Santa Ana hereby supports the Orangeline Development Authority Magnetic Levitation Project and authorizes seeking funding to pay the annual fee for membership in the Joint Exercise of Powers with the Orangeline Development Authority.

Section 4. The City has been presented with a proposed agreement entitled “First Amended Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement”. The City Council of the City of Santa Ana hereby approves the agreement and directs and authorizes the City Manager and Clerk of the Council to execute the First Amended Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement with the Orangeline Development Authority for the purpose of promoting this development.

Section 5. This Resolution shall take effect immediately after its adoption by the City Council, and the Clerk of the Council shall attest to and certify the vote adopting this Resolution.
ADOPTED this ____ day of _________, 2007.

______________________________
Miguel A. Pulido
Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Joseph W. Fletcher, City Attorney

By: _________________________
  Lisa E. Storck
  Assistant City Attorney

AYES: Councilmembers: ____________________________

NOES: Councilmembers: ____________________________

ABSTAIN: Councilmembers: ____________________________

NOT PRESENT: Councilmembers: ____________________________

CERTIFICATION OF ATTESTATION AND ORIGINALITY

I, PATRICIA E. HEALY, Clerk of Council, do hereby attest to and certify the attached Resolution No. ___________ to be the original resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Santa Ana on ________________.

______________
Clerk of Council
City of Santa Ana

Resolution No. 2007-xxx
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MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Orangeline Development Authority

FROM: Albert Perdon, Executive Director

DATE: September 12, 2007

SUBJECT: Approval of input to the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority regarding the 2007 Long Range Transportation Plan Update

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board approves the proposed input to the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (METRO) regarding the 2007 Long Range Transportation Plan Update.

DISCUSSION

Metro is updating its Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The Long Range Transportation Plan will impact the Orangeline Development Authority’s ability to successfully implement the Orangeline High Speed Maglev Project. It is recommended that the Authority provide the following input to Metro:

- Include the Orangeline High Speed Maglev from Palmdale to Irvine in the LRTP.
- Complete a Performance Analysis on the Palmdale-to-Irvine Orangeline High Speed Maglev to allow the project to be compared and ranked against other proposed projects.
- Rank the Orangeline High Speed Maglev against other transit projects not only in accordance with the ranking criteria shown in the current Update, but also according to project user and public benefits in relation to public costs.
- Rank the Orangeline High Speed Maglev against highway projects using not only the ranking criteria shown in the current Update, but also according to a broader spectrum of project user and public benefits criteria that includes land use/transportation integration, energy conservation, emission reduction, travel cost, efficiency and safety benefits, all in relation to public and private costs.

Attachment 1 contains a discussion of issues pertaining to the current LRTP, which points to the need to provide the recommended input to Metro.

ATTACHMENT:

1. Review of Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) 2007 Long Range Transportation Plan Update - Financial Plan Forecast Update, presented to Metro Board of Directors on August 16, 2007
Orangeline Development Authority

Review of
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)
2007 Long Range Transportation Plan Update - Financial Plan Forecast Update
Presented to Metro Board of Directors on August 16, 2007

Presented to Orangeline Development Authority
Board of Directors
September 12, 2007

Summary and Recommendations

Metro is updating its Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The Financial Forecast Update identifies: anticipated revenues and costs from now to 2030, revenue and cost risks, baseline assumptions, potential tax increases to fund additional programs, list of projects approved for funding, and a prioritized list of additional highway and transit projects proposed for funding. The Metro Board is being asked to provide input to staff, which will then prepare preliminary recommendations for Board consideration, provide a 45-day public review period, and then present a final plan for Metro Board approval. The 2007 LRTP Plan Update – Financial Forecast Update dated August 16, 2007 is shown in Exhibit A.

The Long Range Transportation Plan will impact the Orangeline Development Authority’s ability to successfully implement the Orangeline High Speed Maglev Project. It is recommended that the Authority provide input to Metro which, if adopted and made a part of the updated LRTP, will enable the Orangeline High Speed Maglev to move forward. The recommended input to Metro is as follows:

- Include the Orangeline High Speed Maglev from Palmdale to Irvine in the LRTP.
- Complete a Performance Analysis on the Palmdale-to-Irvine Orangeline High Speed Maglev to allow the project to be compared and ranked against other proposed projects.
- Rank the Orangeline High Speed Maglev against other transit projects not only in accordance with the ranking criteria shown in the current Update, but also according to project user and public benefits in relation to public costs.
- Rank the Orangeline High Speed Maglev against highway projects using not only the ranking criteria shown in the current Update, but also according to a broader spectrum of project user and public benefits criteria that includes land use/transportation integration, energy conservation, emission reduction, travel cost, efficiency and safety benefits, all in relation to public and private costs.

Authority staff review of the LRTP Financial Plan Forecast Update information provided to the Metro Board suggests that the Orangeline High Speed Maglev would rank as one of the top projects in the LRTP if it was properly evaluated on its merits. However, it is believed that strong advocacy by the Authority’s member cities will be required to gain the recognition that the Orangeline High Speed Maglev project deserves as a transportation solution.

It is recommended that Authority Board members seek support of their cities for the recommendations contained herein and that member cities advocate strongly for the support of these recommendations by Metro Board members.
Discussion

This discussion is important because the Authority requires the support of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro). The Orangeline High Speed Maglev cannot be accomplished without Metro support. The Authority’s plan assumes that publicly-owned rights-of-way controlled by Metro will be made available for the Orangeline High Speed Maglev project. Metro’s support of or opposition to the Orangeline High Speed Maglev project is indicated in its official policy statements, including in the Short Range Transportation Plan and the Long Range Transportation Plan.

Metro’s Board has not been asked to take an official policy position on the Orangeline High Speed Maglev. The Authority’s current focus is to gain support of the cities along the corridor that are not yet members of the Authority and to secure funding commitments for the project. Under the Authority’s current strategy, Metro support would be requested once all cities along the corridor have formalized their support for the project through resolutions either approving membership in the Authority or otherwise stating their support, and after funding commitments have been secured.

Presuming that funding is secured and all remaining corridor cities join the Authority or indicate their support, Metro’s support is still not guaranteed. Metro uses evaluation criteria to set its priorities and to determine how public dollars will be allocated to transit and highway projects. The specific criteria for scoring and ranking proposed projects, as presented in the Long Range Transportation Plan Financial Forecast Update, are as follows:

For transit projects, the criteria are:
1. 50% of score on the basis of “performance”:
   a. Annual boardings per mile
   b. Annual boardings per million dollars of capital cost
2. 50% of score on the basis of “need”:
   a. Population and employment density
   b. Percent transit dependent Census tracts
   c. Major Activity Centers per mile
   d. Boardings per mile (2004)

For highway projects, the criteria are:
1. 50% of score on the basis of “performance”:
   a. Annual hours of delay savings
   b. Annual hours saved per million dollars of capital cost
2. 50% of score on the basis of “need”:
   a. Population and employment density
   b. Major activity centers per mile

Discussion of Metro Evaluation Criteria

The criteria used by Metro introduce unintended biases that are not necessarily consistent with broad public policy or near- and long-term public interest. The criteria appear to bias against projects such as the Orangeline High Speed Maglev. Metro has not evaluated or ranked the Orangeline High Speed Maglev, although the Preliminary Performance Analysis – Transit, dated 8/3/07, includes a project identified as, “West Santa Ana Branch ROW Corridor Mag Lev between LA Union Station and Santa Ana Metrolink Station.”
Specific concerns that arise from use of the Metro criteria to evaluate and rank transportation projects are as follows:

1. By separating evaluation of transit and highway projects, there is not an evaluation that compares, on a level playing field, transit projects against highway projects. Under Metro criteria, there is a presumption that one block of public funding will be used only for highway projects and another block of funding will be used only for transit projects. This approach is inconsistent with state and federal environmental laws that require an equal consideration of all practical alternatives for addressing the purposes and impacts of a proposed project, irrespective of mode.

2. The transit project “performance” criteria do not address the true benefit of a project and result in project rankings that do not offer the maximum return on the public’s expenditures on transportation in terms of mobility provided. The criteria result in the higher ranking of projects with lower utility and lower benefit for system users, taxpayers and the public at-large.

3. The transit “performance” and “need” criteria both include “boardings per mile”, thus weighting the ranking to favor projects that exhibit higher boardings and biasing against projects that exhibit higher passenger miles. “Passenger miles” is a better indicator of a transportation project’s utility and benefit, as compared to passenger boardings.

4. The use of the “Percent transit dependent Census tracts” criterion for transit projects and not for highway projects suggests that transit is intended to serve the population segment that has no alternative other than transit for mobility. This creates a bias against transit projects serving the population segment that is currently auto dependent, and against transit projects that offer significant benefits in reducing the negative impacts of the region’s heavy reliance on auto travel.

5. By not applying the “Performance” criteria used for highway projects to the evaluation of transit projects, the criteria are biased against transit projects that score higher that highway projects under the “Performance” criteria.

6. The evaluation criteria, particularly the criteria for highway projects, do not account for the full cost of mobility – they account only for the public costs. The result is that highway projects resulting in a higher cost of travel are favored over more cost-effective transit projects.

7. Use of the “Highway congestion score” criterion for highway projects results in projects that are intended to reduce congestion by adding highway capacity, which merely results in more highway traffic and more congestion in future years. Funds spent on such projects would offer more lasting benefits if they could be spent on transit projects that demonstrate a higher and longer-term benefit in reducing congestion. Under the Metro approach, such transit projects would not be given consideration.

8. The criteria influence not only how public transportation dollars are spent, they also influence how private transportation dollars and other public dollars are spent, including private expenditures on automobile purchases and operations, auto parking at multiple trip origins and destinations, health care costs for persons injured or killed while traveling, environmental clean-up, traffic enforcement and criminal justice costs, and costs to secure foreign fuel supplies for transportation.

9. The criteria create the possibility for the public to lose confidence in the government’s actions to protect the public interest, to make the best use of taxpayer funds and to provide the environment for individual decision making that maximizes travel options and optimizes the benefits of the transportation system for users and the general public.

10. Use of the current Metro criteria will likely preclude the implementation of optimum solutions to meeting Los Angeles County mobility needs.
2007 Long Range Transportation Plan Update

Financial Forecast Update

Metro Board of Directors
August 16, 2007
Introduction

• Long Range Transportation Plan Update
  – Updates 2001 Long Range Transportation Plan
  – Includes Metro Board actions taken since 2001

• Financial Forecast Update
  – Not the Long Range Transportation Plan
    • Preliminary step to Plan recommendations
  – Guides Metro in meeting State and Federal financial planning requirements
Long Range Financial Forecast for Transportation

- LA County’s large local funding share is unique in the nation
  - New funds in the near term, such as Prop 1B, help to cover cost increases, keep more projects on schedule and backfill for State reductions in transportation funds

![Metro Long Range Transportation Plan Update](chart)

- **Local** $100 B (65.0%)
- **Federal** $17 B (11.4%)
- **State** $31 B* (20.3%)
- **Prop 1B** $5 B (3.3%)

*$153 Billion Total FY 2005 - FY 2030

* State Budget problems could reduce this by up to $1 B
Long Range Financial Forecast for Transportation

- Forecast includes regional funds used for transportation in LA County and not just Metro-controlled funds
  - Voters have twice acted to focus local investment on transit

```
Metro Long Range Transportation Plan Update
2030 Baseline, July 2007
Summary of Fund Uses

- Debt Service $13.8 B 9%
- Highways, Streets and Roads $45.5 B 30%
- Countywide Rail Operations $12.7 B 8%
- Countywide Rail & Transitway Capital $12.0 B 8%
- Countywide Bus Operations $49.0 B 32%
- Countywide Bus Capital $9.7 B 6%
- Unallocated $4 B 3%
- Other $6.4 B 4%

$153 Billion Total FY 2005 - FY 2030
```

“Other” represents regional security, agencywide capital, regulatory oversight, Safety Net Program, and Prop A local return to cities/county.
Long Range Financial Forecast for Transportation

- About 71% of LA County’s public transportation investment is controlled by Metro
  - Maintaining existing and previously planned services and improvements requires 96% of Metro’s funds
  - $4 B is available for new projects depending on funding source and match requirements
    - $3 B all transit eligible beginning in FY 2023 ($1.8 B is highway eligible)
    - $1 B for New Starts-eligible projects beginning in FY 2020 if matching funds are assigned

```
2007 Long Range Transportation Plan

Metro Controlled Uses

Metro Controlled Funds -- Bus & Rail Operations
$54.8 B
50.2%

Metro Controlled Funds -- Bus & Rail Capital
$30.4 B
27.8%

Metro Controlled Funds -- Highway
$16.9 B
15.5%

Metro Controlled Funds -- Other
$3.1 B
2.8%

$4 B
3.7%

$109 Billion Total
FY 2005 - FY 2030

"Other" represents regional security, agencywide capital, regulatory oversight, and Safety Net Program.
```
Update on Available Funds

- Federal New Starts and Fixed Guideway Modernization & Prop. A 35% Rail bonds: $2.2 B available (FY 2020-’30)
- State and Federal highway/transit funds: $1.8 B (FY 2023-’30)
Long Range Financial Forecast for Transportation

• Revenue risks
  – Economic downturn/State budget reductions
  – State transportation formula funds (STIP and STA)
    • Statewide FY 08 $1.3 B cut in Public Transportation Account funds
    • Ongoing state cuts could mean loss of STIP funds
  – Sales tax forecast and transit fares
    • 4% Sales tax growth could be too high in a recession
    • 33% Metro transit fare to operating cost recovery ratio
      – Requires difficult Metro Board actions
  – Federal Highway Trust fund balance
    • Impact unknown: $1.1 B (est.) Calif. rescissions pending (‘09 & ’10)
    • Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement program funds
      – Formula very favorable now, but that could change
  – Proposition 1B Transit Modernization Bond Funds
    • Formula and distribution processes not yet finalized
    • Metro decision on use of the funds pending LRTP update
Long Range Financial Forecast for Transportation

Cost Risks

• Transit operating costs could rise faster than forecasted
  – Labor, fuel, and service hour risks

• Project costs could increase
  – Minimal contingency provided, higher increases would impact schedules
    • Highway: $190 M
      – Design refinement
      – Environmental mitigation, commodities, energy, and surety risks
    • Transit: $370 M
      – Design refinement
      – Environmental mitigation, commodities, energy, and surety risks
      – Centralized rail yard
      – Additional rail cars
Baseline Key Financial Assumptions

• Countywide discretionary funds (Prop. C 40%)
  – Strategy to resolve Metro structural deficit thru FY 30
    • $4.2 billion Prop C 40% required for Metro operations
    • $1.8 billion Prop C 40% required for Metro transit capital
  – $2.8 billion Prop C 40% required for debt service for major transit projects through FY30
  – Prop C 40% funds the Muni Operator Service Improvement Program (MOSIP)

• Metro fare recovery ratio assumptions
  – 25% Metro transit fare to cost ratio in FY 2007 – before fare change
  – Increases to 30% by FY 2010 (approved)
  – Increases to 33% by FY 2012 and remains there through FY 2030
    » Metro approval needed in FY 2011
Long Range Financial Forecast for Transportation

• New funding is needed
  – Link to demand management and land use is critical
    • Optimize system to provide congestion relief
    • Greenhouse gas reductions needed
• Revenue opportunities
  – Tolls/congestion pricing
    • Public/Private Partnerships
  – State or regional gas tax increase
  – Federal gas tax increase
  – State transportation formula funds (STIP and STA)
    • PTA Spillover protections could improve outlook for STIP
  – Congestion management impact fees
  – Tax increment financing/assessment districts
  – Sales tax increase (Murray Bill or alternate)
  – Fare increases
## Metro Fare Revenue Increases Assumed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>12.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012</td>
<td>12.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2020</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2022</td>
<td>4.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2024</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2026</td>
<td>5.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2028</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2030</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Long Range Financial Forecast for Transportation

- 33% Metro transit fare recovery ratio target
  - Metro transit fares raised in FY 2008, FY 2010, then every 2 years to stay in the 33% range

"33%" recovery ratio target: Fares raised in FY08, FY10 and FY12 (assumed) per Board Motion, then continuing fare increases every two years to stay in the 33% range. Average from FY08-30: 32.5%.
Long Range Financial Forecast for Transportation

- Metro transit fare revenues at the 33% recovery ratio target

Fare Revenues at 33% Fare Recovery Ratio

“33%” recovery ratio target: Fares raised in FY08, FY10 and FY12 (assumed) per Board Motion, then continuing fare increases every two years to stay in the 33% range. Total fare revenue from FY08-30: $12.6 billion.
Metro Operating Cost Assumptions

- Metro bus and rail revenue service hours (RSH)
  - 8.4 million total RSH in FY 2008 Metro Budget
    - 7.76 million bus RSH
    - 0.65 million rail RSH
  - Projected through FY 2030, this level of service results in $1.7 B more Metro bus and rail operating costs than previously assumed in February 2007
    - Mostly bus: $1.6 B in Metro bus operating costs added through 2030
## Countywide Transit Capacity Mile Assumptions

- Daily capacity miles increase by 2030 over 2006
  - Daily Capacity Mile = average seat per vehicle $\times$ load factor $\times$ vehicle miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 Daily Capacity Miles</th>
<th>2030 Daily Capacity Miles</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Bus</td>
<td>21,150,000</td>
<td>27,360,000</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>1,658,000</td>
<td>4,009,000</td>
<td>141.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Rail</td>
<td>493,000</td>
<td>906,000</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide</td>
<td>23,301,000</td>
<td>32,275,000</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comparison of Metro Revenue Service Hours (RSH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus RSH</td>
<td>7.5 M</td>
<td>7.8 M</td>
<td>9.2 M</td>
<td>7.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail RSH</td>
<td>0.8 M</td>
<td>0.7 M</td>
<td>0.9 M</td>
<td>1.0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Metro RSH</td>
<td>8.3 M</td>
<td>8.4 M</td>
<td>10.1 M</td>
<td>8.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus cost per hr</td>
<td>$116.84</td>
<td>$118.10</td>
<td>$188.17</td>
<td>$188.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail cost per hr</td>
<td>$261.14</td>
<td>$365.25</td>
<td>$400.54</td>
<td>$505.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Orange Line is included in the bus figures.
## 2007 Plan Baseline Transit Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>2001 Plan Total Project Cost (escalated)</th>
<th>2007 Plan Total Project Cost (escalated)</th>
<th>2001 Plan Open</th>
<th>2007 Plan Open</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastside Light Rail Transit (LRT)</td>
<td>$ 762 M</td>
<td>$ 899 M</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposition LRT (Phase I to Culver City)</td>
<td>$ 614 M combined with Wilshire</td>
<td>$ 640 M</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposition LRT (Phase II to Santa Monica) [2001 Plan project was Crenshaw to Santa Monica]</td>
<td>BRT/LRT* $ 155 M</td>
<td>LRT $ 985 M</td>
<td>BRT/LRT* 2015</td>
<td>LRT 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire Boulevard Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)</td>
<td>combined with Expo</td>
<td>$ 124 M</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Plan did not specify mode but cost and schedule assumptions were based on Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
## 2007 Plan Baseline Transit Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>2001 Plan Total Project Cost (escalated)</th>
<th>2007 Plan Total Project Cost (escalated)</th>
<th>2001 Plan Open</th>
<th>2007 Plan Open</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crenshaw Corridor (technology TBD; cost for BRT or LRT until Metro Board action on preferred alternative) (2001 Plan project was Wilshire/Crenshaw to Green Line/LAX)</td>
<td>$ 346 M</td>
<td>$ 550 M to $ 955 M</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley North/South BRT (Orange Line Canoga Extension)</td>
<td>$ 243 M</td>
<td>$ 243 M</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Major Funding Source Usage Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ($ in millions)</th>
<th>New Starts</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Prop C 40% Bonds</th>
<th>Prop A 35% Bonds</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expo Phase II</td>
<td>$ 381.0</td>
<td>$ 84.0</td>
<td>$ 171.4</td>
<td>$ 268.8</td>
<td>$ 79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crenshaw LRT</td>
<td>$ 174.1</td>
<td>$ 2.7</td>
<td>$ 362.0</td>
<td>$ 398.4</td>
<td>$ 17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley North-South (Orange Line Canoga Extension)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$ 100.0</td>
<td>$ 138.4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$ 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$ 555.1</td>
<td>$ 186.7</td>
<td>$ 671.8</td>
<td>$ 667.2</td>
<td>$ 101.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prop 1 B Bond Transit Fund Revenue Assumptions

- $960 M Prop 1 B Transit Modernization funds assumed (Metro share)
- Candidate projects within next ten years, such as:
  - Backfill for STIP reductions due to FY 08 State Budget
  - Rehabilitation of existing rail lines
  - Rail rolling stock replacement
  - Exposition LRT Phase II, Crenshaw, San Fernando Valley North-South
  - Union bus division
  - New airport bus division
  - Planning and design of future transit projects
- Metro decision needed as early as FY 2008
## 2007 Plan Baseline Highway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description (all costs are escalated total project costs)</th>
<th>2001 Plan Cost</th>
<th>2007 Plan Cost</th>
<th>2001 Plan Open</th>
<th>2007 Plan Open*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 405 Carpool Lanes from Interstate 105 to State Route 90</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50.0 M</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 405 Carpool Lanes from State Route 90 to Interstate 10</td>
<td>$152.7 M</td>
<td>$169.5 M</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 57/State Route 60 Carpool Lane Direct Connector</td>
<td>$72.5 M</td>
<td>$70.5 M</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-101 Freeway and Ramp Realignment to Center Street</td>
<td>$15.8 M</td>
<td>$40.9 M</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 405 Southbound Carpool/Auxiliary Lane from Waterford to Interstate 10</td>
<td>$74.0 M</td>
<td>$50.0 M</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Opening years may vary depending on Caltrans delivery schedule and funding availability.
## 2007 Plan Baseline Highway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description (all costs are escalated total project costs)</th>
<th>2001 Plan Cost</th>
<th>2007 Plan Cost</th>
<th>2001 Plan Open</th>
<th>2007 Plan Open*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 405/US-101 Connector Gap Closure near Greenleaf</td>
<td>$33.9 M</td>
<td>$45.7 M</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 405 Carpool Lane (Northbound) from Greenleaf to Burbank Blvd.</td>
<td>$3.6 M</td>
<td>$6.4 M</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5/State Route 126 Interchange Reconstruction Phases I and II</td>
<td>$13.3 M</td>
<td>$72.2 M</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 60 Carpool Lanes from I-605 to Brea Canyon Road</td>
<td>$67.0 M</td>
<td>$153.3 M</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Opening years may vary depending on Caltrans delivery schedule and funding availability.
## 2007 Plan Baseline Highway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description (all costs are escalated total project costs)</th>
<th>2001 Plan Cost</th>
<th>2007 Plan Cost</th>
<th>2001 Plan Open</th>
<th>2007 Plan Open*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 10 Carpool Lanes from Interstate 605 to Puente Avenue</td>
<td>$ 441.7 M</td>
<td>$ 191.0 M</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 10 Carpool Lanes from Puente Ave. to Citrus Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 182.0 M</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 10 Carpool Lanes from Citrus Avenue to State Route 57</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 191.5 M</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 710 Freeway Improvements from PCH to Downtown Long Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 6.6 M</td>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 Carmenita Road Interchange Improvement</td>
<td>$ 127.7 M</td>
<td>$ 251.5 M</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Opening years may vary depending on Caltrans delivery schedule and funding availability.
## 2007 Plan Baseline Highway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description (all costs are escalated total project costs)</th>
<th>2001 Plan Cost</th>
<th>2007 Plan Cost</th>
<th>2001 Plan Open</th>
<th>2007 Plan Open*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5/State Route 14 Carpool Lane Direct Connector</td>
<td>$ 58.8 M</td>
<td>$157.0 M</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend State Route 90 Freeway to halfway between Culver and Mindanao</td>
<td>$ 12.1 M</td>
<td>$ 23.7 M</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 138 Widening (7 of 13 segments funded in the baseline)</td>
<td>$119.0 M (in CFP)</td>
<td>$215.0 M</td>
<td>No date</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 Carpool Lanes from State Route 14 to State Route 118</td>
<td>$438.0 M</td>
<td>$ 89.1 M</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 Carpool Lanes from State Route 118 to SR-170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 Carpool Lanes from State Route 170 to State Rte. 134</td>
<td></td>
<td>$609.8 M</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Opening years may vary depending on Caltrans delivery schedule and funding availability.
# 2007 Plan Baseline Highway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description (all costs are escalated total project costs)</th>
<th>2001 Plan Cost</th>
<th>2007 Plan Cost</th>
<th>2001 Plan Open</th>
<th>2007 Plan Open*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Route 14 Carpool Lanes from Pearblossom to Ave P-8</td>
<td>$105.5 M</td>
<td>$40.8 M</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 14 Carpool Lanes from Ave P-8 to Avenue L</td>
<td></td>
<td>$59.8 M</td>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 405 Carpool Lanes (Northbound) from I-10 to US-101</td>
<td>$1,497.0 M high cost alternative</td>
<td>$950.0 M</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2013-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 Carpool &amp; Mixed Flow Lanes from Interstate 605 to Orange County Line</td>
<td>$222.3 M interim project</td>
<td>$1,155.3M two lanes each way</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Opening years may vary depending on Caltrans delivery schedule and funding availability.
# 2007 Plan Baseline Highway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description (all costs are escalated total project costs)</th>
<th>2001 Plan Cost</th>
<th>2007 Plan Cost</th>
<th>2001 Plan Open</th>
<th>2007 Plan Open</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Route 71 Freeway from Interstate 10 to Mission Blvd.</td>
<td>$118.1 M</td>
<td>$100.0 M</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 71 Freeway from Mission Blvd. to Rio Rancho Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>$290.0 M</td>
<td></td>
<td>2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 57/State Route 60 Mixed Flow Interchange</td>
<td>$355.5 M</td>
<td>$450.0 M</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5/Interstate 405 Carpool Lane Partial Connector</td>
<td>$143.5 M</td>
<td>$290.0 M</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Opening years may vary depending on Caltrans delivery schedule and funding availability.
## Major Baseline Assumptions -- Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use (regional funds)</th>
<th>Total (M)</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro transit operations</td>
<td>$41,877</td>
<td>Through 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service (Props A and C)</td>
<td>$13,682</td>
<td>Through 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal and non-Metro bus operations (including MOSIP through 2030)</td>
<td>$11,265</td>
<td>Through 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro bus capital</td>
<td>$6,112</td>
<td>Through 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned highway projects</td>
<td>$5,990</td>
<td>Through 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation of rail system</td>
<td>$4,239</td>
<td>Through 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 and future Calls for Projects</td>
<td>$4,215</td>
<td>FY 2008-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing and planned transit capital projects</td>
<td>$3,990</td>
<td>Through 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Major Baseline Assumptions -- Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use (regional funds)</th>
<th>Total (M)</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASI (paratransit)</td>
<td>$ 3,340</td>
<td>Through 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal bus capital</td>
<td>$ 2,930</td>
<td>Through 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrolink</td>
<td>$ 2,288</td>
<td>Through 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrofit soundwalls</td>
<td>$ 941</td>
<td>Through 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>$ 679</td>
<td>Through 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit project contingency/new rail yards/additional rail cars</td>
<td>$ 370</td>
<td>FY 2008-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway project contingency</td>
<td>$ 190</td>
<td>FY 2011, 14-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus speed improvements (bus only lanes)</td>
<td>$ 150</td>
<td>FY 2030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Major Baseline Assumptions -- Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use (regional funds)</th>
<th>Total (M)</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety Net Program increase</td>
<td>$ 117</td>
<td>Through 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrolink – new capital</td>
<td>$ 100</td>
<td>FY 2027-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New airport bus division</td>
<td>$ 75</td>
<td>FY 2016-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union bus division</td>
<td>$ 65</td>
<td>FY 2005-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for new projects</td>
<td>$ 64</td>
<td>FY 2007-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit studies for new projects</td>
<td>$ 50</td>
<td>FY 2025-28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beyond the Baseline

- New transit projects are possible beginning FY 2020 if Federal New Starts funding is achieved and matching funds are assigned.
- New highway projects are possible beginning FY 2023 if flexible funds are not used for transit projects.
- Board could assign funds to other unmet needs.
Top two highest performing transit and highway projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Project Description</th>
<th>Metro Cost Est. (Escalated $)</th>
<th>If Opens In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Connector</td>
<td>$ 880 M</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway Extension to Century City (initial segment to LaCienega)</td>
<td>$ 2,260 M</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Project Description</th>
<th>Metro Cost Est. (Escalated $)</th>
<th>If Opens In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-710 Gap Closure (half toll funding assumed)</td>
<td>$ 2,500 M (regional funds)</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-605 Carpool Lanes from I-210 to I-10</td>
<td>$ 270 M</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beyond Baseline

Current unmet program needs:

- Transit corridor cost increases
- Union bus division
- Airport bus division
- New fixed guideway projects
- Additional demand for transit service
- Unmet Metrolink current services (above current funding levels)
- Additional Metrolink expansion and safety initiatives
- Paratransit (Access Services Inc.) expansion beyond assumed growth
- Accelerating committed projects
- Highway project cost increases

- New highway projects
- Call for Projects cost increases (non-State Highway)
- Increased Call for Projects funding levels
- Increased Goods Movement funding
  - Dedicated freight corridors
- Accelerated Soundwall program
- Local streets and roads preservation
- Other
Next Steps

- Board input
- Preliminary Plan recommendations
- Forty-five day public review period
- Board adopts final Long Range Transportation Plan Update
Draft Preliminary Performance Analysis

- Transit
- Highway
### Transit Projects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Projects*</th>
<th>Annual Boardings per Mile</th>
<th>Annual Boardings per Million $</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Pop &amp; Employment Density</th>
<th>% of Transit Dependent Census Tracts</th>
<th>Major Activity Centers/ Mile</th>
<th>Boardings/mile (2004)</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Connector Light Rail in tunnel from LA Union Station to 7th St/Metro Center**</td>
<td>4,180,892</td>
<td>9,547</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.16</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>36.97</td>
<td>77,907</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Red Line Westside Extension from Wilshire/Western Station to Century City</td>
<td>2,286,587</td>
<td>5,858</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.56</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>9,363</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Subdivision DMU between LA Union Station and Metro Green Line Aviation Station</td>
<td>390,731</td>
<td>6,761</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8,150</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Red Line Westside Extension from Century City to City of Santa Monica</td>
<td>1,634,160</td>
<td>4,760</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>4,127</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Red Line Extension from North Hollywood Station to Burbank Airport Metrolink Station</td>
<td>2,236,029</td>
<td>5,733</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>7,636</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont Corridor Subway</td>
<td>1,406,198</td>
<td>3,581</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.27</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>8,845</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burbank/Glendale Light Rail from LA Union Station to Burbank Metrolink Station</td>
<td>589,004</td>
<td>4,977</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>8,496</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension from Atlantic/Pomona Station to City of Whittier (At-grade light rail)</td>
<td>458,325</td>
<td>3,818</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Line Light Rail between Metro Red Line North Hollywood Station and Regional Connector 3rd/Flower St Station</td>
<td>430,567</td>
<td>3,789</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>3,984</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-405 Corridor Busway between Metro Orange Line Sepulveda Station and Metro Green Line Aviation Station</td>
<td>311,166</td>
<td>8,166</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Line Light Rail between Metro Red Line Vermont/Santa Monica Station and City of La Puente</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>4,167</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension to City of Whittier (Aerial light rail)</td>
<td>559,427</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Green Line Extension from Redondo Beach Station to South Bay Galleria</td>
<td>466,509</td>
<td>4,761</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>3,062</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Green Line Extension between LAX/Airport Station to Expo Santa Monica Station</td>
<td>575,258</td>
<td>3,929</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 138 Transit Corridor BRT between Metro Red Line North Hollywood Station and Metro Gold Line Del Mar Station</td>
<td>324,180</td>
<td>5,659</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Green Line Extension between Norwalk Station and Norwalk Metrolink Station (Elevated)</td>
<td>658,593</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>2,136</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Green Line Extension between Norwalk Station and Norwalk Metrolink Station (Underground)</td>
<td>658,593</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>2,136</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension from Sierra Madre Villa Station to Montclair (MTA cost)</td>
<td>268,781</td>
<td>3,575</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Green Line Extension between South Bay Galleria and Pacific Coast Hwy Harbor Transway Station</td>
<td>349,328</td>
<td>3,003</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Light rail projects using heavy rail lines may be required to negotiate exclusive use agreements to share tracks. If at-grade or aerial alignments require right-of-way purchases, cost estimates could increase substantially.

** The Regional Connector Light rail project received the highest score in each category. Because the scores for this project were significantly higher than the field in most categories they were not considered in the range of scores when assigning points to the other projects, in order to achieve a more balanced distribution.

Shared with Board previously. Metro costs revised for Gold Line Foothill Extension. Slight changes to some total scores reflect minor technical corrections.
## Highway Projects

### (Alphabetical by Score)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Annual Hrs of Delay Savings /Mile</th>
<th>Annual Hrs Saved Per Million $</th>
<th>Pop &amp; Emp Density</th>
<th>Major Activity Centers/ Mile</th>
<th>Highway Congestion Score</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Total Combined Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR-710 North Extension: Add 3 Mixed Flow + 1 HOV lane in each direction</td>
<td>749,853</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1405*</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-505 HOV lanes: I-210 to I-10</td>
<td>309,140</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.669</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-405: Add N/B lane from Hawthorne to I-105 (Approximate length = 3.5 miles)</td>
<td>259,909</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,524</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-405: Add S/B lane from Rosecrans to Inglewood (Approximate length = 1.0 mile)</td>
<td>259,909</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,524</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-101 Corridor: Add HOV lane in each direction between Rt. 27 (Topanga Canyon) and Rt 2 in Downtown LA and restripe for mixed flow lane in each direction between Rt 27 and the Ventura Co Line.</td>
<td>446,126</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4762*</td>
<td>4,002</td>
<td>5,521</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-101: Add HOV lane in each direction between Rt 27 and the Ventura Co Line (This HOV lane would be in addition to the mixed flow lane proposed on the 2001 LRTP Strategic list.)</td>
<td>543,389</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8029*</td>
<td>6,883</td>
<td>9,174</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-10: Add one HOV lane in each direction on Santa Monica Freeway between Lincoln Blvd. (in Santa Monica) and the I-5 Frewy interchange.</td>
<td>400,134</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2291*</td>
<td>2,036</td>
<td>2,545</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Carpool &amp; Mixed Flow Lanes: I-605 to I-710</td>
<td>388,537</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>959*</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 57 HOV lanes: Rt. 60 to I-210</td>
<td>347,406</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,287</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5: SR-14 to Kern Co Line (HOV and Truck Lane Improvements)</td>
<td>292,844</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11,092</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-710 Corridor Study Recommendations: (Add Mixed Flow lanes to make uniform 10 lanes from Ports to SR-60; Add 2 Truck lanes in each direction from Ports to Hobart/ICTF Railyards- Cities of Vernon, Commerce)</td>
<td>419,620</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 60 HOV lanes: Rt. 101 to I-605</td>
<td>203,009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,904</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-14: I-5 to Kern County Line (HOV &amp; Mixed Flow Improvements)</td>
<td>155,810</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDC E-W: SR 14 to LA/SB Co Line- (add 3 MF+1 HOV freeway/expressway)</td>
<td>13,318</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDC N-S: SR14 to SR138 - add 2 MF expressway**</td>
<td>4,981</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-138: I-5 to SR-14 - Add 2 MF lanes in each direction</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-138: Pearblossom Hwy to SB Co Line - Widen existing SR-138 to 4 lanes.</td>
<td>8,226</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **SR-710 North Extension:** The shared score reflects a slight change to total score for the SR-710 project (from Rt. 2 to Ventura County Line) due to minor technical correction.
- **I-5 Carpool & Mixed Flow Lanes:** The score reflects the shared delay savings due to the same corridor.
- **US-101 Corridor:** The estimated cost was provided in the form of a range rather than a single estimate, and the midpoint of the range was used for evaluation purposes.
- **US-101 HOV lane:** The delay savings were calculated from the US-101 HOV lane project through a comparison of projected daily trip volumes. The HDC N-S carries approximately 44% of the volumes of the HDC E-W, therefore the delay savings were calculated to be 44% that of the HDC E-W segment.

---

**Footnotes:**
- For each project in which estimated cost was provided in the form of a range rather than a single estimate, the midpoint of the range was used for evaluation purposes.
- The Hours of Delay Savings for the HDC N-S project were provided through off-model analysis. The delay savings for this segment was calculated from the HDC E-W project through a comparison of projected daily trip volumes. The HDC N-S carries approximately 44% of the volumes of the HDC E-W, therefore the delay savings were calculated to be 44% that of the HDC E-W segment.

---

**Technical Notes:**
- The delay savings for each project were calculated by modeling delay savings throughout a defined corridor. Where there are multiple freeway projects located in a
## Baseline Highway Projects Priority

($ in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>2007 Plan Cost (escalated)</th>
<th>2007 Plan Open</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 405 Southbound Carpool/Auxiliary Lane from Waterford to Interstate 10</td>
<td>$50.0</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 405 Carpool Lanes from State Route 90 to Interstate 10</td>
<td>$169.5</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 Carpool Lanes from State Route 14 to State Route 118</td>
<td>$89.1</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 405/US-101 Connector Gap Closure near Greenleaf</td>
<td>$45.7</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 60 Carpool Lanes from I-605 to Brea Canyon Road</td>
<td>$153.3</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 Carpool Lanes from State Route 118 to SR-170</td>
<td>$310.8</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 10 Carpool Lanes from Interstate 605 to Puente Avenue</td>
<td>$191.0</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 Carmenita Road Interchange Improvement</td>
<td>$251.5</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 Carpool &amp; Mixed Flow Lanes from Interstate 605 to Orange County</td>
<td>$1,155.3</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 710 Freeway Improvements from PCH to Downtown Long Beach</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5/State Route 14 Carpool Lane Direct Connector</td>
<td>$157.0</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 Carpool Lanes from State Route 170 to State Rte. 134</td>
<td>$609.8</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 405 Carpool Lanes (Northbound) from I-10 to US-101</td>
<td>$950.0</td>
<td>2013-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 10 Carpool Lanes from Puente Ave. to Citrus Ave.</td>
<td>$182.0</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 10 Carpool Lanes from Citrus Avenue to State Route 57</td>
<td>$191.5</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 71 Freeway from Interstate 10 to Mission Blvd.</td>
<td>$100.0</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Baseline Highway Projects Priority – Cont’d

($ in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not prioritized</th>
<th>2007 Plan Cost (escalated)</th>
<th>2007 Plan Open</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5/State Route 126 Interchange Reconstruction Phases I and II</td>
<td>$ 72.2</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend State Route 90 Freeway to halfway between Culver and Mindanao</td>
<td>$ 23.7</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 138 Widening (7 of 13 segments funded in the baseline)</td>
<td>$ 215.0</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 14 Carpool Lanes from Avenue P-8 to Avenue L</td>
<td>$ 59.8</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 57/State Route 60 Mixed Flow Interchange</td>
<td>$ 450.0</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5/Interstate 405 Carpool Lane Partial Connector</td>
<td>$ 290.0</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 71 Freeway from Mission Blvd. to Rio Rancho Rd</td>
<td>$ 290.0</td>
<td>2027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Orangeline Development Authority

FROM: Albert Perdon, Executive Director

DATE: September 12, 2007

SUBJECT: Approval of input to the Southern California Association of Governments regarding the Regional Transportation Plan Update

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board approves the proposed input to the Southern California Association of Governments in regard to the Regional Transportation Plan Update.

DISCUSSION

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is updating the Regional Transportation Plan for Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura and Imperial counties – an area of more than 38,000 square miles with a population exceeding 18 million people.

The federal government mandates SCAG to update its Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) every four years to address the region’s transportation needs. The projects addressing these needs are identified in the RTP and become eligible for state and federal funding. The 2008 RTP is scheduled to have a draft release in October/November 2007, and be finalized in Spring 2008. SCAG is seeking public input on the RTP Update.

The Regional Transportation Plan Update will impact the Orangeline Development Authority’s ability to successfully implement the Orangeline High Speed Maglev Project; it will also affect other maglev projects under consideration in Southern California. It is recommended that the Authority provide the following input to SCAG which, if adopted and made a part of the updated RTP, will assist in moving the Orangeline High Speed Maglev forward:

- Revise the current Maglev System map (Exhibit 4.9 on Page 133) in the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan, Chapter 4, to clearly identify the existing maglev segments from Palmdale and aligned along the SR-14 Fwy, I-5 Fwy, Pacific Electric Corridor to Santa Ana, and along the I-5 Fwy to the Irvine Transportation Center, by the color orange and the name “Orangeline High Speed Maglev”, with an implementation date of “by 2018”.

- Include the following data for the Orangeline High Speed Maglev from Palmdale to Irvine in the updated Table 4.13 - 2004 RTP Regional Maglev Milestones and in the current Chapter 4 “Private / Innovative Funding Strategy – Maglev Project Financing”:
  - Capital Costs $19 billion (2007) dollars
Capital Cost Period 2007 to 2018

- Include the following language in the updated narrative section of the current paragraph titled “Maglev System” on Page 129:
  - Fifteen cities along the 108-mile Orangeline High Speed Maglev project corridor have formed the Orangeline Development Authority, a joint powers authority organized to pursue implementation of the Orangeline High Speed Maglev project as part of an overall corridor development strategy. The Authority has formed a public-private partnership with a consortium of firms led by ARCADIS. The ARCADIS team has invested over $1 million in first phase engineering and financial planning studies, which have been matched by an equal investment by the Authority’s member cities. As currently planned, the system would include 18 stations located in existing or planned areas with high-density, transit-oriented development and served by interconnected local feeder or regional transit services. The Orangeline High Speed Maglev would also connect to 3 regional airports: Palmdale, Burbank and Orange County John Wayne. The system will also carry freight, including the possibility of cargo containers from the San Pedro Bay seaports to an inland port in Palmdale. The Authority is seeking participation of all remaining cities along the corridor, as well as state and federal support. The project is identified as a high priority project in SAFTEA-LU. The Authority is seeking private funding to construct the project. Deployment of the Orangeline High Speed Maglev by 2018 is considered to be a high priority by SCAG.

- Include the following policy statement regarding maglev deployment in the updated Regional Transportation Plan:
  - The Maglev system is being planned as a largely privately-funded endeavor in which passenger revenues and cargo fees will cover both construction costs and operating expenses. It is assumed that the maglev lines will be primarily elevated systems located within and running above existing publicly-owned freeway and railroad transportation corridors. As the availability of these corridors is limited and there are competing demands for their use, any proposed uses for the corridors that are planned to be used for the regional maglev system must take into consideration the need for these corridors to accommodate the regional maglev system projects. Other uses may not preclude the use of the designated corridors for maglev system implementation or appreciably increase the cost of maglev system projects, unless it can be shown that other uses offer greater transportation-related benefits or better achieve local and regional goals.

The maglev system map in the 2004 RTP, shown on SCAG’s website, (Attachment 1) clearly shows maglev system line segments that make up the Orangeline High Speed Maglev as it is currently being planned by the Authority. Attachment 2 contains a variation of this system map that also appears on the SCAG website, but with a missing link from downtown Los Angeles to Sylmar. SCAG representatives, however, have indicated that “the Orangeline is not in the RTP”, but that “the Orangeline Maglev, including the downtown L.A.-to-Sylmar portion, will be shown on SCAG’s map of the Regional Maglev/High Speed Rail systems. The proposed language recommended for inclusion in the RTP Update will help to eliminate any ambiguity regarding the status of the Orangeline High Speed Maglev project. The Authority’s formation and pursuit of the project is consistent with current SCAG policy.

ATTACHMENT:

1. Excerpts from the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
2. Maglev System Map from SCAG website
2004 Regional Transportation Plan

Adopted April 2004

Southern California Association of Governments
Regional Rail Capacity Improvement Program
The regional rail capacity improvement program recommended by SCAG would be financed with a revenue stream raised on corridor traffic hauled by the Union Pacific and Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroads. It is also recommended that discussions take place with other West Coast ports regarding a similar revenue approach to minimize any potential for cargo diversion.

In order to collect and distribute funds throughout the corridor for eligible capital improvement projects, it is envisioned in concept that SCAG create a subsidiary agency. The role of this agency, here referred to as the Southern California Railroad Infrastructure Financing Authority (SCRIFA), would be limited to issuing and servicing debt, administering the revenue collection process, and distributing money for approved projects to the railroads and other implementing agencies. Similar agencies should be created for administering funds for rail projects in other regions along the West Coast.

The proposed capacity improvements would include a total investment of $3.4 billion in Southern California: $1.2 billion for railroad infrastructure projects and approximately $2.2 billion in grade separation projects.

- **Maglev System**

The Intra-Regional High Speed Rail System, using magnetic levitation (Maglev) technology, would ultimately facilitate the development of a regional airport system, and connect to major activity and multi-modal transportation centers in Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Orange Counties. Without a regional airport in El Toro, the Region needs to further decentralize its future growth in air passenger traffic and air cargo to regional airports in the northern, eastern and southern portions of the Region. Therefore, the Maglev system becomes more important and critical to the success of SCAG’s decentralized regional aviation system.

The proposed system will be deployed through a public-private partnership. Its costs, estimated at $29.4 billion, will be funded through bonds and loans to be repaid through the project-generated revenues. It is anticipated that no operating subsidies will be required.

- **Aviation**

DESTINATION 2030 proposes a new decentralized aviation plan called the Regional Aviation Plan.” This Plan would accommodate a total regional passenger aviation demand of 170 million annual passengers (MAP). Under the Regional Aviation Plan, rather than relying on expanding existing urban airports, the future demand for air travel will be largely served by using available capacity at airfields located in the Inland Empire and north Los Angeles County, where projected population growth will be best served. This plan calls for constraining the LAX at 78 MAP, increasing the Ontario International Airport to 30 MAP, and a new passenger airport at Palmdale that will accommodate 12.8 MAP.
Marine Ports
The ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach and Hueneme are planning to invest $6 billion over the next 25 years on an ambitious infrastructure development program including $4 billion over the next 10 to 15 years for infrastructure improvement projects being sought by the San Pedro Bay ports. This program will include widening arterial streets, upgrading freeway ramps, separating railroad grade crossings, expanding rail yards, and adding intelligent transportation systems (ITS) to improve ground access management.

Inland Port
Conceptually, inland ports serve as cargo facilitation centers, where a number of import, export, manufacturing, packing, warehousing, forwarding, customs, and other activities (including Foreign Trade or Enterprise Zones) could take place on site or in near proximity.

Such facilities are being studied and will be considered further for development in San Bernardino, in Victorville at the Southern California Logistics Airport, in Barstow and in March Inland Port. These facilities will function as inland sorting and depository centers for ocean and domestic containers, possibly transported via dedicated rail or truck facilities. At one of these inland ports, containers or trailers can be assembled and sorted into line-haul trains destined for locations outside of the Region. Conversely, shipments arriving on westbound trains could be broken down and sorted for short-haul train delivery within the Region and to the ports. Each of these possible locations will be the subject of further study.

Maglev System
The Regional High Speed Rail Maglev System will ultimately facilitate the development of a regional airport system, and connect to major activity and multi-modal transportation centers in Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Orange Counties. Without a regional airport in El Toro, the Region needs to further decentralize its future growth in air passenger traffic and air cargo to its regional airports in the northern and eastern portions of the Region. Therefore, the Maglev system becomes more important and critical to the success of SCAG’s decentralized regional aviation system.

The Maglev system is the name for an elevated monorail using the world’s most advanced technology to move people and goods at a very high speed (up to 310 mph), with a high degree of safety, comfort, and reliability; and it is environmentally friendly. For the past four years, SCAG has been studying the feasibility of deploying four Maglev corridors in the Region:

- Los Angeles Airport (LAX) to March Inland Port in Riverside County (Moreno Valley)
- LAX to Palmdale
- Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal (LAUPT) to Orange County (Anaheim)
- LAX to Orange County (Irvine Transportation Center)
In 2002, the Western States Maglev Alliance was formed between SCAG and the California-Nevada Super Speed Train Commission and was approved by the Regional Council. As a result of this alliance, the Plan supports continued analysis of the proposed Las Vegas to Anaheim Maglev segment that passes through Barstow (see Exhibit 4.9).

The SCAG Interregional High Speed Rail system will ultimately grow to cover over 275 miles of Maglev corridors in the SCAG Region, and will move up to 500,000 riders a day. When fully deployed, the Maglev system could complement the regional State highway transportation system. The Maglev program also envisions a longer-term connection to San Diego and other southern airports in the SCAG Region\(^6\), a connection between San Bernardino and Palmdale via a high desert alignment and interlining with the proposed California State High Speed Rail System. The California State High Speed Rail Authority has been commissioned to do preliminary development work on several north/south corridors. SCAG has supported the Antelope and San Joaquin Valley corridors (Resolution #96-357-1-B). The State of California should coordinate all high-speed rail-planning activities with SCAG and other stakeholders within the State, especially with regard to Maglev, aviation, environment, growth, access, finance and community development.

Three phases have been developed to implement the Maglev deployment program:

- **Phase 1** Pre-Deployment Analysis, was completed in October 2003 and includes right-of-way assessment on the freeway system and railroad corridors, assessment of ridership and interaction with other transportation systems, LAUPT capacity analysis, stakeholder outreach, financial feasibility, public/private partnership, technology transfer, and identification of an Initial Operating Segment (IOS).

- **Phase 2** Preliminary Engineering, will focus on defining the project to prepare preliminary engineering for the purpose of environmental assessment and analysis (EIR/EIS) for public/private investment.

- **Phase 3** Project Deployment Strategy, will complete the investment quality analysis necessary to take the deployment program to the private market. This phase will include an investment-grade ridership and revenue forecast, operation plans, a detailed financial plan, and creation of a public/private consortium for project deployment.

In December 2002, SCAG’s Regional Council approved the deployment of a 56-mile IOS of the Maglev system that would connect West Los Angeles via LAUPT to Ontario Airport. It is a component of a 92-mile corridor between LAX and March Inland Port in Riverside County. In selecting the IOS, SCAG considered the RTP performance measures, stakeholder support and environmental issues. At the same time, SCAG’s Regional Council approved the advance planning of the LAX to Palmdale corridor and Los Angeles to Orange County corridor (Orange Line). It is anticipated that the IOS is expected to be implemented by the private sector by 2018.

---

\(^6\) SCAG will undertake a future study to determine the feasibility of extending Maglev services to the southernmost regions of California to connect regional airports in San Diego, Palm Springs, Imperial County and March Inland Port.
The feasibility studies for the four corridors demonstrated that the Maglev system could be constructed and deployed through a public-private partnership structure administered through a public agency, a joint powers authority (JPA), or a public nonprofit (PNP) format using a number of innovative and traditional funding mechanisms. The system would be financed through tax-exempt bonds and Federal Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovative Act (TIFIA) program loans that would be repaid through the project-generated revenues. No operating subsidies will be required.

The Maglev Deployment will move SCAG’s Region forward through investment in critical infrastructure that will quickly improve surface transportation, enhance goods movement and revitalize the Southland’s economy. The initiative is a short- to medium-term fix that will inject over $26 billion into SCAG’s regional economy between the years 2005 and 2018. The Maglev Deployment for the IOS will create approximately 92,000 jobs in the SCAG Region for a total private investment of $5.5 billion. JPA formation for the IOS and LAX to other corridors is in process.

The completion of the privately funded Maglev projects beyond 2018 will result in improvements in productivity, quality of life, and mobility, and will enhance the Southern California economy. The project milestones are summarized in Table 4.13 and depicted on the map in Exhibit 4.9.

### Table 4.13

#### 2004 RTP Regional Maglev Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Capital Costs ($ billion)</th>
<th>Capital Costs Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario - LA Union Station - West LA</td>
<td>$ 5.5</td>
<td>2015 – 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario - March Airport</td>
<td>$ 2.4</td>
<td>2018 – 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles - LAX</td>
<td>$ 0.7</td>
<td>2018 – 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAX - Palmdale Airport</td>
<td>$ 8.2</td>
<td>2020 – 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAX - John Wayne Airport - Irvine Transit Center</td>
<td>$ 9.0</td>
<td>2025 – 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Union Station - Central Orange County</td>
<td>$ 3.6</td>
<td>2025 – 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County - San Bernardino</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>2030+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino / Victorville</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>2030+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorville / Palmdale</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>2030+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March Airport / San Diego</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>2030+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SCAG will undertake a study to determine the feasibility of extending Maglev Services to regional airports in Palm Springs, Imperial County and San Diego to meet aviation demand.
Next Steps

- Prepare preliminary engineering for the IOS for the purpose of preparation of the federal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and/or State Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to a level necessary for public/private investment.

- Form a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) for the IOS, and market projects to public/private stakeholders.

- Secure federal, State and local funds by 2010 to complete deployment of the IOS and coalesce community support for operation of the IOS.

- Seek legislative support at the regional, State and federal levels for the Maglev deployment.
development mitigation, as deemed necessary. Initial revenue estimates for some approaches identified for further analyses indicate that about $1.5 billion could be generated for arterials, grade separations, and interchanges in San Bernardino County.

- **Private / Innovative Funding Strategy**

**Consider the Feasibility of HOT Lanes for New Facilities**

Given limited public funds to support transportation infrastructure development, high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes would be considered for some new facilities. Projected toll revenues could be substantial based upon some initial analyses of corridors within the SCAG Region.

**Pursue User-Fee–Supported Project Financing for Major Regional Investments Where Applicable**

There are several one-of-a-kind major regional projects proposed in the 2004 RTP, including the proposed Maglev system, special purpose facilities, and freight railroad system improvements. These proposals are to be debt financed and backed by user charges. The proposed debt financing instruments, including tax-exempt revenue bonds and tax credit bonds, facilitate public-private partnerships—most critical to addressing some of the Region’s infrastructure funding issues.

In recognizing that limited public resources are available to address many large-scale transportation projects in the Region, this strategy simply provides that the Region will consider the feasibility of using innovative public-private partnership arrangements to develop transportation infrastructure where such financing strategies are applicable. These financing arrangements are most applicable where we have identified projects capable of generating their own streams of revenues to offset capital development, operations and maintenance as well as any associated debt service costs.

Potential financing structures identified for the three proposed projects include:

**Special Purpose Facility Financing**

- Total development cost for a regional system of 140 miles including potentially the I-710 corridor, the East-West Corridor, and the I-15 corridor, is estimated to be $16.5 billion.
- Net revenues generated from tolls would be leveraged to issue tax-exempt revenue bonds.
- Capital financing instruments may include a combination of senior-lien tax-exempt revenue bonds and federal credit enhancement in the form of loans (at 33% total eligible capital cost—TIFIA).
- For the preliminary financial analysis, tolls were assumed to be imposed at an average rate of $0.56 per mile.
Regional Rail Capacity Project Financing

- Total development cost for this component is estimated to be $3.4 billion ($1.2 billion for capacity improvements and $2.2 billion for grade separations).
- The financial analysis relies upon taking advantage of the interest rate differential between private sector financing costs and tax-credit bonds, a public financing mechanism that would substitute federal tax credits for interest payments.
- It is assumed that a revenue stream equivalent averaging $5.39 per TEU would be generated to finance the program.

Maglev Project Financing

- The cost for this initial operating segment (IOS) is estimated to be $5.5 billion.
- The financing structure for this project relies upon the issuance of tax-exempt revenue bonds and TIFIA loans.
- An average charge of $0.37 per passenger mile would be needed to finance the project.

■ Funding Components and SCAG’s Regional Checkbook

Table 4.17 itemizes each new funding component. The components, taken together, make up the SCAG Region’s public and private funding strategies in developing a financially feasible and comprehensive 2004 RTP. Furthermore, Table 4.18 outlines SCAG’s regional checkbook for the 2004 RTP.
AGENDA REPORT

TO: Members of the Orangeline Development Authority

FROM: Kirk Cartozian, Chair

DATE: September 12, 2007

SUBJECT: Report of the Authority Board Ad-hoc Contract Negotiating Committee and possible action regarding the professional services agreement with Albert Perdon & Associates

The Authority Board Contract Negotiating Committee will present its report at the Authority Board Meeting.
AGENDA REPORT

TO: Members of the Orangeline Development Authority

FROM: Albert Perdon, Executive Director

DATE: September 12, 2007

SUBJECT: Approval of Warrant Register

RECOMMENDATION

That the Authority Board approves the Warrant Register for the period August 9, 2007 through September 12, 2007.

ATTACHMENT:

The Warrant Register for August 9, 2007 to September 12, 2007 will be available on or before the Authority Board meeting of September 12, 2007.
AGENDA REPORT

TO: Members of the Orangeline Development Authority

FROM: Albert Perdon, Executive Director

DATE: September 12, 2007

SUBJECT: Communication Items to the Board

RECOMMENDATION

That the Authority Board reviews and discusses the information items and provides possible direction to staff.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Treasurer’s Report

The Finance Director’s August 2007 Report is shown in Attachment 1.

In the News/Events

- **Maglev project gets speedy council support.** PALMDALE - City leaders are backing a plan to build a high-speed magnetic levitation, or maglev, train system from Palmdale to cities in Los Angeles and Orange counties. The Orangeline High Speed Maglev project is a collaboration among Palmdale and 13 other cities in the two counties. The City Council on Wednesday approved the project’s financial report and a funding application that will be sent to the California Transportation Commission. Source: jkoren@avpress.com, Antelope Valley Press, August 19, 2007

- **High-Speed Rail Proposals Gain Momentum.** Transportation and mobility are vital for a thriving business environment and a high quality of life, but as California's choked roads and freeways indicate, the state is on a collision course with its own growth. So before the wheels come off the state’s economy, the search is on for the key to unlocking California's growing gridlock. One group, the Sacramento-based California High-Speed Rail Authority, believes its proposal for a statewide system of high-speed trains is just the ticket to keep Californians' mobility and productivity on track. This is not the only proposed high-speed rail fix, however. Regionally, another group, the Orangeline Development Authority, is mounting a public-private effort for a magnetic levitation train system that would whisk riders from Orange County to north Los Angeles County at speeds of up to 240 mph. Both high-speed rail proposals appear to be picking up speed as both public and private interests increasingly eye the possible returns of infrastructure investment and the success of existing high-speed trains in Europe and Asia. Source: Julie Nakashima, California Real estate Journal, September 4, 2007.
Crowds Heed Amtrak's 'All Aboard'. Airplanes are getting stuck in lots of traffic jams this summer, but Amtrak is on a roll. Ridership on the passenger rail system is up 6% so far this year, the biggest jump since the late 1970s. On the Acela Express, trains that run at higher speeds between Washington, New York and Boston, the number of riders has surged 20% over the past 10 months. That's enough new passengers to fill 2,000 Boeing 757 jets. Airport security lines and flight delays are wiping out the time savings of the plane … and Acela is cheaper (the one-way non-discounted fare for the New York-Washington Acela is $199, compared with $324 for the air shuttle). The Acela runs as fast as 135 miles per hour between New York and Washington. Truly high-speed rail requires a straighter, dedicated line built to highly exacting standards. David Gunn, who was fired as president of Amtrak in 2005 after a policy dispute, put it bluntly: "If you really want a super-zippy train from Washington to New York, you have to build another railroad." Source: Daniel Machalaba at daniel.machalaba@wsj.com, Wall Street Journal, August 23, 2007.

Metrolink planners hope better service will lure more riders; But planning experts still question whether it's better to subsidize fares for relatively affluent train-riders, or to put more money into buses. Source: David Reyes, Los Angeles Times Staff Writer, September 1, 2007.

Regional airport network falls flat - Board stalled; A panel resurrected by L.A. Mayor Villaraigosa makes little headway in developing alternatives to expansion of LAX. Panel head says other counties won't take part unless they are sure L.A. won't force new air traffic on other areas. Nearly a year after it reconvened, the authority has no defined mission. Its last meeting was six months ago. And even some of its most passionate supporters say the momentum has stalled. "It's just going nowhere," said county Supervisor Don Knabe, whose district includes LAX. "It's really been at a snail's pace, this whole process, so obviously I'm disappointed."

Meanwhile, Los Angeles Councilman Bill Rosendahl, the man picked by the mayor to head the airport authority's board, said other counties won't join the effort unless they are certain Los Angeles won't force new air traffic on communities that don't want it. Rosendahl, a close Villaraigosa ally, worked with the mayor in December 2005 to settle a lawsuit over the last LAX plan -- a legal agreement that scrapped two-thirds of the projects envisioned for the airport by Villaraigosa's predecessor, Hahn. These days, however, Rosendahl is spending much of his time trying to prevent Villaraigosa's Airport Commission from pushing LAX's northernmost runway closer to Westchester and Playa del Rey, both of which are in his district. Villaraigosa aides say the mayor could wind up pursuing twin strategies -- wooing airlines to L.A.-owned airports in Palmdale and Ontario while trying to get the airport authority to move more passengers by bus and rail to those airports. Source: David Zahniser, Los Angeles Times Staff Writer, September 6, 2007.

Meetings

Authority Board Members and the Executive Director participated in or are scheduled to participate in the following meetings:

Orange County Transportation Authority – August 9, 2007; Vice Chair Edgar and Executive Director attended OCTA Board Transit Planning & Operations Committee to secure support for the Orangeline Maglev. (See staff report in Attachment 3.)

City of Palmdale – August 15, 2007; Executive Director attended Palmdale City Council meeting. City Council approved resolutions in support of Orangeline financial plan and proposal to California Transportation Commission.

Los Angeles City Council – August 15, 2007; Chair Cartozian and Executive Director met with City Councilmember Bernard Parks.
• **City of Santa Ana** – August 20, 2007; Chair Cartozian and Executive Director made a presentation to Santa Ana City Council, which approved motion for Santa Ana to join the Authority.

• **L.A. Chamber of Commerce** – August 22, 2007; Executive Director attended Chamber Transportation Committee meeting and met afterwards with Kathleen Brown, Managing Director, Goldman Sachs, regarding Orangeline Maglev investment opportunities.

• **Los Angeles City Councilmember Ed Reyes** – Chair Cartozian and Executive Director met with Suzanne Jimenez, staff to City Councilmember Reyes.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Treasurer’s Reports August 2007
2. OCTA Transit Planning and Operation Committee August 9, 2007 Meeting, Item 7 - Orangeline Magnetic Levitation, Discussion Notes
3. News Clippings: Maglev project gets speedy council support
   - High-Speed Rail Proposals Gain Momentum
   - Metrolink planners hope better service will lure more riders
   - Regional airport network falls flat - Board stalled
The Treasurer’s August 2007 Report will be available on or before the September 12, 2007 Authority Board meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cash Balance (8-9-07)</td>
<td>$84,693.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Receipts</td>
<td>113,051.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Expenditures</td>
<td>(19,790.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Cash Balance (9/12/07)</td>
<td>$177,954.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W. Michael McCormick
Treasurer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check Number</th>
<th>Payee</th>
<th>Check Amount</th>
<th>Transaction Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1203</td>
<td>Albert Perdon &amp; Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>$14,014.33</td>
<td>Inv. #OLDA 07-09 dated 8/1/07: Charges 8/1/07-8/31/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inv. #OLDA 07-09exp dated 8/1/07: Expense Charges 7/1/07-8/31/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1204</td>
<td>Colantuono &amp; Levin, PC</td>
<td>1,282.50</td>
<td>Inv. #15072 dated 8/9/07: Professional Services 7/1/07-7/31/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1206</td>
<td>Diane Martinez</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>OLDA Meeting Stipend 8/8/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207</td>
<td>Erhart Food Service</td>
<td>493.62</td>
<td>Contract dated 7/2/07: Catering Services 7/1/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1208</td>
<td>Frank Gurule</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>OLDA Meeting Stipend 8/9/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1209</td>
<td>Kirk Cantozian</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>OLDA Meeting Stipend 8/8/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210</td>
<td>Laura Lee</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>OLDA Meeting Stipend 8/8/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1211</td>
<td>Maria Davilla</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>OLDA Meeting Stipend 8/8/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1212</td>
<td>Marsha McLean</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>OLDA Meeting Stipend 8/8/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1213</td>
<td>Scott A. Larsen</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>OLDA Meeting Stipend 8/8/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1214</td>
<td>Thomas Martin</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>OLDA Meeting Stipend 8/8/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215</td>
<td>Tony Lima</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>OLDA Meeting Stipend 8/8/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1216</td>
<td>Transit Media Consultants</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>Invoices dated 8/1/07: Monthly Services 8/1/07-8/31/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tony Edgar</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>OLDA Meeting Stipend 8/8/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$19,790.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OCTA Transit Planning and Operation Committee
August 9, 2007 Meeting
Item 7 - Orangeline Magnetic Levitation
Discussion Notes

Staff Presentation
- Staff outlined the contents of the Staff Report recommending that OCTA continue with the projects in the Long Range Plan (which does not include the Orangeline High Speed Maglev) and that it study alternatives to the maglev in cooperation with LACMTA
- Art Leahy, OCTA Executive Officer
  - MTA is not supportive of the project
  - The project is redundant to Metrolink and the state high speed rail project
  - The project is changing; there was no orderly evaluation and there are questionable assumptions

Public Comment
- Ralph Rodriguez, City Council Member, City of La Palma
  - The Councilmember spoke in opposition to the Orangeline High Speed Maglev
    - La Palma is against the Orangeline; we’re not against transportation; this is not NIMBYism
    - People of La Palma have spoken; no public subsidy for private profit
    - This particular proposal is not in the best interest of Orange County
- Troy Edgar, City Council Member, City of Los Alamitos and Vice Chair, Orangeline Development Authority
  - The Authority Vice Chair spoke in support of the Orangeline High Speed Maglev

Committee Discussion
Mark Rosen, Councilmember, City of Garden Grove
- Several years ago, then Mayor Bruce Barrows of Cerritos appealed to us to join the Authority, stating there would be no cost (for constructing the system)
- Two months later, he told us we would have to pay dues to be a member of the Authority; so, we dropped out
- Garden Grove owned and sold some of the right-of-way
- A Walmart Super Center is being built; it depends on the right-of-way for parking
- We can’t hold onto the right-of-way indefinitely for hypothetical projects
Miguel Pulido, Mayor, City of Santa Ana
- This is valuable right-of-way
- We’re trying to widen Bristol; difficult to get needed property (hand-to-hand combat)
- We need to keep options open for the future
- Congestion will become so severe
- The Orangeline is not redundant
- Look at the numbers; they’re not huge for Metrolink
- I’ve talked to SCAG’s Mark Pisano; he said, “What do O.C. cities want?”
- We want to meet with Garden Grove, Tustin and Irvine to discuss the Orangeline
- The City of Orange doesn’t want the California state high speed rail going through their city; that’s why the California High Speed Rail ends in Anaheim and Santa Ana is not served by their proposal
- Orangeline stations are 6 miles apart by design
- We want to work with Garden Grove
We need transportation alternatives
I imagine potentially different modes – some underground
I see Mexico City – I’m from Mexico City – they have underground rail systems
We need to see the footprint of the Orangeline, what the options are, integrate the systems
In Santa Ana, perhaps some underground, some above ground
Let’s (the Committee) not go full speed ahead with a motion to not support the maglev; let’s understand everything
Don’t cut off options; let’s look at the options
There is no silver bullet; there is no one thing that will solve all the problems
We just widened the 22 Freeway, which was just completed a few weeks ago, and portions are already jamming up
I’m not in favor of staff recommendations regarding maglev

Richard Dixon, Mayor, City of Lake Forest
• In defense of maglev, in 2000, I rode with SCAG’s consultant (and now the Authority’s Executive Director) on the maglev in Germany; it’s very quite, you heard nothing as it went by.
• It doesn’t have to go 250 mph; it can go slower
• But, I still don’t support the Orangeline project
• I’m the first Vice President at SCAG
• SCAG’s maps don’t show the Orangeline High Speed Maglev
• SCAG’s maps show 1) LAX-March, which was chosen for the highest ridership; and 2) Los Angeles-Orange County (but with major ridership hurdles)

Cathy Green, City Council Member, City of Huntington Beach
• A question to Ralph Rodriguez: What about under-grounding the Orangeline?
• Rodriguez: there is a high water table - in dry years it’s only 18 feet down
• Under-grounding was discounted because of cost, we did consider it

Mark Rosen, City Council Member, City of Garden Grove
• You don’t want it at-grade
• Intrigued by Richard Dixon’s comment about no noise
• The benefit of the overhead Orangeline High Speed Maglev is that you can use the area underneath the guideway for something else
• Every major system goes underground

Ralph Rodriguez, City Council Member, City of La Palma
• The Orangeline rendition shows green space under the guideway; that’s positive
• Our problem is that it goes past our backyards
• We’re going to hold public forums
• I was active in securing support for Measure M
• I focused on Measure M projects that are beneficial to everyone

Cathy Green, City Council Member, City of Huntington Beach
• I represent you (speaking to Ralph Rodriguez); I don’t know what you want; I want to hear from you
• At some point we’re hitting gridlock
• People won’t quit having babies
• We need to look at the future

Ralph Rodriguez, City Council Member, City of La Palma
• I’ll invite you to talk
• We’re built out
• I wish we could add housing
• Santa Ana’s growth is terrific; but no high-rises in our city

John Moorlach, Orange County Supervisor
• Two points:
  o An outside organization has come up with the idea of the Orangeline; is the OCTA’s problem with the Orangeline the fact that it is coming from an outside organization?
  o Is the problem that this proposal is coming in too late?
• Question to Ralph Rodriguez: If we merged the Orangeline into OCTA, took it over, made the Authority a division of OCTA, would that make it acceptable?

Ralph Rodriguez, City Council Member, City of La Palma
• We’re focusing on the OCTA “Go Local” program; that will meet our needs
• Buena Park’s new Metrolink station is a short distance from LA Palma; I hope that it is successful; however, we know the prospects of most rail projects
• Metrolink meets our region’s needs
• Orangeline prices are not viable; the car is more convenient; I won’t ride the train; I’ve gone through the Orangeline reports; I’ve studied their financial plan; the data that is being used to sell the project is the problem

Art Leahy, Executive Officer, OCTA
• The Orangeline High Speed Maglev is not in the Long Range Transportation Plan
• We recommend working with LACMTA and others
• We support LA-to-Anaheim HSR
• We support Anaheim-to-Ontario Maglev
• The problem with the Orangeline is the weak analytics

John Moorlach, Orange County Supervisor
• Why is MTA not supportive

Art Leahy, Executive Officer, OCTA
• Weak analytical analysis

Janet Nguyen, Orange County Supervisor
• I was on the Garden Grove City Council (when this was presented to us and Garden Grove voted to support the concept)
• We need to do something
• We need public opinion
• Will underground impact neighbors?
• OCTA, what are you going to do with the P.E. right-of-way? We need to know
• Garden Grove spent/has earmarked $200,000 for a park
• We need a general agreement; are you going to use the right of way (for transportation) or not?
  • If yes, then let’s decide what to do with it.
  • The land surrounding the right-of-way was formerly commercial; now it’s residential
  • We thought the completion of the 22 freeway widening project would help reduce congestion; there are segments that are already congested.

Richard Dixon, Mayor, City of Lake Forest
• There have been some misleading comments made regarding:
  o Who owns the concept
  o If we’re not doing this we’re doing nothing
• There is a plan for use of the right-of-way; it complements Measure M
There are 2 specific maglev projects in the County
“These folks” have another plan
There are two maglevs coming into Orange County
  o Anaheim to Ontario and on to Las Vegas
  o Along the I-405 from LAX to Irvine
Next time, this Board needs to see the maps of the other maglev plans
The problem with SCAG
  o We don’t like it but it’s an animal we have to accept
  o We have to deal with it; federal funding requires that a project to be funded with federal funds must be approved by SCAG
  o A project has to be in the SCAG RTP to get state and federal funds
The Orangeline is not in the RTP; the other maglevs are in the RTP
I support SCAG
I’d rather see the whole picture

Art Brown, City Council Member, City of Buena Park
On October 14, 2003, a motion to have the City of Buena Park join the Authority died
We don’t officially support the project
Please remove our name from the list of “supporters”

Mark Rosen, Mayor Pro Tem, City of Garden Grove
We cannot accept an at-grade system on the P.E. right-of-way
We should take a position on this – no at-grade transportation solution

Miguel Pulido, Mayor, City of Santa Ana
Re water table; It can be managed
Under-grounding may be the best; let’s look at it; let’s not get myopic; it’s years away
I’m hoping that the Santa Ana City Council will say that we want to get involved

Re redundancy; The P.E. right-of-way parallels the I-5 and I-405
We’re at a cross roads; let’s slow down a bit before cutting the maglev off
Let’s bring SCAG (Pisano) and consultants in to discuss
Take 5 meetings if we have to
Later today we’re meeting with Irvine
I make a substitute motion to continue this item

Vote on substitute motion
Dixon opposed to the motion
Motion adopted to continue item; all agreed except Dixon

The OCTA staff report, with included Authority responses to the issues raised, is shown in the attached.

---

1The week before the October 14, 2003 City Council meeting, the Buena Park City Council, voting as a Committee of the Whole in a Study Session, approved a motion by Art Brown recommending that the City Council at its next regularly scheduled meeting approve a motion to have the City join the Orangeline Development Authority. The motion passed by a vote of 3 to 2 (Patsy Marshal and Don McCay voted in opposition; Art Brown, Steve Berry and Jim Dow voted in support. At the October 14 meeting, the motion failed due to Jim Dow switching his position from support to oppose the recommendation. The City Council members voiced their support for the studies to investigate the feasibility of the Orangeline High Speed Maglev, but they were not prepared to join the Authority at that time.
News Clippings

Maglev project gets speedy council support

System would link up 14 L.A., Orange County communities


By JAMES RUFUS KOREN
Antelope Valley Press Staff Writer

PALMDALE - City leaders are backing a plan to build a high-speed magnetic levitation, or maglev, train system from Palmdale to cities in Los Angeles and Orange counties.

The Orangeline High Speed Maglev project is a collaboration among Palmdale and 13 other cities in the two counties. The City Council on Wednesday approved the project's financial report and a funding application that will be sent to the California Transportation Commission.

Approving the documents does not require any action or financial obligation by the city, but Assistant City Manager Laurie Lile said approving the report and application is a statement that the city is still on board. The council approved the documents unanimously and without discussion.

Al Perdon, executive director of the Orangeline Development Authority, said it is important for all 14 cities to approve the documents because the show of support will help make the project attractive to investors.

"We need to convince investors that the government factor is not a risk," Perdon said. "We need to show them evidence of strong government commitment to the project. ... Approving key documents and key policy issues, that strengthens the evidence that we have."

Private investment will be vital for the maglev project because, Perdon said, the project cannot rely on tax dollars.

"What's different about this project - from Caltrans, from the MTA - is that it really is conceived and promoted and pursued by local cities," Perdon said. "There's no state mandate for this, and there's no guaranteed funding. Caltrans relies heavily on the gas tax. MTA relies on sales tax dollars."

The application to the transportation commission is seeking funding to complete preliminary environmental, engineering and planning work on the project - work that, when funded, would take two or three years and cost about $200 million.

Perdon said that funding - which could come from loan or from loan guarantees - will allow the development authority to nail down plans and hopefully secure the $19 billion it will take to construct the maglev system.

"The billions are there if we can solve the millions," Palmdale City Councilman Steve Hofbauer said. The maglev system would start in Palmdale, head south into Santa Clarita, go through Los Angeles and continue south through communities in southeast Los Angeles County and northern Orange County, including South Gate, Downey, Cerritos, Los Alamitos and Anaheim.

The line would follow existing road and railroad rights of way, including the Antelope Valley Freeway through Palmdale and Santa Clarita.

Perdon said about half of the 14 cities have approved the funding application and financial plan.

As the current 14 member cities go through the process of approving the documents, Perdon said, the Orangeline authority is trying to get 14 other cities along the proposed route to join.

Hofbauer said the maglev system is a better option than the high-speed rail system the state is working toward because the latter system is a standard wheel-on-track railroad and because it would require a lot of digging.

"It would basically mean digging a ditch from San Diego to San Francisco," Hofbauer said. "That's a lot of dirt that has to be moved to make that work."

jkoren@avpress.com

Source: http://www.avpress.com/n/19/0819_s14.hts
High-Speed Rail Proposals Gain Momentum

September 4, 2007

By JULIE NAKASHIMA
California Real Estate Journal Staff Writer

Transportation and mobility are vital for a thriving business environment and a high quality of life, but as California's choked roads and freeways indicate, the state is on a collision course with its own growth. So before the wheels come off the state's economy, the search is on for the key to unlocking California's growing gridlock.

One group, the Sacramento-based California High-Speed Rail Authority, believes its proposal for a statewide system of high-speed trains is just the ticket to keep Californians' mobility and productivity on track.

This is not the only proposed high-speed rail fix, however. Regionally, another group, the Orangeline Development Authority, is mounting a public-private effort for a magnetic levitation train system that would whisk riders from Orange County to north Los Angeles County at speeds of up to 240 mph.

Both high-speed rail proposals appear to be picking up speed as both public and private interests increasingly eye the possible returns of infrastructure investment and the success of existing high-speed trains in Europe and Asia.

The California High-Speed Rail Authority is a state entity that is guided by a policy board whose nine members were appointed through legislation, according to Kip D. Field, deputy program manager. He recently discussed the project at a meeting of the Business Development Association of Orange County.

"[We have] not only the responsibility, but the authority to design, build and operate" a statewide high-speed train system, Field said.

Of keen interest to an association of engineering and design firms, Field noted that the authority hires consultants to supplement its small staff. So far it has entered into contractual arrangements with 90 firms throughout the state, he said.

The authority calls California a linchpin in the U.S. and global economy. But with a population that is projected to increase by 30 percent over the next 20 years, the Golden State is expected to be home to 50 million people by 2030.

That means more cars, more flights, and more movement of goods every day. As the authority's chairman, former state Sen. Quentin L. Kopp, observed: "The strain on transportation facilities will exceed and just overwhelm mobility in California."

To avert this looming train wreck, the authority has proposed a $33 billion system that could shoot passengers from Los Angeles to San Diego in less than an hour and 20 minutes, and to San Francisco in just over 2½ hours, traveling at speeds of up to 220 mph. The system also would serve shorter intercity trips, such as Anaheim to Los Angeles' Union Station in 20 minutes, or downtown Los Angeles to the Palmdale and Ontario airports in 25 minutes.

The proposed 700-mile-long route runs from Sacramento and the San Francisco Bay Area in the north, heading south through the Central Valley to the Los Angeles area and down to San Diego by way of the Inland Empire.

The proposed system would use existing rights-of-way and rail and freeway corridors to minimize the impact on farmland, wetlands and sensitive habitat. All stops are planned in existing urban areas, helping to curb sprawl while promoting sustainable transit-oriented development.

Challenges Ahead

Field previously served as project manager for the preparation of the program-level environmental document, approved in November 2005, for the proposed statewide system. His current role as deputy program manager involves preliminary engineering and project-specific environmental review.
After the approval of the programmatic statewide environmental document, he said, the state granted the authority a budget of $14.3 million in the past fiscal year. With that money, the authority has undertaken the next step in the implementation process - performing project-specific studies focusing on segments within each area.

However, that budgeting ended on June 30, and the impasse in passing this year’s budget threw funding targets into question.

Field said the highest level of funding suggested for this year’s state budget was $60 million. Ultimately, $20 million was allotted to high-speed rail.

Over the past six to eight months, the authority has accomplished a number of goals through its regional and segment teams, Field said. This includes completing the environmental scoping in two of the segments, from Los Angeles to Anaheim and from Los Angeles to Palmdale.

"Those two segments are ready to roll right into the specific engineering and all the technical studies that go along with the environmental work to complete those documents," he said.

The goal is to complete the project-specific environmental documents and preliminary engineering in preparation for a bond measure that would fund a limited portion of the system between the Los Angeles metropolitan area and the San Francisco Bay Area. The $10 billion bond issue, which is separate from the authority’s funding, is on California’s 2008 general election ballot. Originally slated in 2006, the measure was delayed to avoid competition with last year’s massive infrastructure package.

Field said the Los Angeles-to-Orange County segment, as a first phase, has been designed down to Anaheim, although an extension to Irvine is under consideration.

"Because of some of the problematic physical features south of Anaheim, the authority is only pushing for Anaheim at this time," he said.

Whether one is looking at the local level or the state level, Field said, the system’s benefits include a reduction in energy consumption and air pollutants from cars.

"It’s very environmentally friendly," he said. In addition, it would yield safety and economic benefits by improving the existing rail corridors.

"The most prominent thing we see in terms of benefits in Orange County has to do with grade separation," Field said. The existing rail corridors between Los Angeles and Anaheim are rife with at-grade crossings where cars and trains cross paths, contributing to traffic delays, noise and pollution from the idling of cars. Occasionally, more tragic results ensue.

"It’s an unsafe situation in any case," Field said. "As you grade separate systems throughout the state and provide another means for riders throughout the state," Field said, "you remove traffic and improve both the existing freight and commuter lines on the corridors involved."

A high-speed transit system running between population centers in California sounds like a good idea to Edwin Minch, principal in John Minch & Associates, an environmental consulting firm specializing in archeology, paleontology and biology.

"That’s something that I would definitely consider," Minch said.

Minch’s wife is from the Bay Area, so they make that trip up there several times a year. By car this takes 6½ hours, he said, but by plane it’s not much faster by the time one gets to the airport, parks and passes through security.

Minch acknowledged that for shorter intercity trips, getting people to forgo their private automobiles would be a tough sell. But as California becomes more crowded and the freeway system becomes more difficult and frustrating to navigate, the selling job likely would get easier if stations are strategically located.

"One of the most challenging things about building and designing a system like this is that it’s great for the people who are along the lines or at the stops, but in outlying areas it’s still difficult to get to," Minch said.

Another High-Speed Proposal

The Sacramento-based high-speed rail effort isn’t the only proposal out there.

The Orangeline Development Authority, a joint exercise-of-powers authority, is pushing a 108-mile maglev system that would zip passengers from Palmdale to Irvine in one hour. The system would travel on an elevated guideway above existing highway or railroad corridors at speeds of up to 240 mph, with an average speed of 90 mph in urban areas.

Unlike the state-developed high-speed rail project, the maglev proposal is a public-private enterprise that was initiated by the cities along the route, according to Executive Director Albert Perdon. He said the Orangeline Development Authority has completed its initial preliminary engineering and financial planning studies for the system, which is estimated to cost $19 billion, or $176 million per mile, to build.

"These studies verify that this system can be built, constructed and operated with private funding," Perdon said. "What we’re doing now is meeting with private investors to bring this investment opportunity to their attention, and hopefully be successful in attracting their interest."

Perdon said the authority would be making its second trip to New York soon to talk to Wall Street investment bankers, hedge funds and equity investors.

"There’s a growing interest in the investment community in investing in infrastructure projects," he noted. "The issues will be, what are their terms and how secure is the project, the ridership numbers and revenue
streams. In our initial meeting with private investors, one of their key concerns that they want to make sure we'll be able to address is the degree of political support for the project.

"This is the highest-risk period, when you're just starting this up."

To that end, the group is going through the process of talking to all the cities along the corridor to elicit their support.

The authority currently is comprised of 14 cities - Artesia, Bell, Bellflower, Cerritos, Cudahy, Downey, Huntington Park, Los Alamitos, Maywood, Palmdale, Paramount, Santa Clarita, South Gate and Vernon - that contribute an annual fee. Supporting agencies include the Gateway Cities Council of Governments and the Southern California Association of Governments, as well as the cities of Garden Grove, Huntington Beach, Long Beach and Stanton. On Aug. 20, the Santa Ana City Council approved membership in the authority.

Of the $3 million invested in the project so far, Perdon said $1.5 million represents private investment. The authority has a developer team - composed largely of infrastructure development companies such as planning, architectural and engineering firms - that has joined with it to pursue the project.

To its proponents, maglev is the way of the future - the most advanced high-speed ground transportation technology in the world. Besides the Orangeline, other regional maglev lines are proposed, including a Southern California effort spearheaded by San Diego attorney and real estate developer Sandor W. Shapery.

Perdon said maglev has several benefits over conventional steel-wheel technology that make it ideal for serving more densely populated urban areas. For example, it generates about half the noise of the latter technology at high speeds, because there's no contact between a steel wheel and a steel track.

Instead, Perdon said the maglev vehicle "floats" above the track on a monorail guideway. A second benefit is that it has lower operating and maintenance costs because the motor is located in the guideway. Therefore, the vehicle is lighter and can accelerate and decelerate much faster than a steel track vehicle.

According to Perdon, a conventional steel-wheel train requires 14 miles to go from zero to 185 mph.

"The maglev can do that in 2.6 miles," Perdon said. "The significance of that for the service that we're providing, which is commuter service, is that we can have stations fairly close together, maybe six miles apart, and we can still maintain an average speed with station stops at 70 to 90 miles per hour."

A fourth advantage is that maglev can offer more frequent service, because the system is automated. Rather than having a 10-car train with a conductor and engineer coming every 15 to 30 minutes, the maglev could have shorter trains coming every five minutes.

"You don't have to schedule your arrival to the train station like you do with typical high-speed intercity trains," Perdon said.

Catalyst for Development

While some observers describe the Orangeline maglev proposal as a competitor to the high-speed rail project proposed by Sacramento, Perdon sees the project as being more complementary. He actually envisions both systems being built, with the maglev feeding into the rail system.

"We'll pick people up at a lot of stations they don't serve," Perdon said.

Like the High-Speed Rail Authority, the Orangeline Development Authority views its project as a catalyst for development.

"First of all, we're the Orangeline Development Authority, not the Orangeline construction authority," Perdon pointed out. "The Orangeline maglev is a vehicle to enable our cities to achieve the development goals that they have set for themselves. They're revising their general plans and taking the Orangeline maglev into account."

He added that some cities are putting the Orangeline in their General Plan, showing where the station would be located and looking at rezoning the surrounding land to create higher-density zoning, mixed use and focused growth around those stations. He sees cities transferring development rights for the areas not served by transit to the areas that are served by transit.

"The hot property in Southern California is the property that is around existing transit stations and transit sites that are being planned," Perdon said.

- E-mail Julie_Nakashima@DailyJournal.com
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Metrolink planners hope better service will lure more riders

• But planning experts still question whether it’s better to subsidize fares for relatively affluent train-riders, or to put more money into buses.

September 1, 2007

By David Reyes, Los Angeles Times Staff Writer

The Santa Ana train station begins to come to life in the glow of the predawn light. The station is just one hub in an expanding Metrolink system in Orange County, where transportation officials report an 8% rise in ridership from last year. Their goal by 2009 is to have commuter trains running every 30 minutes from 5 a.m. to midnight weekdays between Fullerton and Laguna Niguel.

As the Metrolink train pulled into the Santa Ana station, Martha Hernandez grabbed her purse, carry-all and coffee and boarded the train to Union Station.

At 6:22 a.m. the train will take less than an hour to reach Los Angeles, where she will take a shuttle to USC for graduate classes in social work.

She is a new Metrolink rider. After she left her car at home and triumphed over ticket machines and train schedules, she is now a believer: "It beats driving a car and fighting freeway traffic," she said.

Hernandez is part of the 8% jump in Metrolink ridership on the Orange County line over last year that Orange County transportation planners hope will continue to grow. With Monday’s approval of $60 million to eliminate the need for trains to blast their horns at most Orange County rail crossings, they are slowly putting the pieces together for expanded Metrolink service.

By 2009, the goal is to have commuter trains running every 30 minutes from 5 a.m. to midnight on weekdays, between Fullerton and Laguna Niguel -- the bookends of Orange County.
Seven locomotives and 59 more passenger cars have been ordered, a new station in Buena Park opens Tuesday, new track has been laid and parking lot improvements are scheduled for Fullerton, Orange, Tustin, Irvine and Laguna Niguel.

For a county that has habitually invested its transportation dollars in freeways and road improvements, the Metrolink expansion marks a new course.

But the value of subsidizing train riders is questioned by some critics, who say rail passengers come from households earning more than $85,000 a year who, unlike traditional bus riders, have the option of driving a car to work.

The recent bus strike highlighted the reliance of the county’s workforce on buses. Many of the county’s 225,000 daily bus riders -- 72% of whom don’t own a vehicle -- walked, biked and carpooled during the 9-day strike.

Bus ridership receives a greater percentage of subsidy in the county than commuter rail, the Orange County Transportation Agency said. Bus riders pay about 25% of the actual cost for transportation compared to more than 50% for Metrolink riders, the agency said.

In addition to higher household income, Metrolink riders average 38 miles each trip. By comparison, half the bus riders earn less than $20,000 a year -- about $45,000 below the county’s median -- and travel only five miles a trip, according to OCTA surveys.

"What that means is that each Metrolink rider is more likely to own a car and has the option of driving that car to work," said Art Leahy, chief executive of the agency, which operates Metrolink in Southern California with four other agencies. "Every person on a Metrolink train is like the equivalent of taking one car off the Interstate 5."

With 13,000 daily Metrolink commuters, "it's not a great percentage," Leahy conceded. But because that reduction occurs at peak periods, he said they represent roughly one lane of traffic on Interstate 5 at crunch time.

That's only a marginal benefit, said Genevieve Giuliano, a USC professor and director of the National Center for Metropolitan Transportation Research. She said the claim that each train rider represents a car removed from the freeway is only partly correct because they are considered discretionary riders and can drive to work, and sometimes do so.

Metrolink does provide more overall capacity for the county's transportation system, she said. "But the question is, should I be subsidizing people who make $85,000 a year or subsidizing those in Santa Ana who earn considerably less?"

"For me, I find it hard to defend subsidizing people earning $85,000 when there is only marginal benefit," she said.

It's a tough policy question, concedes OCTA board member Art Brown, a prominent rail advocate. Brown, who is a Buena Park councilman, has represented Orange County on Metrolink’s board since 2002.

"When people tell me we shouldn't be subsidizing Metrolink and other transit, I ask if they use the freeway," Brown said. "Because having more Metrolink riders means fewer cars for you to contend with on the freeway."

Hernandez, who lives in Costa Mesa, said she empathizes with those who rely on a bus to get to work. "We had a caregiver for my mother who was always worried about the bus. She was so dependent on buses" because she had no car.

Filiberto Bernal, who lives in Rancho Bernardo and works for Southern California Edison in Commerce, has a 216-mile daily commute.

Asked if Metrolink should continue to subsidize its riders, he responded: "It's a loaded question because you're asking somebody who would want to continue to be subsidized as a Metrolink rider."

Bernal acknowledged that, unlike most bus riders, he owns a car and can drive to work, and does so occasionally.

Metrolink’s purpose, Brown said, "is to get people off the freeways" at peak commute hours. With the expansion, trains will run every 30 minutes in the county, offering consistency and a greater incentive for motorists to use the service, he said.

"We're also trying to get the fare down so riders will pay slightly more than bus fares when the expansion is finished," he said.

Freeway projects will remain the transit agency’s main focus. A voter-approved county initiative to raise $12 billion for transportation through 2041 calls for 43% of the tax money to be spent improving freeways, 32% on streets and 25% on public transit, including commuter rail, such as Metrolink, and buses.

High gas prices and a congested Riverside Freeway may have spurred a 14% Metrolink ridership surge from the previous year on the Inland Empire-Orange County Line, transit agency officials said. Passengers on the county’s three Metrolink lines took 3.8 million trips last year.

Overall, Metrolink passengers took 10.5 million trips during the same period in Southern California.

david.reyes@latimes.com
Regional airport network falls flat - Board stalled

- A panel resurrected by L.A. Mayor Villaraigosa makes little headway in developing alternatives to expansion of LAX
- Panel head says other counties won’t take part unless they are sure L.A. won’t force new air traffic on other areas.

September 6, 2007

By David Zahniser, Los Angeles Times Staff Writer

When Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa scaled back an $11-billion plan for modernizing Los Angeles International Airport two years ago, he promised neighborhoods near LAX that he would embrace a different aviation strategy: sending air traffic to other airports across the region.

To reach that goal, Villaraigosa resurrected an obscure five-county panel on air travel that had disbanded in 2003 because of lack of interest.

But even as the mayor’s appointees prepare a new plan for LAX, the Southern California Regional Airport Authority is once again having trouble getting off the ground.

Nearly a year after it reconvened, the authority has no defined mission. Its last meeting was six months ago. And even some of its most passionate supporters say the momentum has stalled.

"It’s just going nowhere," said county Supervisor Don Knabe, whose district includes LAX. "It’s really been at a snail’s pace, this whole process, so obviously I’m disappointed."

Knabe is one of just four voting members on the revamped airport authority’s board of directors. Some say the more accurate number is three, because Riverside County’s representative stopped attending after the first meeting.

Either way, foes of airport expansion at LAX -- who largely embrace the idea of a regional airport network -- say the authority looks more irrelevant than ever.

"I don’t even pay attention to it now, because literally the last I heard was that all they were doing was talking about organizing," said Westchester resident David Voss, a former airport commissioner under former Mayor James Hahn.

With its meetings in May, June and July canceled, the regional airport authority is shooting for Sept. 13 as its next session. That would be the agency’s fourth since June 2006, when Villaraigosa announced that a reconstituted airport authority would implement his vision of "regionalization" -- making Los Angeles more like New York City or Washington, D.C., metropolitan areas with more than one major airport.

Despite the slow pace, Villaraigosa aides say they already have made critical progress on regional air travel, bringing one United Airlines flight a day to the city’s airport in Palmdale and 30 new direct flights per day to LA/Ontario International Airport.

Meanwhile, Los Angeles Councilman Bill Rosendahl, the man picked by the mayor to head the airport authority’s board, said other counties won’t join the effort unless they are certain Los Angeles won’t force new air traffic on communities that don’t want it.

"That’s why I’m taking my time," he said.

"I want to show that suspicions of L.A. taking over are totally unfounded. Those were the suspicions in the beginning, so I’m in no hurry to force anybody to do anything."

Rosendahl, a close Villaraigosa ally, worked with the mayor in December 2005 to settle a lawsuit over the last LAX plan -- a legal agreement that scrapped two-thirds of the projects envisioned for the airport by Villaraigosa’s predecessor, Hahn.

The settlement was supposed to launch a new era in which Los Angeles World Airports, the agency that runs LAX, would shift its emphasis toward a regional approach.

These days, however, Rosendahl is spending much of his time trying to prevent Villaraigosa’s Airport Commission from pushing LAX’s northernmost runway closer to Westchester and Playa del Rey, both of which are in his district.

Villaraigosa aides say the mayor could wind up pursuing twin strategies -- wooing airlines to L.A.-owned airports in Palmdale and Ontario while trying to get the airport authority to move more passengers by bus and rail to those airports.

To achieve the latter goal, the authority could push for an extension of the Metro Gold Line east to Ontario, Villaraigosa spokesman Matt Szabo said.

"We’re doing what we can, as fast as we can, to regionalize air travel by encouraging expansion at Ontario and other airports," he said.
Still, a rail extension to Ontario has no funding and would take several years. So would Rosendahl's vision of building light rail or magnetically levitated rail between Anaheim and Ontario.

For the time being, much of the regional airport authority's time has focused on minutiae -- a 29-page report that shows five ways of structuring the agency's board.

To persuade more elected officials to take part, board members are talking about prohibiting the agency from gaining the power of eminent domain, the ability to take private property.

Orange County officials want a "pledge of non-interference" guaranteeing that the authority won't try to increase the number of flights out of John Wayne Airport, said Mario Mainero, chief of staff to Orange County Supervisor John Moorlach.

The county also wants a guarantee that the authority won't lobby the federal government to secure increases in air travel out of Orange County.

"Until . . . they're willing to do those things, the supervisor is not comfortable committing the county to rejoining that agency," Mainero said.

Riverside County Supervisor Bob Buster, who skipped two of the board's last three meetings, said his constituents also have little interest in more air traffic, since they are already upset over night flights by the shipping company DHL.

"That's soured people on the introduction of any other flights -- commercial or otherwise," he said.

Knabe, who served on the first incarnation of the airport authority in the early 1980s, said he fears the agency could end up becoming too welcoming, winding up with as many as two dozen members. Some would-be representatives only want to join to protect their own backyards, he said.

david.zahniser@latimes.com