Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS **CTC Meeting**: October 9, 2019

From: SUSAN BRANSEN, Executive Director

Reference Number: 4.9, Action

Prepared By: Paul Golaszewski
Deputy Director

Published Date: October 7, 2019

Subject: Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Interstate 105 ExpressLanes Project – Toll Facility Approval Request

Issue:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve an application from the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro) for the Interstate 105 (I-105) ExpressLanes Project in Los Angeles County?

Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Commission approve LA Metro's application to develop and operate a high-occupancy toll facility on I-105 in Los Angeles County, as specified in the application received by the Commission on August 22, 2019.

This recommendation is based on findings that the application meets the criteria for approval set forth in Assembly Bill (AB) 194 (Frazier, 2015), as well as consideration of public comments received via email and at the public hearing held on September 25, 2019. Given the project is still undergoing the Project Approval/Environmental Document phase, it is important to note that the Commission's 2016 Guidelines for Toll Facility Applications include an expectation for applicants to request approval of any changes to the project that substantially alter the scope, schedule, or terms of the approved project. It is also important to note that the approval of tolling authority under AB 194 does not commit the Commission to approve future applications for funding for the project.

Background:

In 2015, the Legislature passed AB 194, which delegates to the Commission the responsibility to approve the tolling of transportation facilities in California. Section 149.7 of the California Streets and Highways Code, as amended by AB 194, authorizes regional transportation agencies or the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to apply to the Commission to develop and operate high-occupancy toll lanes or other toll facilities, including the administration and operation of a value pricing program and exclusive or preferential lane facilities for public transit or freight.

Applications for the development and operation of toll facilities are subject to review and approval by the Commission pursuant to criteria set forth in the Guidelines for Toll Facility Applications (guidelines) adopted by the Commission at its March 2016 meeting. It is important to note that the Commission's guidelines state that after the Commission has approved a project, it will have no further role in reviewing or approving changes to the project except at the request of the sponsor agency. If the sponsor agency finds it necessary or appropriate to make changes to the toll facility project after approval, the Commission expects the agency will request approval of the change by submitting a supplement to the project application setting forth a description of the change and the reasons for it. A change approval request is only necessary if the change substantially alters the scope, schedule, or terms of the approved project. The Commission will approve the change if it finds that the revised project meets the evaluation criteria set forth in the guidelines.

LA Metro Application

On August 22, 2019, the Commission received an application from LA Metro to implement a high-occupancy toll facility along 15.7 miles of Interstate 105 (I-105) between Interstate 405 and Interstate 605. This highly-travelled corridor traverses nine cities and unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County, including Downey, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Inglewood, Los Angeles, Lynwood, Norwalk, Paramount and South Gate. The corridor currently has one high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane operating at HOV2+. The proposed project would expand upon LA Metro’s network of high-occupancy toll lanes, which it refers to as ExpressLanes. LA Metro currently operates ExpressLanes on the Interstate-110 and Interstate I-10 freeways.

The application identifies three project alternatives, as LA Metro has not yet finished preparing the draft Environmental Document, which it expects to complete in the fall of 2019. The first alternative is the no-build scenario; the second alternative involves converting the existing single HOV lane to a single ExpressLane in each direction; and the third alternative would restripe the freeway within its existing footprint to create two ExpressLanes. Under the second alternative, the single ExpressLane would allow HOV3+ occupancy. The third alternate contemplates allowing either HOV2+ or HOV3+ occupancy for the dual ExpressLanes.

LA Metro estimates the second alternative to cost $266 million and the third alternative to cost $520.9 million. For the more expensive alternative, LA Metro's funding plan includes $2.6 million in federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement funds, $62.9 million in Measure M local sales tax funds, $125 million from other federal or state funds (potentially including funds from the Solutions for Congested Corridors program), and $330.4 million from toll revenue-backed bonds.

LA Metro's application estimates that the second alternative would be ready to list by spring 2022 and complete by March 2024. The application includes two schedule estimates for the third alternative since it could require additional bridge widenings. For this alternative, LA Metro estimates being ready to list by spring or fall 2022 and project completion by March 2025 or September 2027.

A copy of the application is available on the Commission's website at: https://catc.ca.gov/-/media/ctc-media/documents/ctc-meetings/2019/2019-09/metro-i105-express-lanes-application.pdf

Statutory Criteria for Commission Approval

For the Commission to approve a proposed toll facility, AB 194 requires the Commission to find, at a minimum, that the application meets the following criteria:

> *(1) A demonstration that the proposed toll facility will improve the corridor's performance by, for example, increasing passenger throughput or reducing delays for freight shipments and travelers, especially those traveling by carpool, vanpool, and transit.*

LA Metro's application states that the I-105 corridor currently experiences heavy demand during peak commute hours, often exceeding the freeway's maximum operational capacity. Under free flow conditions, it takes approximately 17 minutes to travel the corridor. By contrast, during peak congestion, it takes up to 51 minutes to travel the corridor in the general-purpose lanes and 43 minutes in the HOV lane. Certain segments of the HOV lane are considered degraded, per federal performance standards.

The application includes documentation from preliminary studies showing how the second alternative (single ExpressLane) and third alternative (dual ExpressLanes) affect the corridor's performance compared to the first alternative (no build). The studies show the performance improvements are greater under the third alternative as compared to the second, and they are greater in the ExpressLanes as compared to the general-purpose lanes. For instance, peak-period speeds improve from 29 to 33 miles per hour to 53 to 56 miles per hours in the ExpressLanes under both alternatives, while peak-period speeds remain about the same in the general-purpose lanes under the third alternative and decrease under the second alternative.

It is important to note that the reason performance decreases on some measures in the second alternative is due to the change from HOV2+ to HOV3+, which causes some vehicles to shift to the general-purpose lanes and be replaced by single-occupancy vehicles. In both alternatives, however, the ExpressLanes meet federal performance standards and thus address the degradation in the current HOV lane.

Additional evidence of improved corridor performance comes from Caltrans. In a support letter dated September 25, 2019, the Acting Director of Caltrans states that the implementation of ExpressLanes, specifically the third alternative, will increase vehicle and passenger throughput, improve performance on local arterials, and improve performance in the ExpressLanes to meet federal HOV standards.

(2) A requirement that the proposed toll facility is contained in the constrained portion of a conforming regional transportation plan prepared pursuant to Section 65080 of the Government Code.

The I-105 ExpressLanes Project is listed in the financially constrained portion of the adopted Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy. Additionally, the project is also included in SCAG's financially constrained 2019 Federal Transportation Improvement Program.

(3) For projects involving the state highway system, evidence of cooperation between the applicable regional transportation agency and Caltrans. Examples of acceptable evidence of cooperation could be in the form of a completed cooperative agreement or a signed letter between the parties to demonstrate that the parties are working cooperatively on the development of the toll facility.

The Project Study Report/Project Development Support document was developed and subsequently approved by Caltrans in September 2015, and a formal cooperative agreement between LA Metro and Caltrans was executed in October 2017 to facilitate the preparation of the Project Approval/ Environmental Document. In addition, the application states that it was prepared in partnership with Caltrans District 7 and the Acting Director of Caltrans submitted a support letter for the application on September 25, 2019.

(4) A discussion of how the proposed toll facility meets the requirements of Streets and Highways Code Section 149.7.

Streets and Highways Code Section 149.7(e) contains additional requirements for AB 194 applicants. In the application, LA Metro discusses how it meets these requirements. For instance, the application states that LA Metro currently has an agreement for the I-10 and I-110 ExpressLanes with the California Highway Patrol for enforcement and with Caltrans for operations, and LA Metro plans to use these agreements as the basis for agreements with each agency for the I-105 ExpressLanes. The application also states LA Metro's commitment to manage toll

revenues in accordance with statutory restrictions and cites its experience in doing so for the I-10 and I-110 ExpressLanes. The application also indicates that LA Metro has met with all ten local jurisdictions, resource agencies, and council of governments along the I-105 corridor.

(5) A complete project initiation document for the proposed toll facility.

The application includes a copy of the Project Study Report/Project Development Support document that serves as the Project Initiation Document for the project.

(6) A complete funding plan for development and operation of the toll facility.

LA Metro estimates the second alternative to cost $266 million and the third alternative to cost $520.9 million. The following table shows the sources and uses of funding for the more expensive alternative:

Source	Project Development	Construction	Total
CMAQ *	$2,607,000	$0	$2,607,000
Measure M sales tax revenues	$62,907,000	$0	$62,907,000
Other federal or state funds	$0	$125,000,000	$125,000,000
Toll revenue-backed obligations	$0	$330,390,000	$330,390,000
Total	**$65,514,000**	**$455,390,000**	**$520,904,000**

* Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement funds

LA Metro's application states that it has not yet selected its preferred project financing approach for the toll revenue-backed obligations but that it could access the capital markets, seek out a private placement, or apply for federal Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act credit assistance. The application also states that if the anticipated federal and state funds to be used for construction do not materialize, the amount of toll revenue-backed obligations could be increased.

Instead of a specific financing plan for the toll revenue-backed obligations, LA Metro's application includes a debt capacity analysis to demonstrate a range of debt issuance scenarios depending on the alternative selected and different tolling policies. This is consistent with the Commission's guidelines, which state that a complete funding plan means that the applicant has a plan for securing funds and not that all financing has been secured.

LA Metro's debt capacity analysis shows a minimum debt service coverage ratio ranging from 1.62 to 4.46, depending on the alternative selected, interest rate assumed, and toll policy. The debt structure assumes approximately level debt service over thirty years, with interest capitalized until operations commence. LA Metro will use net toll revenues to service the debt on the obligations.

Beginning in Fiscal Year 2027, LA Metro also plans to use Measure M funds when available to redeem principal on the debt. This is the earliest that LA Metro can use

Measure M funds for construction costs under the terms of the measure and this timing restriction is the reason LA Metro plans to seek funding from toll revenue-backed obligations. A total of $175 million is available from Measure M for I-105 ExpressLanes.

Given the complexity involved in evaluating LA Metro's debt capacity analysis, Commission staff contracted with PFM Financial Advisors LLC for an evaluation of the financial plan's feasibility. The report from PFM Financial Advisors LLC states that the preliminary cash flows provided by LA Metro demonstrate that they should have sufficient borrowing capacity supported by net toll revenues to fund the project costs, although it notes that the scenarios are based on preliminary forecasts and not an investment-grade traffic and revenue forecast. Additionally, PFM Financial Advisors LLC found that the plan is financially feasible even if LA Metro increased the size of the toll revenue-backed obligations by $125 million in the event the planned federal or state funds do not materialize. In this situation, however, PFM Financial Advisors believes LA Metro might have to utilize a different debt structure, depending on the tolling policy selected.

Supplemental Information

In addition to the criteria in statute, the Commission's guidelines specify that the Commission will consider all provided information to determine whether to approve the proposed toll facility. Accordingly, the guidelines strongly encourage applicants to provide more information than necessary to meet the minimum criteria. The guidelines request that, whenever applicable and possible, applicants provide information on the following:

Compliance with State Law. In addition to Streets and Highways Code Section 149.7, the application states the toll facility will be compliant with California Vehicle Code 5205.5(h)(1), which allows for reduced tolls for clean-air vehicles, and with all applicable state laws and regulations regarding privacy of personal account information; utility relocation and right-of-way acquisitions (in the event needed); and highway design standards.

System Compatibility. The application states that the project is subject to the standards in Caltrans' Highway Design Manual and Federal Highway Administration design criteria. It also states the project is included in the 2017 Metro Countywide ExpressLanes Strategic Plan and the 2016-2040 SCAG Regional Transportation Plan / Sustainable Community Strategy; and it is consistent with the recommendations of the 2014 Caltrans District 7 Transportation Concept Report for Route 105. The letter of support from the Acting Director of Caltrans also states that ExpressLanes on I-105 are consistent with state and regional plans.

Corridor Improvement. The performance improvements are discussed above under the statutory criteria.

Technical Feasibility. The application includes a detailed description of the proposed facility, location, and timeline for each of the alternatives under consideration. However, the project has not yet finished the Preliminary Approval/Environmental Document phase, which will elaborate on the technical details of the project.

Financial Feasibility. The financial feasibility of the application is discussed above under the statutory criteria.

Regional Transportation Plan & Community Support. LA Metro has initiated an extensive and ongoing outreach program to inform and engage stakeholders in the I-105 corridor about the project. The outreach program consists of: California Environmental Quality Act-required scoping meetings and public hearings, agency briefings and presentations, community events and pop-up booths, stakeholder roundtables, surveys, and the establishment of a project website. The application also includes copies of letters from SCAG, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce, the Los Angeles World Airport, and Mobility 21 that express support for LA Metro's application to the U.S. Department of Transportation for a grant to fund ExpressLanes on I-105. These letters are available on LA Metro's website at: metro.net/about/infra/regional-expresslanes-accelerator-i-105-hot-lanes/.

Public Hearing and Comments

AB 194 requires that, prior to approving an application, the Commission conduct at least one public hearing at or near the proposed toll facility to receive public comment. The Commission held a hearing to receive public comment on September 25, 2019. The hearing was held in the St. Francis Medical Center Auditorium located in Lynwood California. Commissioners Inman, Van Konynenburg, Butler, and Norton were present for the hearing. The hearing was webcast live and recorded.

Following presentations by SCAG, LA Metro, and Caltrans, the Commission heard comments and questions from speakers attending the hearing as well as viewers watching the webcast. There were questions for LA Metro regarding the consideration of other alternatives; the reasons for project cost increases; the impact on nearby homes (specifically, whether any homes would be jeopardized by the project); and whether the ExpressLanes on I-110 had in fact resolved degradation in that corridor. In addition, there were requests for LA Metro to conduct additional study of the project, including considering extending a portion of it and incorporating other improvements. One speaker identifying himself as representing the LA County Business Federation requested that the Commission approve LA Metro's application. The full extent of

these questions and comments, along with responses from LA Metro, are recorded in the transcript for the hearing, which is included in the attachments.

In addition to the comments received at the hearing, the Commission received letters of support for the application from SCAG, the Los Angeles County Business Federation, and Caltrans. It also received via email two comments from individuals opposing the application. These letters and comments are included in the attachments.

Attachments:

- Attachment A: CTC Resolution G-19-44
- Attachment B: September 25, 2019 public comment hearing transcript
- Attachment C: Letters and comments sent to the Commission
- Attachment D: Assembly Bill 194 (Frazier, 2015)

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Approval of Application for a Toll Facility on Interstate 105 in Los Angeles County

RESOLUTION G-19-44

1.1 WHEREAS Assembly Bill 194 (Frazier, 2015) amended Section 149.7 of the Streets and Highways Code authorizing regional transportation agencies or the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to apply to the Commission to develop and operate high-occupancy toll lanes or other toll facilities, including the administration and operation of a value pricing program and exclusive or preferential lane facilities for public transit or freight, and

1.2 WHEREAS Assembly Bill 194 specifies that applications for the development and operation of toll facilities are subject to review and approval by the Commission pursuant to criteria set forth in guidelines established by the Commission, and

1.3 WHEREAS Assembly Bill 194 requires that for each eligible application the Commission shall conduct at least one public hearing at or near the proposed toll facility for the purpose of receiving public comment, and

1.4 WHEREAS the Commission adopted guidelines at its March 16, 2016, meeting to set forth the Commission's policy for carrying out its role in implementing Assembly Bill 194 and to assist the regional transportation agencies and Caltrans when contemplating an application to the Commission for approval to develop and operate high-occupancy toll lanes or other toll facilities, and

1.5 WHEREAS on August 21, 2019 the Commission received from the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro) the *Application for Toll Facility: Interstate 105 ExpressLanes (Interstate 405 to Interstate 605)* for review and approval in accordance with Assembly Bill 194 and the Commission's Toll Facility Guidelines, and

1.6 WHEREAS the Commission held a hearing to receive public comment on the proposed toll facility related to this application on September 25, 2019 in Lynwood, California, and

1.7 WHEREAS Commission staff reviewed LA Metro’s application for compliance with Assembly Bill 194 and the Commission's Toll Facility Guidelines, and

1.8 WHEREAS this review found that the application meets the minimum criteria identified in Assembly Bill 194, and

1.9 WHEREAS, in addition, the application commits to compliance with state laws regarding the expenditure of revenues generated by the project; the use of exclusive or preferential high-occupancy vehicles lanes for low- and zero-emission vehicles; and state laws and regulations related to privacy, right-of-way acquisition, and utility relocations, and

1.10 WHEREAS, the application states that LA Metro has met with all ten local jurisdictions, resource agencies, and council of governments along the corridor and initiated an extensive and ongoing public outreach program, and

1.11 WHEREAS Caltrans has submitted to the Commission a letter of support for the project application stating that the implementation of ExpressLanes will improve corridor performance, and

1.12 WHEREAS, based on its review of the application, and considering the testimony provided at the public hearing and via email, Commission staff recommended that the Commission approve the proposed toll facility in accordance with Assembly Bill 194 and the Commission's adopted guidelines.

2.1 NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Commission finds LA Metro's *Application for Toll Facility: Interstate 105 ExpressLanes (Interstate 405 to Interstate 605)* consistent with Assembly Bill 194 and the Commission's Toll Facility Guidelines, and

2.2 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission approves LA Metro's application to develop and operate high-occupancy toll lanes on Interstate 105 in Los Angeles County as described, and

2.3 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in approving LA Metro's application for tolling authority on Interstate 105 in Los Angeles County, as described, the Commission is not committing to approve future applications for funding for the project, and

2.4 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, consistent with Commission guidelines, the Commission expects that LA Metro will request approval of any substantial changes to the project by submitting a supplement to the project application.

Attachment B

Transcript of September 25, 2019 Public Comment Hearing

- [Chair] Everyone, I am going to open this public hearing. So with that, there we go, we opened it. Susan or, let's see, Jofil, do you want to call the roll, please?

- [Jofil] Yes.

- There it is.

- Would you like me to do?

- Okay.

- Hey, everyone, thank you so much. Before we actually-- Oh, sorry. Before we actually begin, we just want to let you know, just logistic-wise, we have our restrooms just outside of the two main doors, we have our exit doors both to your stage right, so, stage left, actually. So, to your right, we also have snacks as well as light refreshments in the back and comment cards right in the back as well. We have staff from both Metro, the commission, and Caltrans just in case you have any other questions and without further ado, Chair Inman, I'm going to be calling in the role.

- Okay, thanks.

- Chair Inman.

- Here.

- Vice Chair Konyenburg.

- Here.

- Commissioner Alvarado.

- [Jofil] Commissioner Burke. Commissioner Butler.

- Here.

- [Jofil] Commissioner Dunn. Commissioner Ghielmetti. Commissioner Guardino. Commissioner Kehoe. Commissioner Norton.

- Here.

- [Jofil] Commissioner Tavaglione. And we have our Executive Director Susan Bransen.

- Okay, we will get started. So, I want to first thank Saint Francis for hosting us here tonight and appreciate the hospitality. So, first and foremost, we need to thank those that are hosting us, so thank you very much and thank the pubic for attending. I'm not sure if we have elected officials tonight but, I don't see any but, anyway, just for those of you that aren't familiar with the California Transportation Commission, we are a state-wide independent body. We have 11 members and I'd like to take this opportunity to welcome our two newest members and, so with that, we have Commissioner Tamika Butler who's joining us. And also Commissioner Hilary Norton. So, welcome to both of you and thank you. We're looking forward to being part of our family and delighted that we could have you join us. We got them sworn in, so we're ready to start working here. So, anyway, the commission programs and allocates transportation funding across the state. We assist the secretary of transportation and the legislature with policy procedure recommendations and also, one of our responsibilities is to approve tolling facilities, so that's the reason that we are here tonight. And so, on August 21, 2019, the commission received an application for tolling authority on the Interstate 105 in Los Angeles County. This is a joint project between LA Metro and Caltrans. The commission plans to consider whether to approve this application at its regularly scheduled meeting in October, which will be October 9th in Stanislaus County, Modesto. And today's hearing is informational only, we will not be taking any action, we're here to listen and to learn. So, anyone wishing to speak today should fill out a speaker card; Jofil, you're back there with the speaker cards, so if you can fill those out, we would appreciate it. If you're unable to attend, the hearing is being webcast. I don't know if you don't already know that but it will be recorded. And the recording will be available online and we will continue to accept written public comments after today, so, please, if you have a thought, suggestion, or comment, now is the time for us to hear from you. So, with that, I think I will turn it over to Susan Bransen, our Executive Director.

- Thank you Madame Chair. I wanted to take the opportunity to share with you a little bit about the statute that provides the commission with authority to approve toll facilities. In 2015, the legislature passed a new law which delegated to the commission the authority to approve toll facilities. This law is Assembly Bill 194. Assembly Bill 194 contains several minimum statutory criteria for the commission to consider for a toll facility application. For example, the project must improve corridor performance such as increasing passenger throughput or reducing delays. The project must have a complete funding plan for the development and operation of the facility. The project must be included in the constrained portion of the regional transportation plan. A project initiation document must have been completed for the toll facility. There must be evidence of cooperation between the regional transportation agency and Caltrans. In addition, the commission approved program guidelines in March 2016 that requested applicants to provide supplemental information with their applications, such as information on the project's compatibility with existing and plans, state, and local facilities, maintenance assumptions and responsibilities, the timeline for completing the project, the impact on adjacent routes, and the impact on air quality and other environmental concerns. AB 194 also requires that, prior to approving the application, the commission conduct at least one public hearing at or near the proposed toll facility for the purposes of receiving

public comment. Today's hearing is being held pursuant to this provision of Assembly Bill 194. In addition, Assembly Bill 194 requires the commission to report to the legislature each year on the progress of the development and operation of each toll facility that is approved under its Assembly Bill 194 guidelines. It is also important to note that after the commission has approved a project under AB 194, it has not further rule in reviewing or approving changes to the project except at the request of the sponsor agency. However, the commission in its adopted guidelines did set forth this expectation that if a regional agency or Caltrans deems it necessary or appropriate to change the toll facility project after approval and the change substantially alters the scope schedule or terms of the approved project, the commission would expect that the agency would come back to request approval of the change that was made. For anyone wishing to review the complete text of Assembly Bill 194 in the commission's guidelines, this information can be found on the commissions website or by contact a California Transportation Commission directly. In closing, I would like to reiterate that today's hearing is informational only for purposes of receiving public comment and that the commission will continue, as the chair said, to accept comments in writing via mail, or email at the addresses that are listed on the slide. And before I pass it over back to your partners at LA Metro, or to our partners at LA Metro, I understood that Kome Ajise, the Executive Director for Southern California Association of Governments might be here but I'm not seeing him here yet.

- Apparently, he's very close.

- Okay.

- So, when he arrives, we'll give him an opportunity to share a few words, so, Madame Chair, should we turn it to LA Metro?

- Yes, sure.

- So, with that, I think we will move through our agenda and Shahrzad, it says that you're in charge of congestion reduction.

- Yes.

- That's an easy job in SoCal.

- I don't know how successful I am. Good evening, everyone, my name is Shahrzad Amiri. I'm the executive officer in charge of congestion reduction programs at LA Metro. I'd like to, on behalf of Metro express my appreciation to the commission for scheduling this hearing and also thank you to all of you for coming here tonight and sharing your evening with us. I bet you could've come up with better things to do, possibly. Under agenda item one, just a housekeeping matter, I'm going to provide some context by talking very briefly about Metro and our existing 10-110 ExpressLanes program. Then, agenda items two through seven which focus on the 105 ExpressLanes and our plans

for the 105 ExpressLanes will be covered by Mark Linsenmayer who's the deputy executive officer of congestion reduction programs at Metro.

- Shahrzad, just a little bit of clarification, so, we actually have hearing agenda and the agenda that you're referring to is your presentation.

- [Shahrzad] Presentation agenda, I'm sorry, yes.

- Just so everybody can follow along.

- LA Metro is Los Angeles County's regional multimodal transportation planner. We are regional funding partner with the jurisdictions. We allocate funding and program funding. We're regional designer and builder mostly of transit but in collaboration with Caltrans of late. We're getting a little bit more involved with freeway projects, both design and construction HOV lanes and truck lanes. And, finally, what we're probably most noted for in this region, we are the regional operator of transit bus and rail. The 10-110 ExpressLanes mark Metro's foray into congestion pricing. The project began as a one-year demonstration project funded, predominantly, by Federal Highway's congestion reduction program funds with some matching funds from Metro. We developed the project in partnership with Federal Highways and Caltrans district seven. Due to the success of the ExpressLanes which opened, as you can see on the 110 in November of '12 and on the 10 and February of '13, both our board and the California legislature agreed that we can operate these lanes indefinitely. The ExpressLanes have been operational for close to seven years and demand and usage seems to increase year over year. I looked at the statistics for this year, we are, beginning from January until now, we average about 5600 new account a month. Our partnership with Caltrans and the CHP has continued throughout the operations. Metro is in charge of funding and operating the ExpressLanes. Caltrans has been a great partner providing maintenance support, they help us out a lot in making the improvements on the roadside. They design a lot of things for us as well. And CHP has been engaged with enforcement and also educating drivers when they stop them and provide them with information about the ExpressLanes. This diagram illustrates how the ExpressLanes work. The Metro ExpressLanes operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week. We rely on all electronic tolling. We dynamically price the lanes based on levels of congestion. When the speed within a segment of the ExpressLanes begins to fall below 45 mile and hour, the lanes go into what we call an HOV only mode where, within that segment, solo drivers are precluded from entering. Solo drivers which enter the ExpressLanes upstream can remain in the ExpressLanes but those who enter will be charged the highest toll for that day regardless of how long a trip they take. And following this illustration kind of numerically, just to let you know, numbers one, that's to say that HOV lanes are allowed in the ExpressLanes as well as solo vehicles. Both of which require a transponder, a Fastrak, or a Fastrak flex transponder. Metro actually issues Fastrak flex to give people the ability to, if they want to carpool, actually declare their occupancy. Number two, one thing I wanted to say is that the occupancy requirements for the two ExpressLanes differ on the 10. The HOV three travels free during the peak am and pm periods. The remainder of the day, it's HOV twos. On the 110, HOV twos travel free of charge all day.

Number two on this one illustrates, I've got to look at it a little more closely, I'm sorry. Oh, we do not have, we have limited access for ingress and egress points on the ExpressLanes. Numbers three through six, actually, they illustrate the static and dynamic signs that are used to demarcate the ExpressLanes and provide toll rates so that drivers know how much they'll be paying and it's usually to the next toll entry as well as the remainder or the corridor. Number seven is the toll gantry where we actually have our cameras and our readers that communicate with the transponders. And finally, number eight is there to illustrate that motorcyclists do not require a transponder and they get to travel free of charge on the ExpressLanes. Currently, solo drivers pay between 10 cents and $2.10 per mile, again, depending on the level of congestion. Qualifying cleaner vehicles receive a 15% discount. From the inception of the program, Metro had provided direct funding for incremental additional transit service on both of those corridors. That's something that we provide annually to our transit partner agencies. This slide highlights the ExpressLanes's performance statistics as of July 2019. As you can see, we've issued over one million transponders. Over 239 million trips have been taken on the ExpressLanes since it's inception. We have about 120 thousand trips a day, currently. Both the vehicle and person who puts on the 110 ExpressLanes during the am peak period exceed those of the general purpose lanes. During the peak periods, ExpressLanes users save between three and almost 14 minutes in travel time when compared to GP lanes. As you can see, the am peak average toll is higher than the pm peak because everyone's headed to work and needs to get there on time in the am. So, there's more congestion on the ExpressLanes. From the inception of the ExpressLanes, we were very careful to include programs that incentivize and encourage carpooling and transit ridership. Also, Metro's very happy to say that of all the over 40 ExpressLanes programs in the nation, we're the only one that has a low income assistance plan for those who, in Allen County households that qualify for it. Finally, this map depicts, well, based on the success of the 10 and 110 ExpressLanes, the Metro board directed us to develop a strategic plan for the ExpressLanes, so this map depicts the strategic plan. What we did was, we looked at all the corridors within the county where HOV lanes existed or were planned. We can only covert HOV lanes to hot lanes or ExpressLanes. And so, as you can see, the red line depicted there is the 105 project. And the navy illustrates all the tier one projects. The tier one projects are near term projects that are slated to be implemented in five to 10 years. The lighter blue or teal color depicts the tier one projects that are 15 years plus out and, as you see, the radial lines that are the sky blue or the light blue, those are the tier three projects which we plan to pursue and, hopefully, construct in the next 25 years. I, personally, will not be engaged in that though, just so everyone knows.

- Never say never.

- Yes.

- [Shahrzad] As you can see, the tier one network provides an integrated and interconnected core network of ExpressLanes, so, what I guess I'm telling you is, hopefully, if all goes well with the 105, we will be coming to you in the future with the rest of the tier one network. The 105 ExpressLanes was among the best performing of

the tier one group and was the most advanced because Caltrans had already completed the PSR PDS for an ExpressLanes project. As a result, we undertook additional planning studies which have led us to this point, seeking tolling authority from the CTC. And, with that, I will hand it off, Kome's not here yet? Mark Linsenmayer to get into detail about the 105 ExpressLanes. Thank you for your time.

- Thank you, Shahrzad. Good evening, Chair, commissioners, Executive Director, stakeholders, interested parties. Again, my name is Mark Linsenmayer. I'm the deputy executive officer for the ExpressLanes at Metro and my job tonight will just sort of be walking you through the project specifics and some of the details around what we have planned for this project. As Shahrzad mentioned, it is one of our tier one, near term projects. It's already included in the SCAG, regional transportation plan, and Sustainable Community Strategy Plan. For 2016, we do anticipate it will be in the 2020 plan as well, can't really confirm that until it's actually produced but, perhaps, Kome, when he arrives, can speak to it. We've been working with Caltrans and, in fact, Caltrans was the responsible party for completing the project initiation document, the PID, which is part of the AB 194 requirements back in 2015. In 2016, the voters of Los Angeles County approved this project as part of the Measure M expenditure plan, committing 175 million dollars to the construction and development of the ExpressLanes here. The project is also included in Metro's Twenty-Eight by '28 initiative to complete 28 transportation projects in time for the 2028 Olympics. The project overview, have to make sure I'm getting my directions right here, so on the west, it's basically the 405 to the 605, the entirety of that 105 span, about 15.7 miles, crossing, importantly, the 110 and the 710 as well as being buttressed by those two major interstates at each end. So, it's a significant project, it's got a significant amount of volume on there right now. Obviously, the project need is demonstrated by the sheer capacity that we have on there in congestion levels. Currently, there's between 200 and 250,000 vehicle trips, on average during the week days. Some area locations between the 405 and the 110 is an example of closer to 300,000. So, you know, over a million trips a week transverse this corridor, so it's very busy. The HOV lane is degraded per the federal guidelines, so the speeds are less than 45 miles an hour during the peak period. That's something that we seek to rectify as part of this project. In both directions, we're having impacts. Right now, it's about 36 minutes to drive eastbound during the pm commute and about 43 minutes westbound in the general purpose lane, so we do see a significant degradation of both the HOV lanes and the general purpose lanes. This is kind of just speaks more and more directly do that. The project purpose is to obviously to enhance the operations, improve trip reliability and travel times. We measure that by looking at the improved traffic flow and, of course, seek to do that sustainable and proactively so that we can manage mobility within the corridor. We have three alternatives. We have a no-build alternative and two build alternatives. The example I have before you or the illustration I have here is the current condition of the 105. So we kind of talk about it from the environmental documents so from a 2017, although this is 2019, nothing's changing. And also, the 2040 no-build which is sort of our out year in terms of what the project will look like. So this is the no-build condition. If we don't do the project, this is what the project will look like. This is currently what the project looks like. So, just for your viewpoint, we have an HOV lane towards the median. We have three general

purpose lanes or main line occupied vehicle lanes. And then we have auxiliary lanes which are, typically, acceleration or deceleration lanes into and out of the on-ramps and off-ramps. We tend to maintain the Caltrans standards for lane width of about 12 feet. Caltrans standard shoulder widths between eight and 10 feet and a buffer between the HOV lane and the general purpose lanes. Currently, we have a painted double white line for that buffer. We'll look to upgrade that as we move into different project scenarios. I'm going to go through this very quickly. Obviously, we're going to have room for questions at the end, but I'll just go ahead and keep plowing through and if we can save the questions, then we can kind of address those all at once. So, I'm going to try to go quickly. And I saw Kome Ajise is here, so I'll also give him time to speak. Alternative two is converting the HOV lane to the ExpressLanes. And this is our first sort of build alternative and it's basically just a simple conversion, taking the HOV lane, the high occupancy vehicle lane and making it a high occupancy toll lane or, for Los Angeles County, an ExpressLanes. So the only, the major component of this just putting in the toll equipment and the toll gantries to help support that part of the congestion management. So the project does require some changes to not only the equipment, the signage, and the pavement markings that I mentioned earlier but there'd likely be a limited number of widenings that we'd have to make sure that all of our equipment has enough room and the access an the weaving that would take place to get in and out of the ExpressLanes is accommodated. So there's some slight physical changes to the roadway but, for the most part, it's just a conversion of that single HOV lane to HOT lane with no other changes to the general purpose lanes. Alternative three is our second build alternative and this looks at the same sort of width of the roadway but looking at changing some of the configuration of it and by that I mean, essentially, converting some of the standard roadway widths of 12 feet to 11 feet in the general purpose lanes and the ExpressLanes, taking off bits of the inside shoulder, making it from, say, an eight to 10 feet to a two to four foot shoulder on the median side, increasing the buffer with channelizers or additional striping and squeezing in an extra HOT lane into that same sort of footprint that we have now. Similar to what we did on the 10 and the 110, making that conversion a little more realistic in terms of what we would do for the construction build on it. So we do reduce the lanes to a non standard 11 foot width, obviously, adding, again, our toll equipment signage, pavement markings, all of our gantries and equipment for tolling, our lights and cameras, and everything else. There is the potential for limited right away additions. I think we were looking at five partial takes down here off of Imperial, just, that's would be west of Alameda. But we're hoping we can engineer that so we don't need any additional right away takes. The facility design, as I alluded to, will include some of the white striped buffers and channelizers possible. We're already starting to channelize between the general purpose lanes and the HOT lanes on the 10 and the 110 and this is both for enforcement and safety, as well as just a clear demarcation of where the HOT lanes are, so we think it's a helpful from both an operational standpoint, a safety standpoint, and a toll facility standpoint. We will keep the limited access, meaning we don't have open access on our HOT lanes, on our ExpressLanes. We have, for the 105, we've identified eight spots where we'd like to perform the ingress and egress functions of getting into and out of the ExpressLanes. So, there is some additional weaving that happens as cars kind of go in and out of those ExpressLanes, the channelizers help to identify that and make it as safe as we can to

do that function. Operationally, as Shahrzad mentioned, it'll perform similar to the 10 and the 110. We do plan on a 24 hour, seven day a week operation, utilizing dynamic pricing, so as congestion rises, prices go up, and congestion reduces, prices go down. It can refresh as often as every five minutes, so we'd have a very robust back office system to manage the transportation and the traffic along the corridor. We will maintain our offer for clean air vehicles of a 15% discount that the Metro board did approve last year. We continue to enhance transit in the corridor, we want to implement lower income assistant plan or maintain the low income assistance plan on the 110 and the 10. Our carpool loyalty programs and our transit reward programs would also be available in this corridor. And, of course, our occupancy will still be determined as part of the environmental process and as we work forward with Caltrans and FHWA and our board on deciding that and that's really whether it's going to be an HOV2 for free or an HOV3 for free and the rest of the vehicles can opt-in to that excess capacity by paying the toll. Enforcement is something that we call multifaceted using a technological approach as well as a facility design and the ultimate enforcement by the CHP, the California Highway Patrol. So it's kind of the standard engineering, you know, education, engineering, and enforcement. So that's kinda how we're looking at it with this one. We do have very robust technology that we deploy for this and we continue to look at technology improvements and enhancements but, right now, we use enforcement beacons which have a numeric and beacon display of vehicle occupancy both on our transponders and on the beacons so that CHP can make sure that the declarations are accurate to the actual people in the vehicle. We also have camera systems to electronically verify those occupants and this is something that our board has asked us to look into and that we'll be rolling out, hopefully, later this year. We continue to have the CHP observations areas and patrols as well as those being co-located to where the enforcement beacons are as well as the channelizers which, as I mentioned, are a safety function but also, I guess, are much easier for CHP to see when people are running over those barriers, that they might have violated that channelization. State and federal roles and responsibilities, we do have Shafiqul Islam from Caltrans to talk about their piece. Briefly, I'll say that we've been working closely with Caltrans, preparing and approving the environmental documents. As I mentioned, they approved the PID, working with us as the delegation authority on the rest of their environmental documents, so they'll have environmental clearance for us. They're reviewing and approving all of our design and operation plans, including the construction and maintenance activities within the state right of way, so they do still maintain the O and M on that part of it. The general maintenance and the maintenance of the physical infrastructure is largely falling back on the Caltrans with support from Metro on the pavement, the median barriers, and any structures that are part of the state highway system. FHWA has also been our partner. They attend our project development team, so the PDT meetings, and our concept of operations which we call ConOps meetings which, again, are just how the lanes operate. So they've been active in all of those meetings and, again, reviewing and providing input on draft documents, signage, and other improvements to conform to FHWA and federal standards. And, interestingly, I guess, the 105 is a project of Division Interest or a PODI, I'm going to say, for FHWA, I hadn't heard that term before putting this together, so, if I'm pronouncing that incorrectly, I apologize. So, again, this is an important project for both the local, state,

and federal governments to make improvements on it. The performance benefits took me a long time just to get here but we talked about this corridor and the significant number of vehicles on it. This is a daily person, so not only the vehicles but the people occupying those vehicles and we're looking at a base of about 343,000 people moving through this corridor in both directions from our 2017 base year. We expect a modest increase by our 2040 no-build year of about 353,000 people going through that area with a significant number going from that in the ExpressLanes with a more modest number, at least on a percentage basis, from the general purpose lanes. This sort of illustrates it graphically. Again, hard to see the details of this but we talked about the general purpose lanes on the wider bards in the histogram on the bottom and the HOV or ExpressLanes numbered on the top. So yo can see, in the base year, we have right around 344,000 people going through the corridor. In the alternative two, we have just below that number. So, again, as we move through the system, we can see that once we start pricing the lanes, the behavior and the throughput changes a little bit. We do have more capacity that we can utilize in the ExpressLanes, so we get a slight bump up into that. And then, once we add capacity in alternative three, we get increased from both the general purpose lanes 'cause there's fewer vehicles competing for that space, as well as the additional capacity that we're now seeing in the ExpressLanes since we've added a lane. And so, we get just over 364,000 vehicles, er, sorry, daily person throughput on the alternative three scenario. So we do see significant benefits from that perspective on a daily person throughput. This one shows just the vehicle throughput which is similar. Again, there is some additional behavior changes as we go from a no-build scenario in alternative one to a priced scenario in alternative two where we do start to see some different variations of behavior as we price, in this scenario, we have an HOV3, so three persons or more are free in the toll lanes and HOV2, single occupancy vehicles would pay, so we do see some behavioral changes in this. So we see more vehicles but also some additional volume coming into the general purpose lanes. And then, with the additional capacity in alterative three, again, we see those sort of reciprocal results. And we kind of invert it for the vehicle hours of delay. Before we were looking at increases, now we're looking at the decrease in vehicle hours of delay. And for those of you that follow the Texas Transportation Institute or Inrex blogs, you'll see that this is the common sort of statistic that they show as Los Angeles having the worst traffic, worse congestion, worst amounts of delay in the country is how much we sit in traffic in Los Angeles County and the 105 is, obviously, a big contributor to that, currently, and potentially going forward. And this project significantly reduces that as we look at this example of the hours of delay coming down both from the general purpose lanes and the ExpressLanes once we start the pricing model on this. And the significant reduction, obviously, in alternative three where there's just not as much delay from either the ExpressLanes or the general purpose lanes since we are reducing some that congestion across the entire corridor. Excuse me. The travel time analysis, excuse me, again, just sort of, as a different way to look at some of the numbers that I just showed you, so I won't belabor this but I will point out that we sort of have mixed results on the travel time analysis in alternative two as we see a continued increase in the westbound peak as well as the eastbound pm peak in terms of amount of delays. We go through this with the time travel increases. We have better results as part of the HOV, sorry, the alternative three, the HOV2 plus dual lane conversion where we do see benefits across

three of the four directions with the sort of neutralized westbound am peak. So, we do see significant benefits for that. And this, again, we're looking at the ExpressLanes. The prior slide was the general purpose lanes. The ExpressLanes show benefits across both build alternatives. I should note that in alternative three that travel time savings are for both lanes and so we do see nearly the equivalent of double the volume with that travel time savings in the alternative three scenario. Summarizing the performance benefits, we look at the alternative two as addressing the HOV lane degradation that I'd mentioned before, restoring the lane performance to meet the federal standards of 45 miles an hour. We do see modes improvement in the vehicle throughput with some mixed benefit for the vehicle delay. Alternative three, which is the dual lane conversion addresses the existing HOV degradation as well, reduces the daily vehicle hours of delay by over 30% for both the ExpressLanes and the general purpose lanes and increases passenger and vehicle throughout, respectively. The environmental documents to date, we have the project approval environmental document that we're working on, the project report, the environmental impact report pursuant to CEQA, the environmental assessment pursuant to NEPA and, obviously, the Caltrans being the CEQA/NEPA lead agency for those documents will take that part of it. Again, this is, I'll let Kome speak this but a project of, it's not a project of air quality concern by the SCAG Transportation Conformity Work Group composed of EPA, FHWA, and Caltrans. So we are looking at some of the environmental benefits to this project as well. The funding plan is primarily local funding sources. We do have some federal contribution through the state and CMAQ, the air quality and congestion management funds that we're looking at for project development. As I mentioned, the Metro sales tax has committed a 175 million dollars to the project. We're spending about 62 million in project development, the rest of it, we can help pay down some of the toll revenue or revenue backed obligation that we make seek to help build this. We're also looking to the state to help us with the solutions for congested corridors program of somewhere between 100 and 125 million dollars to support this project. Without that funding, we would probably need to get additional toll revenue from either TIFIA program at the federal level or through the private market on some toll revenue back bonds. And so, we are fully funded for this project according to our rather sophisticated long range modeling. So far, public outreach, I believe this hearing will be number 75; we've done 74 events up till this date. Along the corridor and throughout Los Angeles County, so we feel we've done a good deal of outreach. We continue to do that as we move forward through the environmental process, having additional hearings and additional times for comment. And, I think I've gone into the environmental process, too, so we've had some of the scoping meetings, the roundtable meetings, some of the community update meetings, we've had a business roundtable that some of you were able to attend back in August, as well as a number of public hearings, especially once the EIR/EA is released. We've had various outreach methods, obviously, public meetings like this, typical community meetings, we also have it posted on our website, we have an email setup, we have a project hotline that you can reach out and provide comments to. We do have a number of different e-blasts for over 2100 people that have subscribed to that. We do have social media outreach, I've seen some ads on my Reddit feed already. We do have directly mailings between 750 feet on each side of the corridor along the entirety of the 105. We do traditional newspaper advertisements for both print and digital editions, as

well as flyer drops on the 10 park and ride lots where the green line is adjacent to the 105. I'm almost finished. The implementation schedule, we did the project initiation document back in September of 2015. The project scoping was about 18 months ago, in April 2018. As noted earlier, we submitted the application in to CTC back in August. We anticipate the initial draft of the environmental document being circulated later this year along with the TNR which is what we call the traffic and revenue investment grade study which is the detailed analysis of how much traffic volume we expect to see and at what price we can expect toll revenues to come in at. Along with that, we have what we call the ConOps, the concept of operations which tell us the preferred way to manage the traffic on this corridor. From that, we will go forward with, hopefully, the final environmental documents, the EIR, the FONSI, Finding Of No Significant Impact approval, the project PSNE which is the Plan Specifications and Estimates on the engineering side of things. If necessary, we'll have right away certification in the fall of 2121, so about two years from today. You can quote me on that; about two years from today. Then, the construction, oh sorry, the release of the RFP, so the Request For Proposals or the ready to list, we anticipate in the spring of 2022 with the construction notice to proceed shortly after that in the fall of 2022. Substantial completion of this project we're aiming for in December of 2024 with the opening in the spring of 2025 to conform with all of our goals and timing for funding. And that is all I have. I don't know if Kome is apparently our next speaker and he can talk to us about the wonderful work they do at SCAG and then, we'll hand it off to Shafiqul Islam at Caltrans.

- Good evening. Madame Chair, it's good to see you and it's good to see our new commissioners here, I'm really excited to have both Commissioners Norton and Butler here with us. Good to see, of course, them again. It's my pleasure to be here, my name is Kome Ajise, I'm the Executive Director at SCAG. For those who don't know, SCAG is the Metropolitan planning organization for this region and our responsibility, mostly, is on making sure that there's coordinator regional planning in the region for all transportation, especially now with SB-375, but that's also coordinated with our various jurisdictions in terms of the land use that we have in the region. SCAG's adopted long range transportation plan which, the current one, which is the 2016 regional transportation plans sustainable community strategy is closely integrated with the land uses around the region to be sure that what we plan in terms of what our communities look like is also consistent with what our transportation system would look like and, thus, allow the region to grow smartly and sustainably. And this project is in that plan, in concept and will be in the plan that we're updating as a matter of constrained project that we would have in the 2020 plan that should be adopted by our board in April 2020. We're about release the draft of that document of our 2020 RTP SES which we call Connect SoCal. And it should also highlight the elements of transportation within the region as well as the sustainable, efficient manner which we expect this region to grow. The core component of Connect SoCal, our regional plan that we have in the works, is the regional express lane network which spans across four of our six counties. SCAD covers six counties and four of those counties, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernadino, are implicated in this regional ExpressLanes network which integrates ExpressLanes facilities into a comprehensive network to enable seamless, inter-county connectivity throughout the region. And that really is the essence of Connect SoCal.

The 105 ExpressLanes project is a critical near term component of our emerging regional ExpressLanes network that would immediately yield mobility benefits in the corridor, also mitigating existing congestion, and associated travel delays and reliability and safety. Not only is it an ExpressLanes, it's also, for all intents and purposes, a congestion management tool in terms of pricing. I think Mark talked about pricing a little bit, that's one thing we had just explored at SCAG, we had a study on pricing that demonstrated that pricing is really necessary for our region to begin to manage the system because we can't build capacity enough for the congestion that's out there. And so, one way to manage our system is to price it and this project speaks to that. Our staff has already told you a lot about the challenges of the corridor, so I don't want to have to repeat some of things they've talked about but they're two things I want to point out in terms of the challenges of the region. Like much of our HOV network in our region, the 105 HOV lane does not meet federal performance standards and I think Mark alluded to that. It's sort of designated as degraded by Caltrans. The peak period speeds are lower than they should be. The peak period speeds are projected to increase with this ExpressLanes project to above the degraded standard. So, we're looking forward to that element of it and that, again, is important to congestion relief. Now, when we did our study on pricing which we, it's on our website, it's called the Go Zone Study, we showed that, in fact, pricing the system afforded us the chance to not only reduce congestion during the peak period which we demonstrated a 24% reduction in congestion but also reduced VMT by 21% during the peak period. And on a daily basis, throughout the day, there is an aggregate reduction in congestion by about 10% and VMT by about 8% as a result of pricing that we demonstrated on the website. And so, that's one element of this project that we're sort of looking forward to. Now, the second challenge on the corridor that I should be brought to attention is that the 105 is a pivotal east/west corridor that connects the Los Angeles International Airport to downtown LA through the 110, 710, and the 605 freeways of which the last two are some of the nation's most critical freight corridors. And so, it enable interstate and international commerce. And so, it's a critical component to the economy of our region. Just to use some numbers, in 2018, LAX serviced well over 87 million passengers with about 102 thousand ground vehicles accessing the complex daily. LAX processed about 2.3 million tons of freight valued at more than 120 billion dollars. And so, when you start to see those kinds of numbers, you can understand that the 105 is vital to the system of the economy that we have in terms of moving goods and moving people that implicates the Los Angeles International Airport. Some of the benefits, real quickly, of the ExpressLanes and, again, I think you've heard a lot from Mark and the team on that, and I just want to point a number of that. You know, Metro has been working very conscientiously on congestion reduction and it has helped in some respects. If you take the 110 and the 10 ExpressLanes, they've proven to be very effective in managing congestion and the 105 ExpressLanes is expected to optimize, in the same way, optimize capacity and speeds on the lanes on the 105 corridor. And to the extent that that happens, we have a system-wide benefit across the board. Analysis shows that the 105 lanes, the 105 ExpressLanes will increase daily throughput in terms of travel by anywhere between 62 to 80% over time and that there's going to be an overall improvement in the corridor by 11 to 15% in terms of throughput. It will improve, like I said, given our study, we expect from our modeling that it would improve peak period, end to end travel by about 15 minutes. And

just in the ExpressLanes by about six minutes in the general purpose lanes. The user pricing is critical throughout our region in helping to manage mobility. I think we have come to terms with the fact that we can not build ourselves out of congestion, so we're beginning to slowly get ourselves into this condition of pricing and I think the reception has been interesting and actually has been welcomed given the study that we published the end of last year at SCAG. Improving travel reliability, travel times on our most congested corridor is really the essence of the regional ExpressLanes network. ExpressLanes also provide a sustainable source of local revenue that can be leveraged for state and federal funding to reinvest in transportation solutions that doesn't actually have to be highways. It could be in transit, it could be an active transportation along the same corridors. I think, maybe I'll end on some of these notes here. What's critical also is we're preparing for, to welcome the world in 2028 and there's facilities that are being built across the region. Obviously this will play a role with the delivery date of 2025, I think we expect that this will play a role in being able to provide capacity for the Olympics when that comes around in 2028. The ExpressLanes project will provide reliable travel times among multiple venues around the Los Angeles area between the west side and downtown where most of the activities will be. The 105 ExpressLanes will also be used extensively by many of the international visitors that we're expecting during that period of time. With regard to SCAG, the consistency of this project to our goals and objectives because we are, at SCAG, required to have a vision of sustainability across the region. Now, as you all know, the past several years, the state has enacted the most ambitions laws to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from various sources. Several studies have found pricing to be among the most impactful VMT and GSU reduction and that's a very prominent strategy in our planning going forward. Together with viable transportation alternatives, pricing strategies are critical to meeting the state's ambitious climate goals. In our modeling, it is the single most important lever that you can pull to reduce VMT and to reduce, to shift travel from the single occupant vehicle to the other multimodal options that are available. And one of the key elements of this corridor is it does provide those multimodal options with the green line with potential for express buses and carpooling in the corridor. The 105 ExpressLanes help to ensure the region meets both air quality conformity requirements and greenhouse gas reduction requirements and required by SB375. As a project, finally, as a project, it is consistent with the policies and goals set forth not only the 2016 to 2040 RTP SES but also, in our forthcoming 2020 Connect SoCal plan, the 2020 RTP SES. So, we respectfully request that the commission give full and fair consideration to this important project proposal from LA Metro. On behalf of our region, I, again, welcome you all to the great SoCal and hope that you will look favorably at this project. Thank you.

- Good evening. Thank you, Madam Chair and the rest of the commission and our SCAG, Kome Ajise, and all the audience. My name is Shafiqul Islam, I'm with Caltrans. I'm with division of traffic operations, office of system performance means I value how the systems perform. So, as you know, Caltrans, we strive to enhance the economy and livability of the state by providing a safe, sustainable, efficient, and integrated transportation system. And this project will improve efficiency of the transportation system along the 105 corridor. And Caltrans has been working, partnering with Metro in reviewing various studies as Mark has went over, PSR PAD and all those. We have

reviewed various documents for consistency, accuracy, and compliance of various design conditions. They all show this product will relieve congestion along the corridor and improve the quality of life. So, I'm here on behalf of Caltrans to show our support for this project and I hope all of you will do the same thing. Thank you.

- Okay, do we have any questions for any of those folks? Well, I know we have public comments but any questions? Anybody want to ask Kome a question? If Kome is still back there.

- I have a question for Kome.

- Yes.

- [Konyenburg] So, Kome, could you, did he leave?

- Where'd Kome go?

- Okay, well.

- And, like that, he was gone.

- [Chair] Wow, how did that happen?

- [Woman] He's coming back.

- Okay, if he only went out for a second, we'll hold that. Yeah, so, question from the audience? I'll need you to identify yourself, that's the only problem. So we do have--

- Should we do comment cards?

- Do you want to do... Maybe we'll hold it to the public comments, so promise that we'll keep everybody here to answer any question you have but for logistics, it might be easier if we get everybody to do that. Other commissioners, did you have any questions of the presenters other than Kome, since we lost Kome? We're going to find him again though. I do want to recognize that we do have a representative from Congresswoman Lucille Roybal-Allard office here. Kim, where's Kim? Kim, thank you. Our best to the congresswoman, did you want to say anything? Okay, well, you tell our congresswoman hello. Kome, you tried to sneak out and we had a question for you. So, Mr. Van Konyenburg has a question.

- Thank you for your presentation. Could you let us know, so, are you preparing multimodal corridor plans for various corridor, I assume, in anticipation of applying for suggestion, solutions for congested corridor funding from the commission? What corridors within the county are you preparing multimodal corridor plans for?

- Okay, so I should really be able to crisply tell you all of them and I can't. I know we just concluded the 105 study, obviously, that led to this. We're also looking at, we're looking at a project on the 405, we're looking at a project on, actually, the 605, that's come up in the conversations that we've had in the office. There was a project that was mentioned on the 10 west as well. So, we're looking all of our corridors and, actually, I-5 is another one that's actually being talked about. We're weighing our capacity at SCAG to see which ones we're going to dive into and also weigh the potential of the projects that are going to come out of it in terms of impact to the system at large, an impact to commuting in general.

- [Konyenburg] And did I understand you to say that you're finding that some form of congestion pricing is the one lever that reduces VMT the most in that?

- Without question, without question. I think it's probably the most, I mean, we've done, we've studied a lot of options in terms of trying to reduce congestion. Congestion pricing plus providing alternatives. Because when you price a system, you have to allow people to have options to the price system.

- Okay, and then, I guess, in light of that, how do we get the public to understand that that is where we are evolving over time? Because, obviously, from the comment that we have on our package and other comments we hear, the public is not yet understanding that that's the lever, or they're finding themselves resistant to that lever.

- Yeah, and I think it's education, I think we have to be transparent. When we went into the Go Zone study which is a study we did on the west side of town, we were as transparent as we could be but there was still a lot of suspicion about paying twice for the same system, I thing that's one thing you hear. But what it really is is the system is like a utility. Most of us understand that we don't turn on electricity during the day, we don't run our washers and dryers on the day because it's peak period and it's more expensive, so we'll come in the evening and then do our wash or do it in the morning, right. So, we have that understanding of peak pricing. The highway system is exactly the same thing. It's wide open and everybody shows up at the same time because they want to go somewhere. Once you introduce pricing, people start to make very rational decision about whether or not that trip is that important for that price or if they could wait until later. The trips are still made, for the most part, but then people are a little more judicious in terms of using the system and that really is the difference. But takes a while to quickly understand how that works. And if you won't want to pay the price, you don't have to use the system. So it's not a mandate. So it's not a tax, as it were. It's really just to moderate behavior as it is.

- [Konyenburg] Thank you.

- [Chair] Any other questions? Yes, Commissioner Norton.

- I had a question for Shahrzad.

- [Shahrzad] Yes, Madam Commissioner.

- One of the things that has been very successful about the 110 and 10 ExpressLanes has been the Metro silver line and I was just wondering if there is similar vision, especially in the next gen bus study, to consider a line that would go along these corridors and whether you've studied what the impacts and opportunities would be to actually have even more SOV reduction and more throughput if you had a dedicated BRT lane and bus system that went along the 105 in this new ExpressLanes?

- So, are you talking about converting one of the, if we were to do a dual lanes, using one of them? We definitely have had internal conversations about additional transit service-- Mark noted that as well. And that could be definitely buses, it could be, I don't know to what extent, we could but, increasing the green line service, feeder shuttles, so all of those things are on the table for the 105. Honestly, in terms of, because we're still in the environmental stage and we don't know whether we're going with single or dual lanes, in terms of converting one of the dual lanes to a BRT lane, we really have not looked into that, we've not delved into it very deeply. But we could do more analysis, obviously. It all depends on, you know this, if the headways are such that people don't see empty lanes, that's wonderful. But when you have, especially on a freeway, a BRT lane and people see a bus there every even 10 minutes, they feel like there's capacity that's being underutilized.

- Thank you very much; I wanted to also ask, first, to commend you about being the only county with the low income program.

- Thank you.

- And that equity program is so, so important. I wanted to ask about the same tolling policy as was in the 110 and the 10 about net toll revenue and the opportunities for net toll revenue because that has been a really great innovation fund and opportunity to fund active transportation and other things, community by community, near the ExpressLanes. I just wanted to know what the thinking is about that possibility.

- Well, the thinking on that one in particular is, as you know, the law, basically, to date has said that any net revenues have to be spent within the corridor. Now, as Mark noted, we may have to actually go to the market so 105 might be faced with debt and the law allows you to initially pay off the debt, operate and maintain the roadway and then look at the net total revenues. And so, one thing that we're thinking about pursuing and we'd had initial conversations with CTC a while back was the notion of the tier one as a network. And, in fact, we're doing a network PSR for the remainder of the tier one projects. But, definitely, we, too, feel that that was a successful, revenue grants were an effective way to actually further enhance the benefit of the ExpressLanes. As the end of the day, it all comes down to how much financing we have for the 105 that has to be paid back but that, all of those options are on the table.

- thank you.

- Thank you.

- I think I have two quick questions probably for you again, but it could be anyone else at Metro. I think the first one is on this net toll question. So, yes, the legislation allows you to pay for debt first. What is your projection or estimate, if you have one, on when you would get through the debt and be able to use it for some of those other purposes?

- That's about 30 year.

- Depends on the alternative.

- Mark is our financial, what is it, genius you told me to call you?

- I think something at the bottom of the hill that slides down. So, I think it depends on the alternative that we choose. So, obviously, in a dual lane scenario, we typically would expect more revenue than we would in a single lane scenario. The occupancy also has a significant impact, whether it's an HOV2 or an HOV3, so it's hard to get a definitive answer before we've selected that ahead of or disrupting of the environmental process but we, typically, expect to do some sort of a toll revenue bond that would likely stretch out 25 to 30 years, how we pay that back, and the capacity we have for that would be determined as part of the final alignment and final decisions on the corridor.

- Got it.

- And then, I also wanted to congratulate you on the low income assistance program. My questions is, for folks who might question whether or not the enrollment in the program is, perhaps, as high as some of our disparity show us about how many folks might actually qualify for the program, what do you think are some of the barriers to having folks actually use the program?

- I think, based on what we showed you, we have about 19, little over 19000 people who are part of the program. I have to tell you that our board is very much impressing and growing that number and that, annually, we do a lot of marketing for the low income program. We do public education, we've sent, we go, I mean, we actually do billboards and radio and all of that. And, as with most things, immediately after we do that level of education and marketing, we do see an uptick in enrollment. We've gone to and I've worked with some of the board officers, in fact, to make sure that we did go out and, you know, provide, at least, the applications and talked to, go to pop-ups and talk to folks about it. But we're open to any suggestions to further increase that. So, it is something that I, personally, am interested in, as is our board very much.

- Great, thank you.

- My pleasure.

- Kome, I think my question is for you. I was at a meeting earlier today talking about the housing crisis in our state and in our region and I think the number that Darren talked about was 1.4 million, just over 1.4 million housing units or dwelling units, whatever terminology we're supposed to use, in the next seven years--

- Next eight years.

- The next eight years, okay. So, when I look at these projections, my question, I guess, is a group question, really, are we planning, are we all using the same planning numbers, I guess, is my basic question because I think the 2040 numbers with 9400 daily persons might be a little light if, indeed, you know, what all our projections are. So, are we all in the same page in agreeing, obviously, projections are forecasts and who knows if we're going to hit them exactly, but are we on the same page?

- Yeah, let me just clarify that. The number is 1.344 million. That's the number that that state gave us as a regional determination for housing needs between 2021 and 2029. The 1.344 million, we estimated is beyond the capacity, at least in our planning capacity that we had projected for that period of time. In fact, it might be more consistent with the build out capacity that we'll have to the end of our current plan and development by 2045. By 2045, we're expecting a population of about four million people joining the region and this is a six county number, so it's not just LA county. And so, that projection's a little out of whack with our regional forecasting, as it were. So we're having conversations with the state, with HCD, on that number.

- [Chair] Okay, so it's not apples to apples?

- Yeah, we don't really think they spent a lot of time looking at our numbers to give us that number and that number is a reaction the fact that we do, in fact, have a significant housing crisis which we agree with.

- Okay, but I think for planning purposes, I guess, my first impression just sitting in gridlock very often was looking at 2040, I would've thought it was a larger number. This is under daily persons and I don't do that math with how many, that's just in the corridor.

- [Shahrzad] Just a clarification, we do use a SCAG model for all of our analysis. It's the accepted regional model. I don't know, Jeff, if you have anything to add there.

- [Chair] Because we're recording, can we ask you to come to a mic?

- Sure.

- Jeff Fromhertz, I'm with WSP Consultants with Metro on this particular project, so we're the traffic and engineering consultant on this particular project. I think as Shahrzad was saying, the SCAG model is really the model that's projecting those trips and this is particular corridor is a fairly built out corridor, so for this particular corridor, it's not projected that there's tremendous growth in 2040. And it's also, with the SCAG

model, with the overall goal of reducing greenhouse gasses and trips so there is mechanisms in the model. But it is consistent with the SCAG model.

- [Chair] Okay, Kome, make sure your model's good then because--

- Our model is probably the best in the nation. And I say that facetiously, honestly, we just launched and activity based model, so it's actually more precise than it probably was ever, and that's the basis for the projection here.

- Okay, okay.

- [Chair] Just want to make sure. Okay, so now, we need to hear from the public and I do have some request cards. And, I think, for us, did you have a question? Okay, I'm going to have you come up first because you raised your hand with a question. And will you tell us your full name, for the record?

- My name is Faraz Akil. I'm here by myself, just a resident here.

- Can you talk louder?

- Oh.

- I'm not sure that mic is live. Can we get him a live mic?

- Hello. Okay. Yes, my name Faraz. I mostly had a, I'm just a resident in the area. My question was, looking at the alternatives, have either LA Metro or Caltrans considered a plan where you can, like, combine alternative one and alternative three, that way you can still keep the HOV carpool lane but you can have expanded a shoulder lane line in alternative three and you could, that way, have both a carpool HOV lane and a Fastrak express? 'Cause that was my question, if they've already considered a plan like that? That's it.

- Okay.

- Faraz, we need to get you to fill this out, just a second. Yeah, yeah. Did someone want to speak to that question?

- Good evening, I'm Philbert Long, I'm the Metro project manager for this project. With respect to general purpose lanes, we're also are looking at auxiliary lane improvements that would improve traffic flow for vehicles that are not using the ExpressLanes. So, in particular, we're looking at two locations, both in eastbound and westbound direction between Long Beach Boulevard and the 710. That's a particularly congested bottle neck and so, we're looking at operation improvements there for general purpose lane traffic.

- [Chair] Okay, next, I'm going to ask Glenda Silva.

- I guess both are working. Good evening, Madam Chair and members of the commission. I'm Glenda Silva, legislative representative for the airport. Pivotal east/west corridor, the interstate 105 connects to the second busiest airport in the U.S., Los Angeles International Airport which also handles over 2.4 million tons of cargo per year and is a major employment center for the region. The addition of the ExpressLanes to the I-105 will better manage traffic through dynamic pricing of limited roadway capacity, yielding mobility benefits for commuters and freight traffic, all which require efficient access to LAX. It also plays a key role in preparing Southern California's transportation network for the LA 2028 Olympics by providing reliable travel times among multiple sports venues between downtown LA, Long Beach, and the west side, served directly by the 105. While the Los Angeles world airport is supportive of the ExpressLanes project, we are concerned about the potential degradation of the general purpose lanes of the I-105 and the potential for increased greenhouse emissions from idling vehicles. Currently, when traveling to and from LAX, motorists experience significant congestion along the I-105 freeway. This congestion has created impacts to the Sepulveda Boulevard exit at all times of the day. We feel that this situation causes economic and environmental impacts to the airport, our employees, and passengers, and to the neighboring communities. In order to fully understand the benefits of the ExpressLanes project it will be important for the project study to quantify the benefits, time savings, trip reliability, et cetera expected by the addition of the ExpressLanes to passengers and the employees of the airport. LAWA would also request that the study include improvements or enhancements of the transitions from the ExpressLanes and the I-105 to the major arterial serving LAX to ensure better connectivity, access, and alleviate congestion using updated traffic models, and new intelligent transportation systems. Additionally, we would like Metro and Caltrans to consider extending the current westbound HOV lane to the Sepulveda Boulevard exit. We appreciate your consideration of these issues in the next phase of the project and hope that Metro and Caltrans will work work the LAWA to address the needs of those traveling to LAX by utilizing various freeways, exits, including the Sepulveda Boulevard and the accessibility of our future consolidated car rental facility from the 105, the 405, and the 110 freeway. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

- [Chair] Thank you, I think, Glenda, those are part of the EIR process where those discussions need to, so, hopefully--

- For the record.

- For the future, EIR development, okay, thank you.

- Okay, great. Next, I'm going to ask Steve Lantz to come, please.

- Hi, I'm Steven Lantz and I'm here representing South Bay Cities Council of Governments tonight. We've had a very successful partnership with Metro on the 110 project and we've learned a lot of lessons. One of the key lessons in the project was that you need to pay attention to the arterials that are parallel to the street. You can't just focus on how well the ExpressLanes is working in isolation. Or how well it's working

in conjunction with the mixed flow lanes on the freeway. Metro instituted a pioneering concept of assigning surplus revenue to the corridor, per the state law and working with the corridor to try an decide what the projects might be. I think that was a C grade in the end. There were a lot of projects that cities proposed that either they were slow to deliver or didn't have the impact or the benefit that we expected them to. And I think a stronger model might be to talk a look at during the project itself, at the improvements that should be made on the ramps and on the arterials parallel to those ramps as part of the project. Metro mentioned that they're going to bonding for a significant share of this project. Well, if you're going to bond for a project and there won't be surplus revenues for then next 20, or 30, or 40 years, then, maybe you should include the projects in the projects itself. So, our suggestion would be to take a look at these projects at a technical level as you're doing the ExpressLanes to determine whether you can incorporate from the 605 over to LAX or to the 405. Those arterial improvements that'll make it go more smoothly. There's already a project underway called the Integrated Corridor Management Program which provides a pioneering example of how you do this. In that project, we just met yesterday, frankly with Metro, another department of Metro, to try and come up with a 20 million dollar program parallel to the I-105 to do ITS improvements and, in particular, to deal with instances where there was an emergency or there was a detour to provide the proper technology that would make all this work well. I believe that that would be especially important if we had a problem that required us to use HOV lanes or the ExpressLanes during emergencies. Because you could just as easily and more efficiently move them to the arterial, get them through the corridor. There's much more capacity it the corridor than there is on the freeway itself. So, I would ask you take a broader look at this corridor and incorporate those kinds of improvements. It might make a much bigger impact than just doing the conversion of the HOV lane to an ExpressLanes. Thank you for your consideration.

- Thank you. Next, Jerard Wright.

- Good evening, Madam Chair and Commissioners, welcome the new commissioners here to Southern California. Jerard Wright, policy manager for LA County Business Federation. On behalf of BizFed, a grassroots alliance of more than 180 business organizations that represent 400,000 employers with over 3.5 million employees in LA County. I'm speaking and express strong support for the LA County Metropolitan Authority's application for tolling authority on I-105 high occupancy tollings or better known as ExpressLanes. The implementation of ExpressLanes on 105 will reduce congestion, improve travel time reliability, as well as improve performance on local arterials in the corridor. Reduced congestion will, in turn, facilitate more efficient freight and passenger movement which is critical for sales tax delivery on projects such as Measure M and the gas tax that are funding all these transportation improvements. In addition, bases on the success of the Metro ExpressLanes on the 10 and 110 freeways, BizFed would also like to add the following support of the two lane ExpressLanes version while it proceeds through the study phase. In support for the net toll revenue policy, keeping the revenue generated within the corridor to fund these important improvements. And some of the improvements that was mentioned with the silver line increasing express bus service, that increase ridership, so it's a net benefit across the

board. Recognizing the regional and local benefits of the project, BizFed respectfully requests the CTC to approve the ExpressLanes's toll facility application. Thank you so very much for your time and attention.

- Thank you. Do we have anyone else from the public wishing to comment? Okay. If we don't have any others, do you have any comments? Yes, Commissioner Van Konyenburg.

- Just a question for staff. This seems like we're a little earlier in the process than traditionally we get. Usually, the EIR is complete and we have appropriate alternative when we approve a tolling facility. So, I think one of the things we might want to look at is even if this comes and we say, yes, you can be on the pathway to a tolling facility, they might want to come back after they have appropriate alternative. Any thoughts on that?

- Yes, Commissioners and everyone here, this project is coming forward for the commission to approve it a toll facility in advance to the completion of the environmental impact report which is allowed under the statute. And so, in this case, the commission, when it developed guidelines for how it would address these requests when they come forward, the commission recognizing that did lay out its expectation that, should there be a material of substantial change to the project, the toll facility as it was brought forward to the commission at the time the commission, if the commission does desire to approve this toll facility at this time, we, the commission does know that there will be a lot that's addressed during the environmental process including in expectation that the comments that we heard today would also be part of the environmental impact report development process in addressing those concerns. So if there is a substantial change to the project as it was proposed to, brought forward to the commission at this time, the commission does expect that, in this case, the LA Metro would come back and bring that difference forward for the commission should it be necessary to make an approval for a change. So, as an example, if the footprint were to change a bit, there was a material change to the footprint that they would come back for it. So, right now, what the commission would be approving is the ability for LA Metro to toll the 105 based on the information presented today and we do see that there's multiple alternatives under consideration. Those would be the alternatives that the commission would be, you know, would have considered in determining whether or not, at this time, it would want to approve the toll facility. So, I hope I answered your question. It's laid out in the commission's guidelines and it may be something that commission chooses to put in its resolution to expect if there's a substantial change it be brought back forward.

- Yes, Commissioner Norton.

- I had a question about logistics and goods movements as it relates to the ExpressLanes. One of the key opportunities with the 110 and the 10 was the logistics industry really changed with FedEx and UPS, especially, providing so many trips along those corridors and it actually improved their throughput and it reduced the number drivers they had to use but also promoted their cleaner fuel vehicles. I just wanted to

ask about study along that in terms of the clean air opportunities and then with the ExpressLanes already promoted in studies like UCLA is that ExpressLanes and carpool lanes are some of the prominent reasons that people buy electric vehicles and plug in electric vehicles, just how you see in the studies just opportunities for additional incentives for people to buy cleaner vehicles with the thought of being able to have the discounts for the ExpressLanes?

- Yes, Commissioner, as we've heard earlier LAX is a key facility located in the western part of the corridor. Two axle trucks are permitted to use the ExpressLanes, so that would be a lot of UPS, FedEx, et cetera, also small cargo trucks. Many of the cargo shipments that go to and from LAX, the smaller, high value cargo shipments. So those two axle trucks would be permitted to use the ExpressLanes. Larger five axle trucks that service the ports of LA and Long Beach would not be allowed to use the ExpressLanes but to the extent that we can improve performance on the general purpose lanes, that would also benefit goods movement. In terms of cleaner vehicles, we did conduct a vehicle count of the existing HOV lane last year and on the 105, we showed around 10 or 12% of vehicles were cleaner vehicles. That might have changed now that we have a difference in policy this year but at out last count in spring 2018. It's kind of a fine balance because, on the one hand, we want to encourage cleaner vehicles but on the other hand, we also have to manage congestion on the ExpressLanes. And so, due to the growing number of cleaner vehicles, we do charge cleaner vehicles but provide the 15% discount. So, we want to encourage cleaner vehicles but, at the same time, we have to manage volume on the ExpressLanes and we're always trying to maintain that 45 miles an hour speed on the ExpressLanes, so that's the balance that we're trying to achieve.

- I have a question in terms of transponders. I know Orange County Toll Authority has gone to a little sticker. And what are we going to do, hopefully, state-wide, and I realize Metro is not responsible for the whole state of California, but to make sure this is very user friendly, so what happens if I have a sticker?

- The entire state is trying to move away from what's called a title 21 protocol to a six C protocol where those stickers are being developed. For the purposes of our ExpressLanes because you have to be able to declare your occupancy and those stickers, for the time being, there's no way you can switch anything. You just stick it, it's a little sticker you put on your vehicle. So, we are looking at Six-C implementation by the end of this year, next year, sorry. Next year, so, by the end of 2020. And, for the time being, we're looking at, still, a switchable transponder. Six-C protocol but a switchable transponder for those folks who want to carpool. Now, between now and then, perhaps somebody will come up with a little sticker that you can switch one way or the other and we'd be open to that as well.

- So, is anybody else in the U.S. doing anything? I mean, I know Denver pulled out all their toll booths way earlier than we did and started using license plate readers and everything, so anybody else doing anything that we should emulate?

- No, I mean, we're all electronic tolling, so we never, from day one had any toll booths or anything like that. Everything's done through communications with the transponder.

- Okay.

- But we are looking at, again, the opportunity to switch as you said and go to the sticker. Currently though, all of California is interoperable. So we all can operate, you can take your transponder or sticker from one county and actually come through LA County--

- [Chair] But if I go with my sticker--

- You can't be carpooling for us.

- I can't be carpooling.

- No.

- [Chair] But what I have the old transponder and my sticker in my car, what's happening?

- Well, I don't think you should have both of them on at the same time. 'Cause I think the system will just have a heart attack.

- Okay, well I'll raise my hand to that because I have a sticker and I kept my beloved, already discolored transponder because it's so old because I'm in LA and stuff, so there might be more of us that are, I mean, we all cross a lot of boundaries and a lot of borders, so I do think whatever we can do to encourage a seamless, simple, not make you all crazy but give the best value to the public is so very important. I know it's not simple but there's a lot of us that cross a lot of different boundaries.

- Absolutely, Chairman, and we work very closely, at least, all the California toll operators to make sure, I mean, out of the 120,000 daily trips that I noted, 10,000 are made by customers of other ExpressLanes or toll facilities a day. So there are folks from TCA coming through, OCT, RCTC, on occasion, Northern California. So, yeah, absolutely, that is, first and foremost, for us within California, now, the entire country was working on some sort of protocol that would work across all states and that's been put on the back burner for a while now.

- Well, on behalf of Commissioner Dunn, I'll say, we're all waiting for the day when everything is simple and it's just one ticket, doesn't matter what I get on.

- It's coming, it's coming.

- One transponder, whatever.

- So, anyway, enough of me--

- It's coming.

- Pining on my challenges, I love my old transponder.

- I just wanted to say, ditto, I've had that same problem. I had my transponder from the Bay that I just refused to get rid of and then my LA Metro transponder and, you're right, the system did explode. Though I paid my toll with my Metro one, I get many letters about not having the Bay Area one on and I had just forgotten it was in my car. And it was a really hard process to get that fee waived because I had paid for it on my other one and so, I would just say ditto on figuring out what this means for folks in real time and I think, especially for those who want to see congestion pricing happening. I think those are the kind of small things that really just annoy people and make them think it's not worth the hassle at all.

- Absolutely, you're absolutely right. Believe me, I get those similar phone calls, never from you but-- Others have called me and we've had to kind of delve very deep into what's going on, so, yes. We try to make it easy for the customer.

- Okay, well, speaking of the wonders of modern technology, we have an online question, so, Jofil.

- Alrighty, thank you, Chairman. We do have viewers online watching right now, so we did receive a question. This is from user, his name nimble@gmail.com. Hi, my formal question is as follows: The Caltrans 2015 PSR PDS study estimated that dual lane ExpressLanes on the corridor would cost an estimated 125 to 200 million. What accounts for the over two-fold increase in the current cost estimate of 520.9 million? And I believe our partners from LA Metro may be able to answer that question.

- Okay, which one of you folks over there?

- Yes, I think there are a few reasons for that. As indicated, the PSR was finalized in 2015, so that was four years ago, so the estimates have increased over time. In addition, we intend to add weave lanes at all of our ingress and egress locations. So the weave lanes are an extra lane at the ingress egress locations that facilitate movement in and out of the ExpressLanes. So, in alternative three, the dual ExpressLanes, we have about 20 bridge widenings that we anticipate widening about three to five feet. So that is a pretty significant cost increase that was not included in the Caltrans estimate. The Caltrans estimate assumed a straight conversion to ExpressLanes without any weave lanes. In addition, our tolling infrastructure cost, I think, has increased since then due to various equipment that we need, testing that we need. So, part of that is also the tolling infrastructure that we need to install.

- [Chair] Okay, Shahrzad.

- If I may just add, I think it's important to note that the PSR PDS is the project initiation document, so that's your first step as you get these, figures always get refined across the board, across all modes as you closer to realizing, you know what, we have to widen bridges or federal highways is saying you have to have a weave lane because of the number of movements, so that happens. We're just getting closer to a refined cost figure.

- Okay, good. Well, I'm delighted to know that folks are able to watch us remotely and so, with that, no more online questions, Jofil? Any more questions from the audience? Well, yes. Please come, could you, we just need you to give us a card so we can record it.

- [Woman] I just have a question, are there--

- Can you tell us your name, please?

- [Woman] Oh, I'm sorry, Ana Chavez. I'm wondering if any homes may be jeopardizing this program expansion?

- [Chair] Metro?

- Philbert Wong with Metro. Currently, there is a possibility of partial right of way acquisition on Imperial Highway, just west of Alameda Street. The widening that we would need is to maintain sight distance on the 105 freeway and there's a possibility that we need to would need to acquire about three to five feet. However, we are hoping that we can, through design, we can eliminate that right away acquisition. It's possible that we could cantilever the freeway over Imperial Highway. There's also a center median on Imperial Highway at that location that we could, potentially, reduce so that we would not need to acquire any right of way. So, our intent, while we are assuming that in the environmental document, our intent is to engineer the facility and the design so that we don't need to do that.

- [Woman] If I could just follow up on that question, I think it was, would there be any homes that might need to be taken? Are you aware yet, in the footprint, when you talk right away?

- No, no full takes are anticipated. There are five partial takes, potentially, to basically address what Philbert just raised about sight distance. But, again, we're looking--

- Partial take?

- Partial takes of residential areas, yes.

- So, there may be?

- Partial takes of some homes, potentially. But we're really trying to focus, as Philbert indicated, at least I'm trying to focus on Imperial Highway and potentially working with Caltrans to reduce the median so that we do not have to touch any homes. And that's only under alternative three. We don't anticipate having to touch anything under alternative two.

- [Butler] So, I don't want to make any assumptions about what folks from the public understand but I'm new here. So could you, for perhaps who might not be as in depth in the knowledge, explain the difference between a full take and partial take and what a partial take could actually mean?

- So, a full take would be taking the entire home. Partial take, in this case, might mean three to four feet of the backyard. Sure.

- With that partial take--

- Follow-up question.

- With the three feet, do these homeowners, would they be compensated a wall for noise, windows for noise?

- Well, they have to be compensated one way or the other, whether it's wall, windows, money. Yes, we're not just taking it and walking away.

- You know, that all is part of the environmental process and I really want to encourage you to participate in that because that's where the work gets done in terms of figuring out exactly what to do and how to do it. So, thank you for coming tonight and for encouraging. Now, Jofil came back, so our technology is working, yes.

- Thank you. This is not my comment, this is a comment from an online user, Mr. George Sunny. I routinely take the 110 northbound and HOT lanes average speed have usefully been below 30 miles per hour but the lane does go HOV only. Knowing this, what makes you think that the 105 will not remain degraded? I believe that question is for our partners from LA Metro.

- All right, thank you. The 45 miles per hour is actually within the law, is within the am peak periods. So, there may be a time with this gentleman is driving and I'm not questioning his figures, that, for a stretch, he may be going 30 miles an hour, that does not mean, or below 30, that does not mean he's traveling the entire corridor at 30 miles per hour. RC, do you want to add to that? I've got a lot of support here today. As you can imagine, this is a very complex system project as well.

- Good evening, it's great to be here. And thank you, again, for all the comments and feedback. To address the comment that we just heard--

- [Chair] Say your name.

- I'm sorry, Robert Campbell, Metro ExpressLanes Congestion Reduction. I'm a manager of transportation planning. Certainly, we are aware that, at certain times of the day, the speeds do tend to drop a bit and one of the things that we're doing right now, we're in the process of getting an encroachment permit to do just this is to significantly expand our detection in the lanes. In some places, more than doubling the density of our detectors because sometimes the traffic will slow down and you may know this, the traffic will slow down during this one stretch and then speed up on another stretch and slow down again. And depending on exactly where the speed-ups and slow-downs happen, our detectors, as they are right now sometimes don't capture it right away, but with this expansion that we're doing now of our detection, we should be able to capture that much faster and our prices, then, can respond much faster as the speeds start to drop, regardless of where that congestion is starting on the corridor. In addition to that, we're also taking a look at our pricing algorithm. We're learning a lot from the data that we collect every day and we're always going back and refining and recalibrating the weight that we give to different inputs so that we can maintain a better performing lane at all times and we have plans to continue to do that even after we deploy this expanded detection. And both of those things should work in concert to address the performance concerns that this comment you raised for the 110 and, certainly, that will then carry over to the 105 as well.

- Right, Jofil, any more questions?

- So, just for the record, again, this Jofil Borja and these comments are actually being forwarded to our inbox at the California Transportation Commission. Our friends over at Metro have made sure that as this session is going through, the public have access to not only to commission but commission staff. So, as they're watching this session right now, live, they're actually sending us emails which will be formally included in the staff book item that will be considered by the commission at our next commission meeting.

- Wow, we have come a long way, so, this is so exciting.

- Yes, Chairman, we've also tweeted about this event and our tweet says that the commission is listening to you, so we have a lot of members of the public that are listening to us right now and, with that, I'd like to just make a comment that we've received from another user. He said that in his experience with the 110 ExpressLanes, there's not much consistency in average speed between 25 and 60 miles per hour average speed and the ExpressLanes remain degraded and still accept cars. I believe that comment may have already been answered but if Metro, if you would still like to follow up with that or say anything else, we'd be happy to hear. Thank you.

- Thank you, it sounds like a different perspective of the same core issue and so, the response I will give is the same, that we are taking a multi-pronged approach to address the inconsistent performance in certain sections, certain isolated areas where demand tends to be most variable. So, I think the previous answer you heard addresses that comment as well.

- Okay, well, just my personal goal in all of this, and I said this to MTC and Steve Hemminger several years ago was when we have a value, a HOT lane and we say pay us X amount of money and we'll get you there in X minutes faster or whatever the deal is, that when we can't deliver on that goal that we refund the money and I know that on the 110 and I think the 10 as well is if we had an incident then we refunded the money, is that true, Shahrzad? From that, no, we're not doing that? You're frowning, you're frowning, okay.

- [Shahrzad] If there's an exit on the side, an accident--

- Yeah, okay, okay. Well, let's all strive, you know, this is under my user-friendliness, deliver value to our folks. If we could get to point where we put a proposition up, pay X amount and you get Y, let's see if we can't, if we don't deliver on that, then, you know, we give them a refund. So I think that technology is probably somewhere there and available but I do think for all of us in terms of serving the public, when we try to improve mobility options, it's important that we do try every angle to make it simple and efficient and deliver.

- I just wanted to add something that Mark touched upon. We are doing a proof of concept of an occupancy detection system because we go out monthly and we do counts and it's kind of unfortunate to say this and it appears to be common across all ExpressLanes, colleagues I've talked to, in the am peak, we have between 20 and 30% of our users who basically are misdeclaring so that they can travel free of charge. And so, every time I go to our board, I don't want to talk about increasing the per-mile rate because if I am cheating, then you're paying more. So increasing--

- [Chair] Mr. Butler and I are paying twice but--

- That's because you...

- [Butler] User problem.

- [Shahrzad] But definitely, yeah, we are looking at that because it's an unfair--

- Yeah, it is.

- Your pointing to equity across the board.

- Exactly.

- Equity for the low income.

- Equity for people we promised to get a better trip. And, again, and that's part of the reason our board did approve a rather conservative approach to increasing, incrementally increasing the cap of our toll rate. But, you know, simply because they're

aware that there are a lot of people that are basically gaming the system and getting in. And if CHP stops them because we do have contracts with CHP, then they're caught. And if they don't, they're willing to take the chance of getting a free trip.

- Wow.

- Well, if you're not honest and you're in the HOV lane when you're not supposed to be there, it's a significant fine. So does that same--

- It's slightly less.

- Apply to folks who aren't honest with their transponder?

- Yes, it's not as high as, I think the--

- [Chair] It's like 600 bucks, isn't it?

- [Shahrzadizid] Four-hundred and something, I think, the first time. But ours is more in the vicinity of 280. But, you know, it's actually CHP depending on what they see with the driver.

- Okay, well let's hope we can increase the honesty factor 'cause I think your point, Shahrzad, of equity for all is best served when everybody's playing by the rules. So, that's good. Okay, with that, I think we're going to call it and evening and thank you to Saint Francis, again, for hosting us, thank you to Metro and Caltrans for taking care of all the logistics and making this happen and to our staff at CTC. Thank you very much and especially, thank you to the public that came out and those that watched us at home tonight, we appreciated the opportunity to serve you. So, thank you, meeting adjourned.

Attachment C

SCAG
INNOVATING FOR A BETTER TOMORROW

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
900 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 1700
Los Angeles, CA 90017
T: (213) 236-1800
www.scag.ca.gov

September 18, 2019

Ms. Susan Bransen
Executive Director
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street MS-52
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Support for the Metro I-105 ExpressLanes Toll Authorization Request

Dear Ms. Bransen:

On behalf of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), I would like to offer this letter of support for the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's (Metro) application to the California Transportation Commission's (CTC) for tolling authority for the I-105 High Occupancy Toll (ExpressLanes).

The I-105 is a pivotal east-west corridor that connects Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) to downtown Los Angeles via the I-110, I-710, and I-605 freeways, of which the latter two are some of the nation's most critical freight arteries that enable both interstate and international commerce. The I-105 freeway currently experiences heavy congestion and demand on the facility exceeds capacity in both the general purpose and high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes. During peak periods, travel times over the 16-mile corridor can be two to three times longer than off peak periods, which has a significant impact on economic competitiveness and productivity.

The implementation of tolled ExpressLanes on the I-105 would reduce congestion, improve travel time reliability, and improve performance on local arterials in the I-105 corridor. Reduced congestion will in turn facilitate more efficient freight and passenger movement. In addition, the ExpressLanes would provide choice to travelers to save time when needed and create synergies with the existing I-110 ExpressLanes, enabling seamless travel between downtown Los Angeles and key destinations including LAX.

As a project that is consistent with the policies and goals set forth in the adopted 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategies (RTP/SCS), we support Metro's efforts and respectfully request that the CTC give full and fair consideration to this important project proposal. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Annie Name, Manager of Goods Movement and Transportation Finance, at (213) 236-1827 or by email at nam@scag.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Kome Ajise

Kome Ajise
Executive Director

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR
P.O. BOX 942873, MS–49
SACRAMENTO, CA 94273–0001
PHONE (916) 654-6130
FAX (916) 653-5776
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov

Making Conservation a California Way of Life.

September 25, 2019

Ms. Susan Bransen
Executive Director
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Ms. Bransen:

On behalf of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), I am pleased to provide this letter of support for the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's (LA Metro) application for tolling authority for the Interstate 105 High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes, also known as ExpressLanes.

Interstate 105 (I-105) is a pivotal east-west corridor which connects the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) and the I-405, I-110, I-710 and I-605 freeways, the nation's critical freight arteries that enable both interstate and international commerce. This freeway currently experiences heavy congestion, as the demand on this facility exceeds capacity. Every weekday, the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) on I-105 is between 200,000 to 250,000 vehicles with some locations reaching 300,000 ADT. During peak periods, speeds in the general purpose lanes average between 22-28 miles per hour, and travel times over the 16-mile corridor are between 34-43 minutes compared to 15 minutes under free flow conditions. Congestion in the eastbound direction during the PM peak period can last as long as six hours between 2-8 PM. The speed on the high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes are below the Federal performance standard of 45 mph. The Caltrans 2017 HOV Degradation Report designates significant sections of the I-105 HOV lanes as degraded.

In response to these conditions, Caltrans has prepared and is preparing several studies and an environmental document to address conditions on the I-105 freeway. In June 2014, a Transportation Concept Report (TCR) was prepared that defined current conditions and key corridor issues. In September 2015, Caltrans completed the I-105 Project Study Report-Project Development Support (PSR-PDS) that included single and dual HOT lanes as project alternatives.

Building on the PSR-PDS, Caltrans is currently partnering with Metro to prepare the Project Report and Environmental Document (PA/ED) for potential ExpressLanes on I-105. The PA/ED includes both single and dual ExpressLanes alternatives between the I-405 and I-605 freeways.

ExpressLanes on I-105 are also consistent with state and regional plans. This project is included in the project list in the 2017 Caltrans District 7 System Management Plan. In addition, the 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) includes the I-105 ExpressLanes in the financially constrained plan as project #1162S011. SCAG has also prepared the I-105 Corridor Sustainability Study that recommended solutions to reduce congestion, improve system connectivity, efficiency, and safety while also resulting in improved air quality and lowered emissions, with the ExpressLanes identified as an integral element of this plan. The ExpressLanes project is also an action that Caltrans has proposed to the Federal Highway Administration to address HOV lane degradation on I-105.

In accordance with Streets and Highways Code Section 149.7, a toll operation agreement outlining terms, roles and responsibilities for the ExpressLanes will be executed between Caltrans and LA Metro prior to beginning tolling operations.

The implementation of ExpressLanes, specifically the dual lane alternative, is projected to increase vehicle and passenger throughput in both the general purpose and HOV lanes, improve performance on local arterials in the I-105 corridor, and improve performance in the HOV lanes to meet Federal HOV performance standards. Given these resulting benefits, Caltrans respectfully requests that the California Transportation Commission approve this application for tolling authority for the I-105 ExpressLanes project.

Sincerely,

BOB FRANZOIA
Acting Director

Los Angeles County Business Federation
Strengthening the Voice of Business Since 2008

September 23, 2019

Susan Bransen
Executive Director
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street MS-52
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: I-105 ExpressLanes toll authorization request

Dear Ms. Bransen:

On behalf of BizFed, a grassroots alliance of more than 180 business organizations that represent 400,000 employers with over 3.5 million employees in LA County, we are writing to express strong support for the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's (Metro) application for tolling authority for the I-105 High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes, also known as ExpressLanes.

The I-105 is a pivotal east-west corridor which connects Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), to downtown Los Angeles via the I-110, and the I-710 and I-605 freeways, two of the nation's critical freight arteries that enable both interstate and international commerce. The implementation of ExpressLanes on the I-105 would reduce congestion, improve travel time reliability, as well as improve performance on local arterials in the I-105 corridor. Reduced congestion will in turn facilitate more efficient freight and passenger movement.

The ExpressLanes would provide choice to travelers to save time when needed and create synergies with the existing I-110 ExpressLanes, enabling seamless travel between downtown Los Angeles and key destinations including LAX.

In addition, based on the success of the Metro ExpressLanes on the I-110 an I-10 freeways, BizFed also would like to add the following support:

1. Support the two lane ExpressLanes version while it proceeds through the study phase.
2. Support for a Net Toll Revenue policy (which keeps revenues generated from the corridor use to fund improvements within the corridor) similar to the policy which governs the I-110 and I-10 freeways.

Recognizing the regional and local benefits of this project, BizFed respectfully requests the California Transportation Commission approve the I-105 ExpressLanes toll facility application.

Sincerely,

Steve Bullock
BizFed Chair
Cerrell Associates

David Fleming
BizFed Founding Chair

Tracy Hernandez
BizFed Founding CEO
IMPOWER, Inc.

Los Angeles County Business Federation

Strengthening the Voice of Business Since 2008

BizFed Association Members

Action Apartment Association
AIA - Los Angeles
Alhambra Chamber
American Beverage Association
American Hotel & Lodging Association
Antelope Valley Board of Trade
Angeles Emeralds
Apartment Association, California Southern Cities
Apartment Association of Greater Los Angeles
Arcadia Association of Realtors
AREAA North Los Angeles SFV SCV
Asian Business Association
Association of Independent Commercial Producers
Azusa Chamber
Beverly Hills Bar Association
Beverly Hills Chamber
Beverly Hills / Greater LA Association of Realtors
BNI4SUCCESS
Burbank Association of Realtors
Building Industry Association, LA / Ventura Counties
Building Owners & Managers Association, Greater LA
Business & Industry Council for Emergency Planning & Preparedness
CalAsian Chamber
California Apartment Association, Los Angeles
California Asphalt Pavement Association
California Business Roundtable
California Cannabis Industry Association
California Construction Industry and Materials Association
California Contract Cities Association
California Fashion Association
California Gaming Association
California Grocers Association
California Hotel & Lodging Association
California Independent Oil Marketers
California Independent Petroleum Association
California Life Sciences Association
California Metals Coalition
California Restaurant Association
California Small Business Alliance
California Sportfishing League
California Trucking Association
CALInnovates
Carson Chamber of Commerce
Carson Dominguez Employers Alliance
CDC Small Business Finance
Central City Association
Century City Chamber of Commerce
Cerritos Chamber
Citrus Valley Association of Realtors
Commerce Industrial Council/Chamber of Commerce
Construction Industry Air and Water Quality Coalitions
Consumer Healthcare Products Association
Council on Trade and Investment for Filipino Americans
Covina Chamber of Commerce
Culver City Chamber of Commerce
Downey Association of Realtors
Downtown Long Beach Alliance
El Monte/South El Monte Chamber
Employers Group
Engineering Contractor's Association
F.A.S.T.-Fixing Angelenos Stuck In Traffic
FilmLA
Foreign Trade Association
FuturePorts
Gardena Valley Chamber of Commerce
Gateway to LA
Glendale Association of Realtors
Glendale Chamber
Glendora Chamber
Greater Antelope Valley AOR
Greater Lakewood Chamber
Greater Los Angeles African American Chamber
Greater Los Angeles New Car Dealers Association
Harbor Trucking Association
Historic Core Bid
Hollywood Chamber
Hong Kong Trade Development Council
Hospital Association of Southern California
Hotel Association of Los Angeles
Independent Cities Association
Industry Manufacturers Council
International Warehouse Logistics Association
Investing in Place
Irwindale Chamber
Japan Business Association of Southern California
La Canada Flintridge Chamber
LAX Coastal Area Chamber
League of California Cities
Long Beach Area Chamber
Los Angeles Area Chamber
Los Angeles Cleantech Incubator
Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition
Los Angeles County Medical Association
Los Angeles County Waste Management Association
Los Angeles Gateway Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles Gay & Lesbian Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles Latino Chamber
Los Angeles Parking Association
Maple Business Council
Motion Picture Association of America
MoveLA
NAIOP Southern California Chapter
National Association of Royalty Owners
National Association of Tobacco Outlets
National Association of Women Business Owners
National Association of Women Business Owners, LA
National Hispanic Medical Association
National Latina Business Women's Association
Nederlands-America Foundation
Orange County Business Council
Pacific Merchant Shipping Association
Pacific Palisades Chamber
Panorama City Chamber
Paramount Chamber of Commerce
Pasadena Chamber
Pasadena-Foothills Association of Realtors
PhRMA
Planned Parenthood Southern California Affiliates
Pomona Chamber
Rancho Southeast Association of Realtors
Recording Industry Association of America
Regional Black Chamber - San Fernando Valley
Regional San Gabriel Valley Chamber
Rosemead Chamber
San Gabriel Chamber
San Gabriel Valley Civic Alliance
San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership
Santa Clarita Valley Chamber
Santa Clarita Valley Economic Development Corp.
San Pedro Peninsula Chamber
Santa Monica Chamber
Santa Monica Junior Chamber
Sherman Oaks Chamber of Commerce
South Bay Association of Chambers
South Bay Association of Realtors
Southern California Contractors Association
Southern California Golf Association
Southern California Grantmakers
Southern California Minority Supplier Development Council Inc.
Southern California Water Coalition
Southland Regional Association of Realtors
The Young Professionals at the Petroleum Club
Torrance Area Chamber
Town Hall Los Angeles
Tri-Counties Association of Realtors
United Chambers San Fernando Valley
United States-Mexico Chamber
Unmanned Autonomous Vehicle Systems Association
US Resiliency Council
Valley Economic Alliance
Valley Economic Development Corp.
Valley Industry & Commerce Association
Vernon Chamber
Vietnamese American Chamber
Warner Center Association
West Hollywood Chamber
West Los Angeles Chamber
West San Gabriel Valley Association of Realtors
West Valley/Warner Center Chamber
Western Manufactured Housing Association
Western States Petroleum Association
Westside Council of Chambers
Westwood Village Rotary Club
Wilmington Chamber
World Trade Center
Young Professionals in Energy - LA Chapter

From: Robert Rooney
To: Borja, Jofil@CATC
Subject: 105 Express Lane
Date: Sunday, September 22, 2019 5:43:47 PM

Dear CTC,
I am against installing an express lane anywhere on the 105 freeway.

Reducing the number of lanes available to ordinary traffic increases traffic density, increasing air pollution, which directly harms the poorest in our community.

The externality of installing an express lane on the 105 freeway is paid for by those stuck in traffic for longer - literally in terms of fuel, and figuratively in terms of their time spent.

I expect government to build programs that encourage equality, not divide us based on our ability to pay for amenities.

Installing an express lane on the 105 is morally wrong.

Sincerely,
Robert David Rooney
562/277-7676

From: Jim Medina <jmedina_ratboy@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2019 7:19 PM
To: Borja, Jofil@CATC <Jofil.Borja@catc.ca.gov>
Cc: Patrick O'Donnell <district4@longbeach.gov>
Subject: I-105 Express Lanes

I will be unable to attend the community meeting on 9/25. However I would like my concerns considered.

First, your fact sheet this proposed project includes a huge misrepresentation. In each proposed alternative a lane identified as "Auxiliary Lane" implies a 4th traffic lane. A casual reader will see this as an available 4th lane which does not exists.

A second glaring misrepresentation is the term "Express Lane." What you are proposing are TOLL LANES: drivers will have to pay to use these lanes. Correction, drivers will have to pay AGAIN to use these lanes. State taxes have already been paid for the use and maintenance of our freeways: we will have to pay AGAIN to use your Toll Lanes. You also do not mention what it costs to acquire a transponder and keep it active.

You would be better served to represent this for what it is: another revenue stream for the state. If you were at least honest, you would at least demonstrate some integrity. The Toll Lanes currently on the 110 do not reduce traffic. They simply allow drivers who are willing to pay a somewhat quicker method of traversing a portion of the 110. They do not reduce traffic in regular lanes. They do however force casual carpools into regular traffic lanes, unless they are willing to pay to acquire a transponder and then pay to keep it active.

Express Lanes, as you call them, are not a solution to traffic in the L.A. Metro area. Reliable, prompt, safe transit is. Currently 90% of transit in the area fails on all accounts. Metro continues to plan rail lines running at grade (that is, IN TRAFFIC!) and wonders why ridership is down. Uh, because I can get there faster by car. And the bus service is extremely slow and only somewhat reliable.

Focus funding on reliable transit alternatives, and manage and audit transit spending to eliminate waste. But don't try to raise revenue by selling access to Toll Lanes.

Sincerely,
James Medina
5834 E. Parkcrest St.
Long Beach, CA 90808
562-354-6181

Attachment D

AB-194 High-occupancy toll lanes. (2015-2016)

Assembly Bill No. 194

CHAPTER 687

An act to amend Section 149.7 of, and to add Section 149.12 to, the Streets and Highways Code, relating to transportation, and making an appropriation therefor.

[Approved by Governor October 09, 2015. Filed with Secretary of State October 09, 2015.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 194, Frazier. High-occupancy toll lanes.

Existing law provides that the Department of Transportation has full possession and control of the state highway system. Existing law authorizes the department to construct exclusive or preferential lanes for buses only or for buses and other high-occupancy vehicles.

Existing law authorizes a regional transportation agency, as defined, in cooperation with the department to apply to the California Transportation Commission to develop and operate high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes, including administration and operation of a value-pricing program and exclusive or preferential lane facilities for public transit, consistent with established standards, requirements, and limitations that apply to specified facilities. Existing law requires the commission to conduct at least one public hearing in northern California and one in southern California for each eligible application submitted by the regional transportation agency. Existing law limits the number of approved facilities to not more than 4, 2 in northern California and 2 in southern California, and provides that no applications may be approved on or after January 1, 2012.

This bill would authorize a regional transportation agency or the department to apply to the commission to develop and operate HOT lanes or other toll facilities, as specified, and would delete the January 1, 2012, deadline for HOT lane applications and remove the existing limitation on the number of facilities that may be approved. The bill would include the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority within the definition of regional transportation authority for these purposes. The bill would delete the requirement that the facilities be consistent with the established standards, requirements, and limitations that apply to specified facilities and would instead require the commission to establish eligibility criteria set forth in guidelines for the development and operation of the facilities and provide for the review and approval by the commission of each proposed toll facility pursuant to those eligibility criteria. The bill would require toll facilities approved by the commission on or after January 1, 2016, to be subject to specified minimum requirements, including those relating to toll facility revenues. The bill would authorize a regional transportation agency or the state, as applicable, to issue bonds, refunding bonds, or bond anticipation notes backed by revenues generated from the facilities. The bill would delete the requirement that the commission conduct at least one public hearing in northern California and one in southern California for each eligible application and would instead require the commission to conduct at least one public hearing at or near the proposed toll facility. The bill would require a regional transportation agency that applies to the commission to reimburse the commission for all of the commission's costs and expenses incurred in processing the application and to enter into specified agreements with the department and the Department of the California Highway Patrol. Before submitting an application to the commission, the bill would require a regional

transportation agency to consult with every local transportation authority and every congestion management agency whose jurisdiction includes the facility that the regional transportation agency proposes to develop and operate pursuant to the above-described provisions. The bill would require the regional transportation agency to give a local transportation authority or congestion management agency, as specified, the option of entering into agreements, as needed, for project development, engineering, financial studies, and environmental documentation for each construction project or segment, and would authorize the local transportation authority or congestion management agency to be the lead agency for those construction projects or segments. The bill would provide that these provisions do not authorize or prohibit the conversion of any existing nontoll or nonuser-fee lanes into tolled or user-fee lanes, except that a high-occupancy vehicle lane may be converted into a HOT lane pursuant to its provisions.

This bill would create the Highway Toll Account in the State Transportation Fund for the management of funds received by the Department of Transportation for toll facilities operated by the department under the bill. The bill would continuously appropriate to the department the portion of revenues designated and necessary for the payment of debt service for those facilities.

This bill would become operative only if AB 914 is enacted and takes effect on or before January 1, 2016.

Vote: majority Appropriation: yes Fiscal Committee: yes Local Program: no

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

SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(a) The development, improvement, expansion, and maintenance of an efficient, safe, and well-maintained system of roads, highways, and other transportation facilities is essential to the economic well-being and high quality of life of the people of this state.

(b) High-occupancy toll lanes, express lanes, and toll roads provide an opportunity to more effectively manage state highways in order to increase passenger throughput and to reduce delays for freight shipments and travelers, especially those traveling by carpool, vanpool, or bus.

(c) Highway tolling should be employed for the purpose of optimizing the performance of the transportation system on a transportation corridor and should not be employed strictly as a revenue generating facility.

SEC. 2. Section 149.7 of the Streets and Highways Code is amended to read:

149.7. (a) Notwithstanding Sections 149 and 30800, a regional transportation agency, as defined in subdivision (k), or the department may apply to the commission to develop and operate high-occupancy toll lanes or other toll facilities, including the administration and operation of a value pricing program and exclusive or preferential lane facilities for public transit or freight.

(b) Each application for the development and operation of the toll facilities described in subdivision (a) shall be subject to review and approval by the commission pursuant to eligibility criteria set forth in guidelines established by the commission. Prior to approving an application, the commission shall conduct at least one public hearing at or near the proposed toll facility for the purpose of receiving public comment. Upon approval of an application, the regional transportation agency or the department may develop and operate the toll facility proposed in the application.

(c) The eligibility criteria set forth in the guidelines established by the commission pursuant to subdivision (b) shall include, at a minimum, all of the following:

(1) A demonstration that the proposed toll facility will improve the corridor’s performance by, for example, increasing passenger throughput or reducing delays for freight shipments and travelers, especially those traveling by carpool, vanpool, and transit.

(2) A requirement that the proposed toll facility is contained in the constrained portion of a conforming regional transportation plan prepared pursuant to Section 65080 of the Government Code.

(3) Evidence of cooperation between the applicable regional transportation agency and the department.

(4) A discussion of how the proposed toll facility meets the requirements of this section.

(5) A requirement that a project initiation document has been completed for the proposed toll facility.

(6) A demonstration that a complete funding plan has been prepared.

(d) A regional transportation agency that applies to the commission to develop and operate toll facilities pursuant to this section shall reimburse the commission for all of the commission's costs and expenses incurred in processing the application.

(e) Toll facilities approved by the commission on or after January 1, 2016, pursuant to this section, shall be subject to the following minimum requirements:

(1) A regional transportation agency sponsoring a toll facility shall enter into an agreement with the Department of the California Highway Patrol that addresses all law enforcement matters related to the toll facility and an agreement with the department that addresses all matters related to design, construction, maintenance, and operation of the toll facility, including, but not limited to, liability, financing, repair, rehabilitation, and reconstruction.

(2) A regional transportation agency sponsoring a toll facility shall be responsible for reimbursing the department and the Department of the California Highway Patrol for their costs related to the toll facility pursuant to an agreement between the agency and the department and an agreement between the agency and the Department of the California Highway Patrol.

(3) The sponsoring agency shall be responsible for establishing, collecting, and administering tolls, and may include discounts and premiums for the use of the toll facility.

(4) The revenue generated from the operation of the toll facility shall be available to the sponsoring agency for the direct expenses related to the following:

(A) Debt issued to construct, repair, rehabilitate, or reconstruct any portion of the toll facility, payment of debt service, and satisfaction of other covenants and obligations related to indebtedness of the toll facility.

(B) The development, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, improvement, reconstruction, administration, and operation of the toll facility, including toll collection and enforcement.

(C) Reserves for the purposes specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(5) All remaining revenue generated by the toll facility shall be used in the corridor from which the revenue was generated pursuant to an expenditure plan developed by the sponsoring agency, as follows:

(A) (i) For a toll facility sponsored by a regional transportation agency, the regional transportation agency shall develop the expenditure plan in consultation with the department.

(ii) For a toll facility sponsored by the department, the department shall develop the expenditure plan in consultation with the applicable regional transportation agency.

(B) (i) For a toll facility sponsored by a regional transportation agency, the governing board of the regional transportation agency shall review and approve the expenditure plan and any updates.

(ii) For a toll facility sponsored by the department, the commission shall review and approve the expenditure plan and any updates.

(6) The sponsoring agency's administrative expenses related to operation of a toll facility shall not exceed 3 percent of the toll revenues.

(f) For any project under this section involving the conversion of an existing high-occupancy vehicle lane to a high-occupancy toll lane, the sponsoring agency shall demonstrate that the project will, at a minimum, result in expanded efficiency of the corridor in terms of travel time reliability, passenger throughput, or other efficiency benefit.

(g) This section shall not prevent the construction of facilities that compete with a toll facility approved by the commission pursuant to this section, and the sponsoring agency shall not be entitled to compensation for the adverse effects on toll revenue due to those competing facilities.

(h) A sponsoring agency that develops or operates a toll facility pursuant to this section shall provide any information or data requested by the commission or the Legislative Analyst. The commission, in cooperation with the Legislative Analyst, shall annually prepare a summary report on the progress of the development and operation of any toll facilities authorized pursuant to this section. The commission may submit this report as a section in its annual report to the Legislature required pursuant to Section 14535 of the Government Code.

(i) (1) A regional transportation agency may issue bonds, refunding bonds, or bond anticipation notes, at any time, to finance construction of, and construction-related expenditures for, a toll facility approved pursuant to this section, and construction and construction-related expenditures that are included in the expenditure plan adopted pursuant to paragraph (5) of subdivision (e), payable from the revenues generated from the toll facility. The bonds, refunding bonds, and bond anticipation notes shall bear such interest rates and other features and terms as the regional transportation agency shall approve and may be sold by the regional transportation agency at public or private sale.

(2) A bond, refunding bond, or bond anticipation note issued pursuant to this subdivision shall contain on its face a statement to the following effect:

"Neither the full faith and credit nor the taxing power of the State of California is pledged to the payment of principal of, or the interest on, this instrument."

(3) Bonds, refunding bonds, and bond anticipation notes issued pursuant to this subdivision are legal investments for all trust funds, the funds of all insurance companies, banks, trust companies, executors, administrators, trustees, and other fiduciaries.

(4) Interest earned on any bonds, refunding bonds, and bond anticipation notes issued pursuant to this subdivision shall at all times be free from state personal income tax and corporate income tax.

(5) (A) For a toll facility operated by the department, the California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank or the Treasurer may issue bonds, refunding bonds, or bond anticipation notes, at any time, to finance development, construction, or reconstruction of, and construction-related expenditures for, a toll facility approved pursuant to this section and construction and construction-related expenditures that are included in the expenditure plan adopted pursuant to paragraph (5) of subdivision (e), payable solely from the toll revenue and ancillary revenues generated from the toll facility.

(B) This subdivision shall be deemed to provide all necessary state law authority for purposes of Section 63024.5 of the Government Code.

(j) (1) Before submitting an application pursuant to subdivision (a), a regional transportation agency shall consult with every local transportation authority designated pursuant to Division 12.5 (commencing with Section 131000) or Division 19 (commencing with Section 180000) of the Public Utilities Code and every congestion management agency whose jurisdiction includes the toll facility that the regional transportation agency proposes to develop and operate.

(2) A regional transportation agency shall give a local transportation authority or congestion management agency described in paragraph (1) the option to enter into agreements, as needed, for project development, engineering, financial studies, and environmental documentation for each construction project or segment that is part of the toll facility. The local transportation authority or congestion management agency may be the lead agency for these construction projects or segments.

(k) Notwithstanding Section 143, for purposes of this section, "regional transportation agency" means any of the following:

(1) A transportation planning agency described in Section 29532 or 29532.1 of the Government Code.

(2) A county transportation commission established under Section 130050, 130050.1, or 130050.2 of the Public Utilities Code.

(3) Any other local or regional transportation entity that is designated by statute as a regional transportation agency.

(4) A joint exercise of powers authority established pursuant to Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 6500) of Division 7 of Title 1 of the Government Code, with the consent of a transportation planning agency or a county transportation commission for the jurisdiction in which the transportation project will be developed.

(5) The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority established pursuant to Part 12 (commencing with Section 100000) of Division 10 of the Public Utilities Code.

(l) A regional transportation agency or the department may require any vehicle accessing a toll facility authorized under this section to have an electronic toll collection transponder or other electronic device for enforcement or

tolling purposes.

(m) Nothing in this section shall authorize or prohibit the conversion of any existing nontoll or nonuser-fee lanes into tolled or user-fee lanes, except that a high-occupancy vehicle lane may be converted into a high-occupancy toll lane.

(n) Nothing in this section shall apply to, modify, limit, or otherwise restrict the authority of any joint powers authority described in Section 66484.3 of the Government Code to establish or collect tolls or otherwise operate any toll facility or modify or expand a toll facility.

SEC. 3. Section 149.12 is added to the Streets and Highways Code, to read:

149.12. The Highway Toll Account is hereby created in the State Transportation Fund for the management of funds received by the department for toll facilities authorized pursuant to Section 149.7 and operated by the department. Notwithstanding Section 13340 of the Government Code, moneys in the Highway Toll Account designated and necessary for the payment of any debt service associated with a toll facility project shall be continuously appropriated, without regard to fiscal year, to the department for the purposes described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (e) of Section 149.7. All other moneys deposited in the Highway Toll Account that are derived from premium and accrued interest on bonds sold pursuant to Section 149.7 shall be reserved in the account and shall be available for expenditure, upon appropriation by the Legislature, as specified in subdivision (e) of Section 149.7. Pursuant to Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 16720) of Part 3 of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code, the cost of bond issuance shall be paid out of the bond proceeds, including premium, if any.

SEC. 4. This act shall become operative only if Assembly Bill 914 of the 2015–16 Regular Session is enacted and takes effect on or before January 1, 2016.