ATTACHMENT E
Metro Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program
SCOPE OF WORK

Project ID: LA0G1715

Project Title: Imperial Highway Complete Street Study

Project Limits: The project is located at 2,600' West of SR-39 in the City of La Mirada west to Alameda Street in the City of Lynwood, for a total of 14.6 miles.

Which traverses through the jurisdictions of La Mirada, LA County, Santa Fe Springs, Norwalk, Downey, South Gate and Lynwood,

in the Gateway Cities Council of Governments area.

Project Description:
Develop a subregional Complete Street master plan for Imperial Highway, which is a high priority high quality transit arterial within the Gateway Cities. This high priority corridor is based on the Gateway Cities COG Board approved prioritization process. The limits extend from COG boundary to COG boundary for a total of approximately 14.6 miles (total). This masterplan will maximize multimodal opportunities on this E/W arterial corridor within the Gateway Cities, as well as maximize our ability to obtain grants for design and construction.

Project Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ITEM</th>
<th>Grant funds (LACMTA)</th>
<th>LOCAL AGENCY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Design, Engineering</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$000,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BUDGET COST</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$000,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCOPE:

I. Task 1: Project Management and Administration
   a. Project Initiation

   The GCCOG will hold a kick-off meeting with the Cities and Metro to discuss the project scope of work, goals and objectives. A meeting agenda, minutes and action items listing will be produced.

   b. Project Administration

   The GCCOG will submit complete invoice packages to Metro based on existing/status quo protocol. The progress report will contain the following components:

   1. Executive summary
   2. Description of the tasks or deliverables completed
   3. Management issues, including status, resolution and action items
   4. Project task schedule describing percentages of completeness of each task
   5. Schedule and schedule tracking narrative
   6. List of deliverable items
   7. Dollar amount for which payment is requested.

   c. Project Management

   The GCCOG will complete the project including the technical tasks included in this scope as well as the Project Management of the overall project.

II. Task 2: Review Existing Documentations

   The GCCOG will gather all relevant document and literature for review and summarize useful information and findings relating to the Corridor, including the STP, relevant transit plans, relevant agency land use plans, and relevant as-builts.


III. Task 3: Corridor Evaluation Documentations
   a. Existing Conditions Corridor Evaluation and Analysis

   The GCCOG will conduct thorough existing conditions analysis by identifying opportunities and constraints for the multimodal Corridor. This is partially obtained via a 1-on-1 meeting with each agency, which will be documented in the report. Evaluation analysis could include the current traffic conditions and Levels of Service, truck volumes/impacts, pavement needs, pedestrian and bicycle traffic, transit connections, parking and other commercial and residential
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linkages, and City entryways, or gateways, and potential safe routes to school options.

b. Future Conditions Corridor Evaluation and Analysis

The GCCOG will use data and information from recent studies on future conditions along the project Corridor and conduct thorough future conditions analysis for the multimodal Corridor. Evaluation analysis would include the 2035 traffic conditions and Levels of Service, truck volumes/impacts, pavement needs, pedestrian and bicycle traffic, transit connections, parking and other commercial and residential linkages, and City entryways, or gateways, and potential safe routes to school options.

Deliverable: Technical memo/ summary report regarding the existing conditions, constraints, opportunities.

IV. Task 4: Conduct Complete Streets Needs Analysis

The GCCOG will conduct a detailed needs analysis for complete streets and multimodal Corridor development, along with identifying constraints/opportunities.

Deliverable: Technical memo/ summary report regarding the needs and along with providing recommendations for consideration based on the constraints and opportunities.

V. Task 5: Community and Stakeholder Outreach

a. Stakeholder and Community Outreach

The GCCOG will coordinate meetings to discuss project with various stakeholder agencies. The GCCOG will also conduct stakeholder outreach after developing the concept alternatives and after the development of the draft Master Plan.

The GCCOG will develop a workshop to introduce the project to the public, define project parameters, inform community of project opportunities and constraints, and solicit opinions from the community. The GCCOG will also conduct community outreach after developing the concept alternatives and after the development of the draft Master Plan.

Deliverable: Coordinate and attend Meetings and a coordinate and conduct a Workshop.
VI. Task 6: Complete Streets Implementation Alternatives
   a. Develop Alternatives

   Based on the existing and future conditions evaluation and the stakeholder/community input, the GCCOG will develop alternative concepts for complete street implementation, and will include plans, sketches, and photos.

   Two primary alternatives considered include 1) the Florence Avenue Corridor as a "Complete Street" in an "unconstrained" condition to quantify the high level engineering and feasibility, and 2) as a multi-modal Corridor evaluated for consistency across the sub-region, including a potentially phased approach to a Complete Street, along with any major challenges as well as project benefits so that potential funding partners could understand the holistic context of the improvements.

   Deliverable: Develop concepts and exhibits, via alternatives, to support the needs identified.

VII. Task 7: Prepare Conceptual Complete Streets Plan

   Based on the preferred design alternative chosen in the stakeholder and community outreach efforts and discussions with the Cities, the GCCOG will develop a draft Concept Master Plan.

   Deliverable: Develop concept plan to incorporate into the Draft Report. This is the first step in creating the Draft Report.

VIII. Task 8: Develop Conceptual Design Alternatives for Complete Streets Plan with Cost Estimates

   The GCCOG will develop conceptual design alternatives with cost estimates. Illustrations will be made in plan view, as street cross sections, and as sketches.

   Deliverable: Develop cost estimates to accompany the concept alternative preferred, to incorporate into the draft Report.

IX. Task 9: Presentation to Committees and City Councils, Describing Quantified and Other Benefits

   The GCCOG will prepare and present PowerPoint presentations to Committees and City Councils, describing quantified and other benefits.

   Deliverable: Develop presentations and present at needed.
X. **Task 10: Finalize Conceptual Design of Complete Streets Master Plan with Needed Delivery Schedule for Preliminary Engineering, Design, and Construction**

The GCCOG will finalize the Master Plan, with proposed implementation schedule concepts indicating funding opportunities to leverage.

Deliverable: Prepare final report for approval by the Corridor Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESIGN:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>January 1, 2020</td>
<td>July 1, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIGHT-OF-WAY:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLOSE-Out</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority**

**2021 Federal Transportation Improvement Program ($000)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIP ID</th>
<th>LA0G1715</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Agency</td>
<td>Various Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description: Imperial Highway Complete Street Study - The GCCOG will evaluate the high quality transit Corridor for Complete street features via a planning analysis. These streets are based on the Gateway Cities Strategic Transportation Plan (STP) and were prioritized by the STP Technical Advisory Committee. The Complete Street Study will maximize multimodal opportunities along the Corridor.</td>
<td>SCAG RTP Project #: 7120001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study/NA/Is Model: Model #:</td>
<td>PM: Yvette Kinlin - (626)644-8058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS: N</td>
<td>LS GROUP#:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity Category: EXEMPT - 93.126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| System-Local Hwy Route: Postmile: Distance: Phase: Environmental Document/Pre-Design Phase (PAED) Completion Date 07/01/2021 |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Lane # Ext#: Lane # Prop: Improv Desc: Air Basin: SCAB Envir Doc: CATEGORICALLY EXEMPT - 07/01/2022 |
| Toll Rate: Toll Ccl Loc: Toll Method: Hov acc eg loc: Uta: Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana Sub-Area: Sub-Region: |
| Prog Code: STUDY - PROJECT STUDY Step Loc: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22</th>
<th>22/23</th>
<th>23/24</th>
<th>24/25</th>
<th>25/26</th>
<th>BEYOND PROG TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC25 - 2016 Earmark Repurposing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SUBTOTAL | $160 |
| TOTAL | $160 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL PE: $160</th>
<th>TOTAL RW: $0</th>
<th>TOTAL CON: $0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- General Comment:
- Modeling Comment:
- TCM Comment:
- Amendment Comment:
- CMP Comment:
- Narrative:

**Last Revised Adoption 21-00 - In Progress**

Change reason: Carry over from 19-09

Total Cost $160
2016 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION EARMARK EXCHANGE PROGRAM — LOCAL FUNDS

This Exchange Agreement ("AGREEMENT"), is made and entered into as of October 29, 2019, by and between the GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS ("CITY") and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority ("LACMTA").

RECITALS:

A. The 2016 Consolidated Appropriation Act allowed the CITY to transfer its Federal Transportation Earmark(s) to LACMTA.

B. LACMTA Board of Directors approved the Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program on May 25, 2016.

C. As of April 19, 2017, CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Fund Balance of $774,167.89 was transferred to LACMTA.

D. As of October 29, 2019 City has exchanged $164,948 of CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Funds for a like amount of Proposition C 25% per 2016 Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Agreement 920000000E1728A, Project "Imperial Highway Complete Street Study”.

E. CITY desires to exchange $139,175 of CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Funds for a like amount of LACMTA Proposition C 25% ("LACMTA Funds").

F. LACMTA is willing to exchange $139,175 in LACMTA Funds for a like amount of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds, subject to the terms and conditions contained herein.

G. An exchange of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds with LACMTA Funds is beneficial to and in the general interest of CITY and LACMTA.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual benefits to be derived by CITY and LACMTA, and of the promises contained herein, it is hereby agreed as follows:

AGREEMENT:

1. Title of the Project (the "Project"): Telegraph Road Complete Street Study. LACMTA Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program ID# E1728B, FTIP# LA0G1716.

2. CITY hereby assigns to LACMTA $139,175 of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds. This assignment shall be automatically effective upon full execution of this AGREEMENT without the necessity of the execution, delivery or recording of any further instrument whatsoever. Notwithstanding the foregoing, at LACMTA's request, CITY
shall execute and deliver such documents and instruments as may be required to evidence such assignment of Federal Transportation Earmark Funds.

3. LACMTA hereby accepts CITY's assignment of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds for use on Proposition C 25% eligible project, to be determined by LACMTA in its sole and absolute discretion.

4. On September 26, 2002, the LACMTA Board of Directors required that prior to receiving Proposition C 10% or 25% funds, CITY must meet a Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirement consistent with the State of California's MOE as determined by the State Controller's office. With regard to enforcing the MOE, LACMTA will follow the State of California's MOE requirement, including, without limitation, suspension and re-implementation. As a participant in the Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program receiving Proposition C 25% funds, CITY is subject to MOE requirements.

5. Upon receipt of (i) a fully executed AGREEMENT, (ii) CITY's written certification of the amount of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Fund Balance, as defined herein, which CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Fund Balance shows that CITY has sufficient Federal Transportation Earmark Funds to meet its obligations hereunder, and (iii) LACMTA's acceptance of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds as provided in paragraph 2 above, LACMTA shall pay CITY $135,000 of LACMTA Funds which amount reflects the deduction for the processing fee described in paragraph 10 below. For purposes of this AGREEMENT, CITY's "Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Fund Balance" shall mean the amount of funds CITY transferred to LACMTA as of April 13, 2017. CITY is prohibited from requesting any amount of funding above the amount exchanged with LACMTA, inclusive of the processing fee described in paragraph 10 below.

6. CITY must complete an Automated Clearing House (ACH) form as provided in Attachment A to allow LACMTA to make disbursements electronically. Disbursements via ACH will be made at no cost to CITY. If electronic disbursements are not the preferred method of disbursement, CITY may request an exception in writing.

7. Unless otherwise stated in this Agreement, the Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report, with supporting documentation of expenses and Project progress as described in paragraph 9 of this Agreement, and other documents as required by LACMTA, shall satisfy LACMTA invoicing requirements.

8. Submit invoice with supporting documentation to:
ACCOUNTSPAYABLE@METRO.NET (preferable) or mail to:
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Accounts Payable
P. O. Box 512296
Los Angeles, CA 90051-0296

2
All invoice material must contain the following information:
Re: LACMTA Project ID# E1728B, FTIP # LA0G1716, and FA# 920000000E1728B
LACMTA Project Manager Annie Chou, MS 99-23-3

9. CITY will be reimbursed on a quarterly basis subject to satisfactory compliance to schedule as demonstrated in a quarterly progress/expense report supported by a detailed invoice demonstrating the staff and hours charged to the project, any consultant hours, materials, etc. An amount equal to five percent (5%) of each invoice will be retained until final completion of the project and audit. In addition, final retention payment will be withheld until the project is complete and approved by LACMTA and all audit requirements including before and after photographs have been satisfied. All quarterly progress/expense reports will be due on the last day of the months of November, February, May and August. Attachments B and C contain Reporting and Expenditure Guidelines and Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report template.

10. CITY shall pay LACMTA a three-percent (3%) processing and administrative fee ("the Processing Fee") in connection with the exchange contemplated by this AGREEMENT. The Processing Fee shall be assessed against the total amount of LACMTA Funds payable to CITY. CITY hereby authorizes LACMTA to deduct the Processing Fee from the amount LACMTA is to pay CITY hereunder.

11. The Project Budget report documents all sources of funds programmed for the Project as approved by LACMTA and is attached as Attachment D. The Project Budget report includes the total programmed budget for the Project, including the funds exchanged under this AGREEMENT and any CITY funds. The Project Budget also includes the fiscal years in which all the funds for the Project are programmed.

12. The Project Schedule report, included here as Attachment E, documents Project schedule performance measurements. The Project Schedule report identifies Project activity purchases, milestones, sequence, duration, and deliverable dates.

13. CITY shall complete the Project as described in the Scope of Work. The Scope of Work for the Project is attached to this AGREEMENT as Attachment F. The Scope of Work includes a description of the Project, a detailed description of the work to be completed by CITY including, without limitation, Project milestones consistent with the lapsing policy and the schedule identified in the Project Schedule report. Work shall be delivered in accordance with that schedule unless otherwise agreed to by the parties in writing. If CITY is consistently behind schedule in meeting milestones or in delivering the Project, then LACMTA will have the option to terminate this Agreement for default as described in paragraph 15.

14. CITY shall expend the LACMTA Funds on the Project by the Lapsing Date. For the purposes of this AGREEMENT, "the Lapsing Date" shall mean the date that is three (3) years from the date that this AGREEMENT is fully executed. Expenses shall be invoiced no later than 60 days after the LAPSING DATE.
A. For the purposes of this AGREEMENT, the term “Proposition C 25%-Eligible Project” shall mean any transportation project or program that supports transit and/or decreases single-occupancy vehicle trips. In all cases, transit service must be provided on the road street on which the project or program is proposed.

B. The term “expend” as used in paragraph 14 shall mean “encumbered by an awarded contract”.

15. A Default under this Agreement is defined as any one or more of the following: (i) CITY fails to comply with the terms and conditions contained herein or in the Guidelines; (ii) CITY is consistently behind schedule in meeting milestones or in delivering the Project; or (iii) CITY fails to perform satisfactorily or makes a material change, as determined by LACMTA at its sole discretion, to the Project Budget, Project Schedule, or the Scope of Work without LACMTA’s prior written consent or approval as provided herein.

16. After project is final vouchered and closed, any cost savings funds greater than $1,000 not expended, will be eligible for use on Proposition C 25%-Eligible Project, to be determined by LACMTA in its sole and absolute discretion.

17. CITY must use the LACMTA Funds in the most cost-effective manner. If CITY intends to use a consultant or contractor to implement all or part of the Proposition C 25%-Eligible Project, LACMTA requires that such activities be procured in accordance with CITY's contracting procedures and be consistent with State law as appropriate. CITY will also use the LACMTA Funds in the most cost-effective manner when the LACMTA Funds are used to pay "in-house" staff time. CITY staff or consultants with project oversight roles may not award work to companies in which they have a financial or personal interest. This effective use of funds provision will be verified by LACMTA through on-going project monitoring and through any LACMTA interim and final audits.

18. LACMTA, and/or its designee, shall have the right to conduct audits of CITY's use of the LACMTA Funds, as deemed appropriate, such as financial and compliance audits; interim audits; pre-award audits, performance audits, and final audits. CITY agrees to establish and maintain proper accounting procedures and cash management records and documents in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). CITY's records shall include, without limitation, any supporting evidence deemed necessary by LACMTA to substantiate CITY's use of LACMTA Funds. These records must be retained by CITY for five years following CITY's last use of the LACMTA Funds. CITY shall reimburse LACMTA for any expenditure not in compliance with the Scope of Work and/or not in compliance with other terms and conditions of this AGREEMENT. The allowability of costs for CITY's own expenditures submitted to LACMTA for the Proposition C 25%-Eligible Project shall be in compliance with Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program Guidelines. The allowability of costs for CITY's contractors, consultants, and suppliers expenditures submitted to LACMTA through CITY's Monthly Progress Reports and Quarterly Expenditures shall be in compliance with Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program Guidelines. Findings of the LACMTA audit are final. When LACMTA audit findings require CITY to return monies to LACMTA, CITY agrees to return the monies within thirty (30) days after the final audit is sent.
to CITY.

19. The terms of this AGREEMENT shall commence on the date that this AGREEMENT is fully executed and shall terminate once CITY has expended all the LACMTA Funds and all LACMTA audit and reporting requirements have been satisfied.

20. CITY shall fully indemnify, defend and hold LACMTA and its officers, agents, and employees harmless from and against any liability and expenses, including, without limitation, defend costs, any costs or liability on account of bodily injury, death or personal injury of any person, or for damages of any nature whatsoever arising out of (i) a breach of CITY's obligations under this AGREEMENT; or (ii) any act or omission of CITY or its officers, agents, employees, contractors, or subcontractors in the use of the LACMTA Funds.

21. LACMTA shall fully indemnify, defend and hold CITY and its officers, agents, and employees harmless from and against any liability and expenses, including, without limitation, defend costs, any costs or liability on account of bodily injury, death or personal injury of any person, or for damages to or loss of risk of property, any environmental obligations, any legal fees and any claims for damages of any nature whatsoever arising out of (i) a breach of LACMTA's obligations under this AGREEMENT; or (ii) any act or omission of LACMTA or its officers, agents, employees, contractors, or subcontractors in the use of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds.

22. This AGREEMENT may be amended or modified only by mutual written consent of LACMTA and CITY.

23. Any correspondence, communication, or contact concerning this AGREEMENT shall be directed to the following:

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS:

Attn: Genny Cisneros
16401 Paramount Blvd
Paramount CA, 90723
Email: gcisneros@gatewaycog.org
Phone: 562.663.6858

Yvette Kirrin (Consultant Engineer)
Email: Yvette@kes-inc.com
Phone: 626.644.8058
LACMTA:

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, California 90012

Attn: Annie Chou
Sr. Administrative Analyst, Countywide Planning & Development
Grants Management & Oversight
Email: choua@metro.net
Phone: 213.418.3453

24. This AGREEMENT shall be interpreted and governed by the laws of the State of California.

25. This AGREEMENT constitutes the entire understanding between the parties with respect to the subject matter herein.

Attachment A – Reporting and Expenditure Guidelines
Attachment B – Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report
Attachment C – Project Budget
Attachment D – Project Schedule
Attachment E – Scope of Work
Attachment F – Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this AGREEMENT to be executed by their respective officers as of the date stated below.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

By: ________________________________

Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

By: ________________________________

Nancy Pfeffer
Executive Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM

MARY C. WICKHAM
County Counsel

By: ________________________________

Deputy

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Ivy Tsai

By: ________________________________

Attorney
REPORTING PROCEDURES

- Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report (Attachment B) is required for all projects. The Grantee shall be subject to and comply with all applicable requirements of the funding agency regarding project-reporting requirements. In addition, Grantee will submit a quarterly report to the LACMTA at P.O. Box 512296, Los Angeles, CA 90051-0296. Please note that letters or other forms of documentation may not be substituted for this form.

- The Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report covers all activities related to the project and lists all costs incurred. It is essential that Grantee provide complete and adequate response to all the questions. The expenses listed must be supported by appropriate documentation with a clear explanation of the purpose and relevance of each expense to the project. Expenses must reflect the proportionate share of local match, including in-kind, charged to the grant.

- In cases where there are no activities to report, or problems causing delays, clear explanation, including actions to remedy the situation, must be provided.

- Grantees are required to track and report on the project schedule. LACMTA will monitor the timely use of funds and delivery of projects. Project delay, if any, must be reported each quarter. If CITY is consistently behind schedule in meeting milestones or in delivering the Project, then LACMTA will have the option to terminate this Agreement for default as described in paragraph 15.

- The Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report is due to the LACMTA as soon as possible after the close of each quarter, but no later than the following dates for each fiscal year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Report Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July –September</td>
<td>November 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October - December</td>
<td>February 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January - March</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April - June</td>
<td>August 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon completion of the Project a final report that includes project’s final evaluation must be submitted.

EXPENDITURE GUIDELINES

- Any activity or expense charged above and beyond the approved Scope-of-Work (Attachment F) is considered ineligible and will not be reimbursed by the LACMTA unless prior written authorization has been granted by the LACMTA Chief Executive Officer or designee.
ATTACHMENT A

FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION EARMARK EXCHANGE AGREEMENT

REPORTING & EXPENDITURE GUIDELINES

- Any expense charged to the grant or local match, including in-kind, must be clearly and directly related to the project.

- Any activity or expense charged as local match cannot be applied to any other LACMTA-funded or non-LACMTA-funded projects; activities or expenses related to a previously funded project cannot be used as local match for the current project.

- Administrative cost is the ongoing expense incurred by the Grantee for the duration of the project and for the direct benefit of the project as specified in the Scope-of-Work (Attachment E). Examples of administrative costs are personnel, office supplies, and equipment. As a condition for eligibility, all costs must be necessary for maintaining, monitoring, coordinating, reporting and budgeting of the project. Additionally, expenses must be reasonable and appropriate to the activities related to the project.

- LACMTA is not responsible for, and will not reimburse any costs incurred by the Grantee prior to the execution of the FA, unless written authorization has been granted by the LACMTA Chief Executive Officer or her designee.

- The FA is considered executed when the LACMTA Chief Executive Officer or designee signs the document.

DEFINITIONS

- Local Participation: Where local participation consists of “in-kind” contributions rather than funds, the following contributions may be included:
  - Costs incurred by a local jurisdiction to successfully complete the project. Examples include engineering, design, rights-of-way purchase, and construction management costs.
  - Donations of land, building space, supplies, equipment, loaned equipment, or loaned building space dedicated to the project.
  - Donations of volunteer services dedicated to the project.
  - A third-party contribution of services, land, building space, supplies or equipment dedicated to the project.

- Allowable Cost: To be allowable, costs must be reasonable, recognized as ordinary and necessary, consistent with established practices of the organization, and consistent with industry standard of pay for work classification.

- Excessive Cost: Any expense deemed “excessive” by LACMTA staff would be adjusted to reflect a “reasonable and customary” level. For detail definition of “reasonable cost”, please refer to the Federal Register OMB Circulars A-87 Cost Principals for State and Local Governments; and A-122 Cost Principals for Nonprofit Organizations.

- Ineligible Expenditures: Any activity or expense charged above and beyond the approved Scope-of-Work is considered ineligible.
GRANTEES ARE REQUESTED TO MAIL THIS REPORT TO
P.O. Box #512296, Los Angeles, CA 90051-0296 after the close
of each quarter, but no later than November 30, February 28,
May 31 and August 31. Please note that letters or other forms
of documentation may not be substituted for this form. Refer to the
Reporting and Expenditure Guidelines (Attachment C) for further information.

SECTION 1: QUARTERLY EXPENSE REPORT

Please itemize grant-related charges for this Quarter on Page 5 of this report and include totals in this Section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PC25 - Earmark Exchange</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Quarter Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Quarter Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Invoice Amount (Less Retention)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-to-Date Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Expended to Date (Include this Quarter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Project Budget Expended to Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Remaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 2: GENERAL INFORMATION

PROJECT TITLE: TELEGRAPH ROAD COMPLETE STREET STUDY

FA #: 9200000000E1728B

QUARTERLY REPORT SUBMITTED FOR:

Fiscal Year:
- □ 2017-2018
- □ 2018-2019
- □ 2019-2020
- □ 2020-2021
- □ 2021-2022

Quarter:
- □ Q1: Jul - Sep
- □ Q2: Oct - Dec
- □ Q3: Jan - Mar
- □ Q4: Apr - Jun

DATE SUBMITTED:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LACMTA Project Mgr.</th>
<th>Name: Annie Chou</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
<td>213-418-3453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:choua@metro.net">choua@metro.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor Contact / Project Manager</th>
<th>Contact Name: Yvette Kirrin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Title: Consulting Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City / Agency: Gateway Cities Council of Governments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address: 16401 Paramount Boulevard Paramount CA 90723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number: 626-644-8058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail: <a href="mailto:Yvette@kcs-inc.com">Yvette@kcs-inc.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3: QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

1. DELIVERABLES & MILESTONES

List all deliverables and milestones as stated in the FA, with start and end dates. Calculate the total project duration. **DO NOT CHANGE THE ORIGINAL FA MILESTONE START AND END DATES SHOWN IN THE 2ND AND 3RD COLUMNS BELOW.**

Grantees must make every effort to accurately portray milestone dates in the original FA Scope of Work, since this will provide the basis for calculating any project delay. If milestone start and/or end dates change from those stated in the Original FA Scope of Work, indicate the new dates under Actual Schedule below and re-calculate the project duration. However, this does not change the original milestones in your FA. **PER YOUR FA AGREEMENT, ANY CHANGES TO THE PROJECT SCHEDULE MUST BE FORMALLY SUBMITTED UNDER SEPARATE COVER TO LACMTA FOR WRITTEN CONCURRENCE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FA Milestones</th>
<th>Original FA Schedule in Scope of Work</th>
<th>Actual Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Breaking Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribbon Cutting Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. PROJECT COMPLETION

A. Based on the comparison of the original and actual project milestone schedules above, project is (select only one):

☐ On schedule per original FA schedule  ☐ Less than 12 months behind original schedule
☐ Between 12-24 months behind original schedule  ☐ More than 24 months behind original schedule

B. Was the project design started within 6 months of the date originally stated in the FA?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Not Applicable

C. Was a construction contract or capital purchase executed within 9 months after completion of design / specifications?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Not Applicable
3. TASKS/MILESTONES ACCOMPLISHED

List tasks or milestones accomplished and progress made this quarter.

4. PROJECT DELAY

If project is delayed, describe reasons for delay (this quarter). Pay particular attention to schedule delays. If delay is for the same reason as mentioned in previous quarters, please indicate by writing "Same as Previous Quarter".

5. ACTION ITEMS TO RESOLVE DELAY

If the project is delayed (as described in #4), include action items that have been, or will be, undertaken to resolve the delay.
SECTION 4: ITEMIZED LISTING OF EXPENSES AND CHARGES THIS QUARTER

All expenses and charges, including grant and local match, must be itemized and listed below. Each item listed must be verifiable by an invoice and/or other proper documentation. The total amounts shown here must be equal to this quarter’s expenditures listed on page 1 of this report. All expenses and charges must be reflective of the approved budget and rates as shown in the FA Attachment B, Scope of Work. Use additional pages if needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>INVOICE #</th>
<th>TOTAL EXPENSES / CHARGES</th>
<th>$ CHARGED TO PC 25-EARMARK EXCHANGE</th>
<th>$ CHARGED TO OTHER FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Local match spent in each quarter, must be in the appropriate proportion to LACMTA grant.
2. All receipts, invoices, and time sheets, attached and included with this Expense Report must be listed and shown under the Invoice Number column of the Itemized Listing (above).

Invoice Payment Information:
LACMTA will make all disbursements electronically unless an exception is requested in writing.
ACH Payments require that you complete an ACH Request Form and fax it to Accounts Payable at 213-922-6107. ACH Request Forms can be found at www.metro.net/callforprojects.
Written exception requests for Check Payments should be completed and faxed to Accounts Payable at 213-922-6107.

I certify that I am the responsible Project Manager or fiscal officer and representative of and that to the best of my knowledge and belief the information stated in this report is true and correct.

Signature

Date

Name

Title
### PROJECT TITLE: Telegraph Road Complete Street Study

**GRANTEE/PROJECT SPONSOR:** Gateway Cities Council of Governments

($ in Actual Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMMED FUNDS</th>
<th>FY 2017-18</th>
<th>FY 2018-19</th>
<th>FY 2019-20</th>
<th>FY 2020-21</th>
<th>FY 2021-22</th>
<th>TOTAL BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA PROGRAMMED FUNDING:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition C 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$135,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Earmark Exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$135,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$135,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANTEE/SPONSOR FUND CONTRIBUTION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELECT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contributions by participating Jurisdictions</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - specify type(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANTEE/SPONSOR SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature: [Signature]  
Date: 10-24-19
## Attachment D - Project Schedule

### 2016 Federal Earmark Exchange

**Project Title:** Telegraph Road Complete Street Study

**Grantee/Project Sponsor:** Gateway Cities Council of Governments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Milestone Name/Phase</th>
<th>Milestone Definition and Status</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project Management and Administration</td>
<td>Project Initiation, Administration and Management</td>
<td>Jan-20</td>
<td>Dec-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review Existing Documentations</td>
<td>Research, obtain and review all relevant documentation that will be utilized within the study to develop the masterplan.</td>
<td>Jan-20</td>
<td>Mar-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corridor Evaluations Documentations</td>
<td>Identify existing conditions, constraints and opportunities for each jurisdiction. Evaluate information to be used in Study.</td>
<td>Jan-20</td>
<td>Mar-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conduct Complete Streets Needs Analysis</td>
<td>Conduct detailed needs analysis for complete streets based on information gathered in Task 2 and Task 3.</td>
<td>Mar-20</td>
<td>May-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community and Stakeholder Outreach</td>
<td>Meet with Cities and County, as well as obtain input from various GCGCO Committees, open to the public.</td>
<td>Apr-20</td>
<td>Nov-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Complete Streets Implementation Alternatives</td>
<td>Develop concept plan alternatives for each jurisdiction.</td>
<td>May-20</td>
<td>Oct-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prepare Conceptual Complete Streets Plan</td>
<td>Prepare concept plan for Corridor and prepare report.</td>
<td>Jul-21</td>
<td>Sep-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Develop Conceptual Design Alternatives for Complete Streets Plan with Cost Estimates</td>
<td>Develop cost estimates based on preferred alternative.</td>
<td>Jul-20</td>
<td>Aug-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Presentation to Committees and City Councils, Describing Quantified and Other Benefits</td>
<td>Present PowerPoint to Committees to receive input and answer questions.</td>
<td>Aug-20</td>
<td>Oct-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signature:**

**Date:** 10-24-19
ATTACHMENT E
Metro Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program
SCOPE OF WORK

Project ID: LA0G1716

Project Title: Telegraph Road Complete Street Study

Project Limits: The project is located at Imperial Highway in La Mirada west to S. Marianna Avenue in the City of Commerce and Unincorporated Los Angeles, for a total of 12.01 miles.

Which traverses through the jurisdictions of La Mirada, Unincorporated LA County, Santa Fe Springs, Downey, Pico Rivera, Commerce and Montebello, in the Gateway Cities Council of Governments area.

Project Description:
Develop a subregional Complete Street master plan for Telegraph Road, which is a high priority high quality transit arterial within the Gateway Cities. This high priority corridor is based on the Gateway Cities COG Board approved prioritization process. The limits extend from COG boundary to COG boundary for a total of approximately 12.01 miles (total). This masterplan will maximize multimodal opportunities on this E/W arterial corridor within the Gateway Cities, as well as maximize our ability to obtain grants for design and construction.

Project Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ITEM</th>
<th>Grant funds (LACMTA)</th>
<th>LOCAL AGENCY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Design,</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$000,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BUDGET COST</strong></td>
<td><strong>$135,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$135,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCOPE:

I. Task 1: Project Management and Administration
   a. Project Initiation

   The GCCOG will hold a kick-off meeting with the Cities and Metro to discuss the project scope of work, goals and objectives. A meeting agenda, minutes and action items listing will be produced.

   b. Project Administration

   The GCCOG will submit complete invoice packages to Metro based on existing/status quo protocol. The progress report will contain the following components:

   1. Executive summary
   2. Description of the tasks or deliverables completed
   3. Management issues, including status, resolution and action items
   4. Project task schedule describing percentages of completeness of each task
   5. Schedule and schedule tracking narrative
   6. List of deliverable items
   7. Dollar amount for which payment is requested.

   c. Project Management

   The GCCOG will complete the project including the technical tasks included in this scope as well as the Project Management of the overall project.

II. Task 2: Review Existing Documentations

   The GCCOG will gather all relevant document and literature for review and summarize useful information and findings relating to the Corridor, including the STP, relevant transit plans, relevant agency land use plans, and relevant as-builts.


III. Task 3: Corridor Evaluation Documentations
   a. Existing Conditions Corridor Evaluation and Analysis

   The GCCOG will conduct thorough existing conditions analysis by identifying opportunities and constraints for the multimodal Corridor. This is partially obtained via a 1-on-1 meeting with each agency, which will be documented in the report. Evaluation analysis could include the current traffic conditions and Levels of Service, truck volumes/impacts, pavement needs, pedestrian and bicycle traffic, transit connections, parking and other commercial and residential
linkages, and City entryways, or gateways, and potential safe routes to school options.

b. Future Conditions Corridor Evaluation and Analysis

The GCCOG will use data and information from recent studies on future conditions along the project Corridor and conduct thorough future conditions analysis for the multimodal Corridor. Evaluation analysis would include the 2035 traffic conditions and Levels of Service, truck volumes/impacts, pavement needs, pedestrian and bicycle traffic, transit connections, parking and other commercial and residential linkages, and City entryways, or gateways, and potential safe routes to school options.

Deliverable: Technical memo/ summary report regarding the existing conditions, constraints, opportunities.

IV. Task 4: Conduct Complete Streets Needs Analysis

The GCCOG will conduct a detailed needs analysis for complete streets and multimodal Corridor development, along with identifying constraints/opportunities.

Deliverable: Technical memo/ summary report regarding the needs and along with providing recommendations for consideration based on the constraints and opportunities.

V. Task 5: Community and Stakeholder Outreach

a. Stakeholder and Community Outreach

The GCCOG will coordinate meetings to discuss project with various stakeholder agencies. The GCCOG will also conduct stakeholder outreach after developing the concept alternatives and after the development of the draft Master Plan.

The GCCOG will develop a workshop to introduce the project to the public, define project parameters, inform community of project opportunities and constraints, and solicit opinions from the community. The GCCOG will also conduct community outreach after developing the concept alternatives and after the development of the draft Master Plan.

Deliverable: Coordinate and attend Meetings and a coordinate and conduct a Workshop.
VI. Task 6: Complete Streets Implementation Alternatives
   a. Develop Alternatives

Based on the existing and future conditions evaluation and the stakeholder/community input, the GCCOG will develop alternative concepts for complete street implementation, and will include plans, sketches, and photos.

Two primary alternatives considered include 1) the Florence Avenue Corridor as a “Complete Street” in an “unconstrained” condition to quantify the high level engineering and feasibility, and 2) as a multi-modal Corridor evaluated for consistency across the sub-region, including a potentially phased approach to a Complete Street, along with any major challenges as well as project benefits so that potential funding partners could understand the holistic context of the improvements.

Deliverable: Develop concepts and exhibits, via alternatives, to support the needs identified.

VII. Task 7: Prepare Conceptual Complete Streets Plan

Based on the preferred design alternative chosen in the stakeholder and community outreach efforts and discussions with the Cities, the GCCOG will develop a draft Concept Master Plan.

Deliverable: Develop concept plan to incorporate into the Draft Report. This is the first step in creating the Draft Report.

VIII. Task 8: Develop Conceptual Design Alternatives for Complete Streets Plan with Cost Estimates

The GCCOG will develop conceptual design alternatives with cost estimates. Illustrations will be made in plan view, as street cross sections, and as sketches.

Deliverable: Develop cost estimates to accompany the concept alternative preferred, to incorporate into the draft Report.

IX. Task 9: Presentation to Committees and City Councils, Describing Quantified and Other Benefits

The GCCOG will prepare and present PowerPoint presentations to Committees and City Councils, describing quantified and other benefits.

Deliverable: Develop presentations and present at needed.
X. Task 10: Finalize Conceptual Design of Complete Streets Master Plan with Needed Delivery Schedule for Preliminary Engineering, Design, and Construction

The GCCOG will finalize the Master Plan, with proposed implementation schedule concepts indicating funding opportunities to leverage.

Deliverable: Prepare final report for approval by the Corridor Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESIGN:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>January 1, 2020</td>
<td>December 31, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIGHT-OF-WAY:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLOSE-Out</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ATTACHMENT F- FTIP**

**Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority**

**2019 Federal Transportation Improvement Program ($000)**

---

**TIP ID: LA0G1716**

**Implementing Agency:** LA Metro

**Various Agencies:**

- **Project Description:** Telegraph Road Complete Street Corridor Study - The GCCOG will evaluate the high quality transit Corridor for Complete street features via a planning analysis. These streets are based on the Gateway Cities Strategic Transportation Plan (STP) and were prioritized by the STP Technical Advisory Committee. The Complete Street Study will maximize multimodal opportunities along the Corridor.

- **System:** Local Hwy
- **Route:**
- **Postmile:**
- **Distance:**
- **Phase:** Engineering/Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E)
- **Completion Date:** 12/01/2022
- **Lane # Exit:**
- **Lane # Prop:**
- **Improv Desc:**
- **Toll Rate:** 0.00
- **Toll Colc Loc:**
- **Toll Method:**
- **Hov acres loc:**
- **Utza:** Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana
- **Sub-Area:**
- **Sub-Region:**
- **Air Basin:** SCAB
- **Envr Doc:** CATEGORICALLY EXEMPT - 12/01/2021
- **Program Code:** STUDY - PROJECT STUDY
- **Stop Loc:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PC25 - 2016 Earmark Repurposing</th>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>PRIOR 19/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22</th>
<th>22/23</th>
<th>23/24</th>
<th>BEYOND PROG TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$135</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$135</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **TOTAL PE:** $135
- **TOTAL RW:** $0
- **TOTAL CON:** $0

---

- **Last Revised:** Amendment 19-80 - In Progress
- **Change reason:** MINOR CHANGE
- **Total Cost:** $135

---

*General Comments:*
- Error in original FY19.
- Modeling Comment:
- TCM Comment:
- Amendment Comment:
- CMP Comment:
- Narrative:

---

*Page 1*  Tuesday, October 29, 2019
2016 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION EARMARK EXCHANGE PROGRAM — LOCAL FUNDS

This Exchange Agreement ("AGREEMENT"), is made and entered into as of October 29, 2019, by and between the GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS ("CITY") and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority ("LACMTA").

RECITALS:

A. The 2016 Consolidated Appropriation Act allowed the CITY to transfer its Federal Transportation Earmark(s) to LACMTA.

B. LACMTA Board of Directors approved the Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program on May 25, 2016.

C. As of April 19, 2017, CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Fund Balance of $774,167.89 was transferred to LACMTA.

D. As of October 29, 2019 City has exchanged $164,948 of CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Funds for a like amount of Proposition C 25% per 2016 Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Agreement 920000000E1728A, Project “Imperial Highway Complete Street Study”.

E. As of October 29, 2019 City has exchanged $139,175 of CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Funds for a like amount of Proposition C 25% per 2016 Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Agreement 920000000E1728B, Project “Telegram Road Complete Street Study”.

F. CITY desires to exchange $168,468 of CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Funds for a like amount of LACMTA Proposition C 25% ("LACMTA Funds").

G. LACMTA is willing to exchange $168,468 in LACMTA Funds for a like amount of CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Funds, subject to the terms and conditions contained herein.

H. An exchange of CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Funds with LACMTA Funds is beneficial to and in the general interest of CITY and LACMTA.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual benefits to be derived by CITY and LACMTA, and of the promises contained herein, it is hereby agreed as follows:

AGREEMENT:

1. Title of the Project (the "Project"): Alondra Blvd Complete Street Study. LACMTA Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program ID# E1728C, FTIP# LA0G1717.
2. CITY hereby assigns to LACMTA $168,468 of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds. This assignment shall be automatically effective upon full execution of this AGREEMENT without the necessity of the execution, delivery or recording of any further instrument whatsoever. Notwithstanding the foregoing, at LACMTA's request, CITY shall execute and deliver such documents and instruments as may be required to evidence such assignment of Federal Transportation Earmark Funds.

3. LACMTA hereby accepts CITY's assignment of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds for use on Proposition C 25% eligible project, to be determined by LACMTA in its sole and absolute discretion.

4. On September 26, 2002, the LACMTA Board of Directors required that prior to receiving Proposition C 10% or 25% funds, CITY must meet a Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirement consistent with the State of California's MOE as determined by the State Controller's office. With regard to enforcing the MOE, LACMTA will follow the State of California's MOE requirement, including, without limitation, suspension and re-implementation. As a participant in the Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program receiving Proposition C 25% funds, CITY is subject to MOE requirements.

5. Upon receipt of (i) a fully executed AGREEMENT, (ii) CITY's written certification of the amount of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Fund Balance, as defined herein, which CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Fund Balance shows that CITY has sufficient Federal Transportation Earmark Funds to meet its obligations hereunder, and (iii) LACMTA's acceptance of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds as provided in paragraph 2 above, LACMTA shall pay CITY $163,414 of LACMTA Funds which amount reflects the deduction for the processing fee described in paragraph 10 below. For purposes of this AGREEMENT, CITY's "Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Fund Balance" shall mean the amount of funds CITY transferred to LACMTA as of April 13, 2017. CITY is prohibited from requesting any amount of funding above the amount exchanged with LACMTA, inclusive of the processing fee described in paragraph 10 below.

6. CITY must complete an Automated Clearing House (ACH) form as provided in Attachment A to allow LACMTA to make disbursements electronically. Disbursements via ACH will be made at no cost to CITY. If electronic disbursements are not the preferred method of disbursement, CITY may request an exception in writing.

7. Unless otherwise stated in this Agreement, the Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report, with supporting documentation of expenses and Project progress as described in paragraph 9 of this Agreement, and other documents as required by LACMTA, shall satisfy LACMTA invoicing requirements.

8. Submit invoice with supporting documentation to:
ACCOUNTSPAYABLE@METRO.NET (preferable) or mail to:
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
9. CITY will be reimbursed on a quarterly basis subject to satisfactory compliance to schedule as demonstrated in a quarterly progress/expense report supported by a detailed invoice demonstrating the staff and hours charged to the project, any consultant hours, materials, etc. An amount equal to five percent (5%) of each invoice will be retained until final completion of the project and audit. In addition, final retention payment will be withheld until the project is complete and approved by LACMTA and all audit requirements including before and after photographs have been satisfied. All quarterly progress/expense reports will be due on the last day of the months of November, February, May and August. Attachments B and C contain Reporting and Expenditure Guidelines and Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report template.

10. CITY shall pay LACMTA a three-percent (3%) processing and administrative fee ("the Processing Fee") in connection with the exchange contemplated by this AGREEMENT. The Processing Fee shall be assessed against the total amount of LACMTA Funds payable to CITY. CITY hereby authorizes LACMTA to deduct the Processing Fee from the amount LACMTA is to pay CITY hereunder.

11. The Project Budget report documents all sources of funds programmed for the Project as approved by LACMTA and is attached as Attachment D. The Project Budget report includes the total programmed budget for the Project, including the funds exchanged under this AGREEMENT and any CITY funds. The Project Budget also includes the fiscal years in which all the funds for the Project are programmed.

12. The Project Schedule report, included here as Attachment E, documents Project schedule performance measurements. The Project Schedule report identifies Project activity purchases, milestones, sequence, duration, and deliverable dates.

13. CITY shall complete the Project as described in the Scope of Work. The Scope of Work for the Project is attached to this AGREEMENT as Attachment F. The Scope of Work includes a description of the Project, a detailed description of the work to be completed by CITY including, without limitation, Project milestones consistent with the lapping policy and the schedule identified in the Project Schedule report. Work shall be delivered in accordance with that schedule unless otherwise agreed to by the parties in writing. If CITY is consistently behind schedule in meeting milestones or in delivering the Project, then LACMTA will have the option to terminate this Agreement for default as described in paragraph 15.
14. CITY shall expend the LACMTA Funds on the Project by the Lapsing Date. For the purposes of this AGREEMENT, "the Lapsing Date" shall mean the date that is three (3) years from the date that this AGREEMENT is fully executed. Expenses shall be invoiced no later than 60 days after the LAPSING DATE.

A. For the purposes of this AGREEMENT, the term "Proposition C 25%-Eligible Project" shall mean any transportation project or program that supports transit and/or decreases single-occupancy vehicle trips. In all cases, transit service must be provided on the road street on which the project or program is proposed.

B. The term "expend" as used in paragraph 14 shall mean "encumbered by an awarded contract".

15. A Default under this Agreement is defined as any one or more of the following: (i) CITY fails to comply with the terms and conditions contained herein or in the Guidelines; (ii) CITY is consistently behind schedule in meeting milestones or in delivering the Project; or (iii) CITY fails to perform satisfactorily or makes a material change, as determined by LACMTA at its sole discretion, to the Project Budget, Project Schedule, or the Scope of Work without LACMTA's prior written consent or approval as provided herein.

16. After project is final vouchered and closed, any cost savings funds greater than $1,000 not expended, will be eligible for use on Proposition C 25%-Eligible Project, to be determined by LACMTA in its sole and absolute discretion.

17. CITY must use the LACMTA Funds in the most cost-effective manner. If CITY intends to use a consultant or contractor to implement all or part of the Proposition C 25%-Eligible Project, LACMTA requires that such activities be procured in accordance with CITY's contracting procedures and be consistent with State law as appropriate. CITY will also use the LACMTA Funds in the most cost-effective manner when the LACMTA Funds are used to pay "in-house" staff time. CITY staff or consultants with project oversight roles may not award work to companies in which they have a financial or personal interest. This effective use of funds provision will be verified by LACMTA through on-going project monitoring and through any LACMTA interim and final audits.

18. LACMTA, and/or its designee, shall have the right to conduct audits of CITY's use of the LACMTA Funds, as deemed appropriate, such as financial and compliance audits; interim audits; pre-award audits, performance audits, and final audits. CITY agrees to establish and maintain proper accounting procedures and cash management records and documents in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). CITY's records shall include, without limitation, any supporting evidence deemed necessary by LACMTA to substantiate CITY's use of LACMTA Funds. These records must be retained by CITY for five years following CITY's last use of the LACMTA Funds. CITY shall reimburse LACMTA for any expenditure not in compliance with the Scope of Work and/or not in compliance with other terms and conditions of this AGREEMENT. The allowability of costs for CITY's own expenditures submitted to LACMTA for the Proposition C 25%-Eligible Project shall be in compliance with Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program Guidelines. The allowability of costs for CITY's contractors, consultants, and suppliers expenditures submitted
to LACMTA through CITY's Monthly Progress Reports and Quarterly Expenditures shall be in 
compliance with Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program Guidelines. Findings of the 
LACMTA audit are final. When LACMTA audit findings require CITY to return monies to 
LACMTA, CITY agrees to return the monies within thirty (30) days after the final audit is sent 
to CITY.

19. The terms of this AGREEMENT shall commence on the date that this AGREEMENT is 
fully executed and shall terminate once CITY has expended all the LACMTA Funds and all 
LACMTA audit and reporting requirements have been satisfied.

20. CITY shall fully indemnify, defend and hold LACMTA and its officers, agents, and 
employees harmless from and against any liability and expenses, including, without limitation, 
defend costs, any costs or liability on account of bodily injury, death or personal injury of 
any person, or for damages of any nature whatsoever arising out of (i) a breach of CITY's 
obligations under this AGREEMENT; or (ii) any act or omission of CITY or its officers, agents, 
employees, contractors, or subcontractors in the use of the LACMTA Funds.

21. LACMTA shall fully indemnify, defend and hold CITY and its officers, agents, and 
employees harmless from and against any liability and expenses, including, without limitation, 
defend costs, any costs or liability on account of bodily injury, death or personal injury of 
any person, or for damages to or loss of risk of property, any environmental obligations, any 
legal fees and any claims for damages of any nature whatsoever arising out of (i) a breach of 
LACMTA's obligations under this AGREEMENT; or (ii) any act or omission of LACMTA 
or its officers, agents, employees, contractors, or subcontractors in the use of CITY's Federal 
Transportation Earmark Funds.

22. This AGREEMENT may be amended or modified only by mutual written consent of 
LACMTA and CITY.

23. Any correspondence, communication, or contact concerning this AGREEMENT shall be 
directed to the following:

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS:

Attn: Genny Cisneros
16401 Paramount Blvd
Paramount CA, 90723
Email: gcisneros@gatewaycog.org
Phone: 562.663.6858

Yvette Kirrin (Consultant Engineer)
Email: Yvette@kes-inc.com
Phone: 626.644.8058
LACMTA:

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, California 90012

Attn: Annie Chou
Sr. Administrative Analyst, Countywide Planning & Development
Grants Management & Oversight
Email: choua@metro.net
Phone: 213.418.3453

24. This AGREEMENT shall be interpreted and governed by the laws of the State of California.

25. This AGREEMENT constitutes the entire understanding between the parties with respect to the subject matter herein.

Attachment A – Reporting and Expenditure Guidelines
Attachment B – Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report
Attachment C – Project Budget
Attachment D – Project Schedule
Attachment E – Scope of Work
Attachment F – Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this AGREEMENT to be executed by their respective officers as of the date stated below.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

By: __________________________

Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF
GOVERNMENTS

By: __________________________

Nancy Pfeffer
Executive Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM

MARY C. WICKHAM
County Counsel

By: __________________________

Deputy

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Ivy Tsai

By: __________________________

Attorney
ATTACHMENT A
FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION EARMARK EXCHANGE AGREEMENT
REPORTING & EXPENDITURE GUIDELINES

REPORTING PROCEDURES

- Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report (Attachment B) is required for all projects. The Grantee shall be subject to and comply with all applicable requirements of the funding agency regarding project-reporting requirements. In addition, Grantee will submit a quarterly report to the LACMTA at P.O. Box 512296, Los Angeles, CA 90051-0296. Please note that letters or other forms of documentation may not be substituted for this form.

- The Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report covers all activities related to the project and lists all costs incurred. It is essential that Grantee provide complete and adequate response to all the questions. The expenses listed must be supported by appropriate documentation with a clear explanation of the purpose and relevance of each expense to the project. Expenses must reflect the proportionate share of local match, including in-kind, charged to the grant.

- In cases where there are no activities to report, or problems causing delays, clear explanation, including actions to remedy the situation, must be provided.

- Grantees are required to track and report on the project schedule. LACMTA will monitor the timely use of funds and delivery of projects. Project delay, if any, must be reported each quarter. If CITY is consistently behind schedule in meeting milestones or in delivering the Project, then LACMTA will have the option to terminate this Agreement for default as described in paragraph 15.

- The Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report is due to the LACMTA as soon as possible after the close of each quarter, but no later than the following dates for each fiscal year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Report Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July - September</td>
<td>November 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October - December</td>
<td>February 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January - March</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April - June</td>
<td>August 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon completion of the Project a final report that includes project’s final evaluation must be submitted.

EXPENDITURE GUIDELINES

- Any activity or expense charged above and beyond the approved Scope-of-Work (Attachment F) is considered ineligible and will not be reimbursed by the LACMTA unless prior written authorization has been granted by the LACMTA Chief Executive Officer or designee.
ATTACHMENT A
FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION EARMARK EXCHANGE AGREEMENT
REPORTING & EXPENDITURE GUIDELINES

- Any expense charged to the grant or local match, including in-kind, must be clearly and directly related to the project.

- Any activity or expense charged as local match cannot be applied to any other LACMTA-funded or non-LACMTA-funded projects; activities or expenses related to a previously funded project cannot be used as local match for the current project.

- Administrative cost is the ongoing expense incurred by the Grantee for the duration of the project and for the direct benefit of the project as specified in the Scope-of-Work (Attachment E). Examples of administrative costs are personnel, office supplies, and equipment. As a condition for eligibility, all costs must be necessary for maintaining, monitoring, coordinating, reporting and budgeting of the project. Additionally, expenses must be reasonable and appropriate to the activities related to the project.

- LACMTA is not responsible for, and will not reimburse any costs incurred by the Grantee prior to the execution of the FA, unless written authorization has been granted by the LACMTA Chief Executive Officer or her designee.

- The FA is considered executed when the LACMTA Chief Executive Officer or designee signs the document.

DEFINITIONS

- Local Participation: Where local participation consists of “in-kind” contributions rather than funds, the following contributions may be included:
  - Costs incurred by a local jurisdiction to successfully complete the project. Examples include engineering, design, rights-of-way purchase, and construction management costs.
  - Donations of land, building space, supplies, equipment, loaned equipment, or loaned building space dedicated to the project.
  - Donations of volunteer services dedicated to the project.
  - A third-party contribution of services, land, building space, supplies or equipment dedicated to the project.

- Allowable Cost: To be allowable, costs must be reasonable, recognized as ordinary and necessary, consistent with established practices of the organization, and consistent with industry standard of pay for work classification.

- Excessive Cost: Any expense deemed “excessive” by LACMTA staff would be adjusted to reflect a “reasonable and customary” level. For detail definition of “reasonable cost”, please refer to the Federal Register OMB Circulars A-87 Cost Principals for State and Local Governments; and A-122 Cost Principals for Nonprofit Organizations.

- Ineligible Expenditures: Any activity or expense charged above and beyond the approved Scope-of-Work is considered ineligible.
GRANTEES ARE REQUESTED TO MAIL THIS REPORT TO P.O. Box #512296, Los Angeles, CA 90051-0296 after the close of each quarter, but no later than November 30, February 28, May 31 and August 31. Please note that letters or other forms of documentation may not be substituted for this form. Refer to the Reporting and Expenditure Guidelines (Attachment C) for further information.

SECTION 1: QUARTERLY EXPENSE REPORT

Please itemize grant-related charges for this Quarter on Page 5 of this report and include totals in this Section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Quarter Expenditure</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC25 - Earmark Exchange $</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Quarter Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Invoice Amount (Less Retention)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-to-Date Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Expended to Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Include this Quarter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Project Budget Expended to Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Remaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SECTION 2: GENERAL INFORMATION**

**PROJECT TITLE:** ALONDRA BLVD COMPLETE STREETS STUDY

**FA #:** 920000000E1728C

**QUARTERLY REPORT SUBMITTED FOR:**

- **Fiscal Year:**
  - [ ] 2017-2018
  - [ ] 2018-2019
  - [ ] 2019-2020
  - [ ] 2020-2021
  - [ ] 2021-2022

- **Quarter:**
  - [ ] Q1: Jul - Sep
  - [ ] Q2: Oct - Dec
  - [ ] Q3: Jan - Mar
  - [ ] Q4: Apr - Jun

**DATE SUBMITTED:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LACMTA Project Mgr.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Annie Chou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
<td>213-418-3453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:choua@metro.net">choua@metro.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor Contact / Project Manager</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Yvette Kirrin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title:</td>
<td>Consulting Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City / Agency:</td>
<td>Gateway Cities Council of Governments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
<td>16401 Paramount Boulevard Paramount CA 90723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
<td>626-644-8058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Yvette@kes-inc.com">Yvette@kes-inc.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3: QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

DELIVERABLES & MILESTONES

List all deliverables and milestones as stated in the FA, with start and end dates. Calculate the total project duration. **DO NOT CHANGE THE ORIGINAL FA MILESTONE START AND END DATES SHOWN IN THE 2ND AND 3RD COLUMNS BELOW.**

Grantees must make every effort to accurately portray milestone dates in the original FA Scope of Work, since this will provide the basis for calculating any project delay. If milestone start and/or end dates change from those stated in the Original FA Scope of Work, indicate the new dates under Actual Schedule below and re-calculate the project duration. However, this does not change the original milestones in your FA. PER YOUR FA AGREEMENT, ANY CHANGES TO THE PROJECT SCHEDULE MUST BE FORMALLY SUBMITTED UNDER SEPARATE COVER TO LACMTA FOR WRITTEN CONCURRENCE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FA Milestones</th>
<th>Original FA Schedule in Scope of Work</th>
<th>Actual Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Breaking Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribbon Cutting Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Duration (Months)**

A. Based on the comparison of the original and actual project milestone schedules above, project is (select only one):

- [ ] On schedule per original FA schedule
- [ ] Less than 12 months behind original schedule
- [ ] Between 12-24 months behind original schedule
- [ ] More than 24 months behind original schedule

B. Was the project design started within 6 months of the date originally stated in the FA?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Not Applicable

C. Was a construction contract or capital purchase executed within 9 months after completion of design / specifications?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Not Applicable
LIST OF TASKS & MILESTONES ACCOMPLISHED

List tasks or milestones accomplished and progress made this quarter.

PROJECT DELAY

If project is delayed, describe reasons for delay (this quarter). Pay particular attention to schedule delays. If delay is for the same reason as mentioned in previous quarters, please indicate by writing "Same as Previous Quarter".

ACTION ITEMS TO RESOLVE DELAY

If the project is delayed (as described in #4), include action items that have been, or will be, undertaken to resolve the delay.
SECTION 4: ITEMIZED LISTING OF EXPENSES AND CHARGES THIS QUARTER

All expenses and charges, including grant and local match, must be itemized and listed below. Each item listed must be verifiable by an invoice and/or other proper documentation. The total amounts shown here must be equal to this quarter’s expenditures listed on page 1 of this report. All expenses and charges must be reflective of the approved budget and rates as shown in the FA Attachment B, Scope of Work. Use additional pages if needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>INVOICE #</th>
<th>TOTAL EXPENSES / CHARGES</th>
<th>$ CHARGED TO PC 25-EARMARK EXCHANGE</th>
<th>$ CHARGED TO OTHER FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Local match spent in each quarter, must be in the appropriate proportion to LACMTA grant.
2. All receipts, invoices, and time sheets, attached and included with this Expense Report must be listed and shown under the Invoice Number column of the Itemized Listing (above).

Invoice Payment Information:
LACMTA will make all disbursements electronically unless an exception is requested in writing.

ACH Payments require that you complete an ACH Request Form and fax it to Accounts Payable at 213-922-6107. ACH Request Forms can be found at www.metro.net/callforprojects.

Written exception requests for Check Payments should be completed and faxed to Accounts Payable at 213-922-6-

I certify that I am the responsible Project Manager or fiscal officer and representative of ____________________________ and that to the best of my knowledge and belief the information stated in this report is true and correct.

Signature ____________________________________________ Date ____________________________

Name ____________________________________________ Title ____________________________
## ATTACHMENT C - PROJECT BUDGET
### 2016 FEDERAL EARMARK EXCHANGE

**PROJECT TITLE:** Alondra Boulevard Complete Street Study  
**GRANTEE/ PROJECT SPONSOR:** Gateway Cities Council of Governments  
($ in Actual Dollars)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMMED FUNDS</th>
<th>FY 2017-18</th>
<th>FY 2018-19</th>
<th>FY 2019-20</th>
<th>FY 2020-21</th>
<th>FY 2021-22</th>
<th>TOTAL BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LACMTA PROGRAMMED FUNDING:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition C 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$163,414.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Earmark Exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LACMTA SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$163,414.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$163,414.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRANTEE/SPONSOR FUND CONTRIBUTION:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELECT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contributions by participating Jurisdictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - specify type(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRANTEE/SPONSOR SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$163,414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature: [Signature]  
Date: 10-24-19
### ATTACHMENT D - PROJECT SCHEDULE
#### 2016 FEDERAL EARMARK EXCHANGE

**PROJECT TITLE:** Alondra Boulevard Complete Street Study  
**GRANTEE/ PROJECT SPONSOR:** Gateway Cities Council of Governments  
**FTIP ID:** LA061717

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Milestone Name/Phase</th>
<th>Milestone Definition and Status</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project Management and Administration</td>
<td>Project Initiation, Administration and Management</td>
<td>Jul-20</td>
<td>Dec-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review Existing Documentations</td>
<td>Research, obtain and review all relevant documentation that will utilized within the study to develop the masterplan.</td>
<td>Jul-20</td>
<td>Sep-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corridor Evaluations Documentations</td>
<td>Identify existing conditions, constraints and opportunities for each jurisdiction. Evaluate information to be used in Study.</td>
<td>Jul-20</td>
<td>Oct-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conduct Complete Streets Needs Analysis</td>
<td>Conduct detailed needs analysis for complete streets based on information gathered in Task 2 and Task 3.</td>
<td>Oct-20</td>
<td>Jan-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community and Stakeholder Outreach</td>
<td>Meet with Cities and County, as well as obtain input from various GCCOG Committees, open to the public.</td>
<td>Dec-20</td>
<td>Jul-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Complete Streets Implementation Alternatives</td>
<td>Develop concept plan alternatives for each jurisdiction.</td>
<td>Feb-21</td>
<td>Jul-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prepare Conceptual Complete Streets Plan</td>
<td>Prepare concept plan for Corridor and prepare report.</td>
<td>Jul-21</td>
<td>Sep-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Develop Conceptual Design Alternatives for Complete Streets Plan with Cost</td>
<td>Develop cost estimates based on preferred alternative.</td>
<td>Jul-20</td>
<td>Aug-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Presentation to Committees and City Councils, Describing Quantified and</td>
<td>Present PowerPoint to Committees to receive input and answer questions.</td>
<td>Aug-21</td>
<td>Oct-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signature:**  
**Date:** 10-24-19
ATTACHMENT E
Metro Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program
SCOPE OF WORK

Project ID: LA0G1717

Project Title: Alondra Boulevard Complete Street Study

Project Limits: The project is located at Calverton Drive in the City of La Mirada west to Shashkins Avenue in the City of Compton, for a total of 15.28 miles.

Which traverses through the jurisdictions of La Mirada, Santa Fe Springs, Cerritos, Norwalk, Bellflower, Paramount, Compton, and Unincorporated LA.

in the Gateway Cities Council of Governments area.

Project Description:
Develop a subregional Complete Street master plan for Alondra Boulevard, which is a high priority high quality transit arterial within the Gateway Cities. This high priority corridor is based on the Gateway Cities COG Board approved prioritization process. The limits extend from COG boundary to COG boundary for a total of approximately 15.28 miles (total). This masterplan will maximize multimodal opportunities on this E/W arterial corridor within the Gateway Cities, as well as maximize our ability to obtain grants for design and construction.

Project Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ITEM</th>
<th>Grant funds (LACMTA)</th>
<th>LOCAL AGENCY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Design, Engineering</td>
<td>$163,414</td>
<td>$000,000</td>
<td>$163,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BUDGET COST</td>
<td>$163,414</td>
<td>$000,000</td>
<td>$163,414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCOPE:

I. Task 1: Project Management and Administration
   a. Project Initiation

       The GCCOG will hold a kick-off meeting with the Cities and Metro to discuss the project scope of work, goals and objectives. A meeting agenda, minutes and action items listing will be produced.

   b. Project Administration

       The GCCOG will submit complete invoice packages to Metro based on existing/status quo protocol. The progress report will contain the following components:

       1. Executive summary
       2. Description of the tasks or deliverables completed
       3. Management issues, including status, resolution and action items
       4. Project task schedule describing percentages of completeness of each task
       5. Schedule and schedule tracking narrative
       6. List of deliverable items
       7. Dollar amount for which payment is requested.

   c. Project Management

       The GCCOG will complete the project including the technical tasks included in this scope as well as the Project Management of the overall project.

II. Task 2: Review Existing Documentations

       The GCCOG will gather all relevant document and literature for review and summarize useful information and findings relating to the Corridor, including the STP, relevant transit plans, relevant agency land use plans, and relevant as-builts.


III. Task 3: Corridor Evaluation Documentations
   a. Existing Conditions Corridor Evaluation and Analysis

       The GCCOG will conduct thorough existing conditions analysis by identifying opportunities and constraints for the multimodal Corridor. This is partially obtained via a 1-on-1 meeting with each agency, which will be documented in the report. Evaluation analysis could include the current traffic conditions and Levels of Service, truck volumes/impacts, pavement needs, pedestrian and bicycle traffic, transit connections, parking and other commercial and residential
linkages, and City entryways, or gateways, and potential safe routes to school options.

b. Future Conditions Corridor Evaluation and Analysis

The GCCOG will use data and information from recent studies on future conditions along the project Corridor and conduct thorough future conditions analysis for the multimodal Corridor. Evaluation analysis would include the 2035 traffic conditions and Levels of Service, truck volumes/impacts, pavement needs, pedestrian and bicycle traffic, transit connections, parking and other commercial and residential linkages, and City entryways, or gateways, and potential safe routes to school options.

Deliverable: Technical memo/ summary report regarding the existing conditions, constraints, opportunities.

IV. Task 4: Conduct Complete Streets Needs Analysis

The GCCOG will conduct a detailed needs analysis for complete streets and multimodal Corridor development, along with identifying constraints/opportunities.

Deliverable: Technical memo/ summary report regarding the needs and along with providing recommendations for consideration based on the constraints and opportunities.

V. Task 5: Community and Stakeholder Outreach

a. Stakeholder and Community Outreach

The GCCOG will coordinate meetings to discuss project with various stakeholder agencies. The GCCOG will also conduct stakeholder outreach after developing the concept alternatives and after the development of the draft Master Plan.

The GCCOG will develop a workshop to introduce the project to the public, define project parameters, inform community of project opportunities and constraints, and solicit opinions from the community. The GCCOG will also conduct community outreach after developing the concept alternatives and after the development of the draft Master Plan.

Deliverable: Coordinate and attend Meetings and a coordinate and conduct a Workshop.
VI. Task 6: Complete Streets Implementation Alternatives
   a. Develop Alternatives

   Based on the existing and future conditions evaluation and the stakeholder/community input, the GCCOG will develop alternative concepts for complete street implementation, and will include plans, sketches, and photos.

   Two primary alternatives considered include 1) the Florence Avenue Corridor as a “Complete Street” in an “unconstrained” condition to quantify the high level engineering and feasibility, and 2) as a multi-modal Corridor evaluated for consistency across the sub-region, including a potentially phased approach to a Complete Street, along with any major challenges as well as project benefits so that potential funding partners could understand the holistic context of the improvements.

   Deliverable: Develop concepts and exhibits, via alternatives, to support the needs identified.

VII. Task 7: Prepare Conceptual Complete Streets Plan

   Based on the preferred design alternative chosen in the stakeholder and community outreach efforts and discussions with the Cities, the GCCOG will develop a draft Concept Master Plan.

   Deliverable: Develop concept plan to incorporate into the Draft Report. This is the first step in creating the Draft Report.

VIII. Task 8: Develop Conceptual Design Alternatives for Complete Streets Plan with Cost Estimates

   The GCCOG will develop conceptual design alternatives with cost estimates. Illustrations will be made in plan view, as street cross sections, and as sketches.

   Deliverable: Develop cost estimates to accompany the concept alternative preferred, to incorporate into the draft Report.

IX. Task 9: Presentation to Committees and City Councils, Describing Quantified and Other Benefits

   The GCCOG will prepare and present PowerPoint presentations to Committees and City Councils, describing quantified and other benefits.

   Deliverable: Develop presentations and present at needed.
X. Task 10: Finalize Conceptual Design of Complete Streets Master Plan with Needed Delivery Schedule for Preliminary Engineering, Design, and Construction

The GCCOG will finalize the Master Plan, with proposed implementation schedule concepts indicating funding opportunities to leverage.

Deliverable: Prepare final report for approval by the Corridor Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIGN:</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>July 1, 2020</td>
<td>December 31, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| RIGHT-OF-WAY: |             |                 |
| CONSTRUCTION: |             |                 |
| CLOSE-Out     |             |                 |
ATTACHMENT F- FTIP
Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority
2019 Federal Transportation Improvement Program ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIP ID</th>
<th>LA0G1717</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Various Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Project Description:** Alondra Boulevard Complete Street Study - The GCCOC will evaluate the high quality transit corridor for complete streets features via a planning analysis. These streets are based on the Gateway Cities Strategic Transportation Plan (STP) and were prioritized by the STP Technical Advisory Committee. The Complete Street Study will maximize multimodal opportunities along the corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Local Hwy Route</th>
<th>Postmile</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Phase: Engineering, Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&amp;E)</th>
<th>Completion Date 12/01/2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane # Ext</th>
<th>Lane # Prop</th>
<th>Improv Desc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toll Rate</th>
<th>Toll Colc Loc</th>
<th>Toll Method</th>
<th>Hov acres loc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Air Basin:** SCAB
**Envr Doc:** CATEGORICALLY EXEMPT - 07/01/2019

**Program Code:** STUDY - PROJECT STUDY Stop Loc:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PC25 - 2016 Earmark Repurposing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22</th>
<th>22/23</th>
<th>23/24</th>
<th>BEYOND PROG TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PE:** $163  **TOTAL RW:** $0  **TOTAL CON:** $0

- General Comment: Repurposing Federal Earmark into smaller Complete Streets Studies along High Quality transit corridors.
- TCM Comment: Change in scope and cost, due to breaking up federal earmark into smaller amounts for multiple complete street studies.
- Amendment Comment:
- CMP Comment:
- Narrative:

**Last Revised Amendment 19-09 - CTC PENDING** Change reason: New Project Total Cost: $163
2016 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION EARMARK EXCHANGE PROGRAM — LOCAL FUNDS

This Exchange Agreement ("AGREEMENT"), is made and entered into as of October 29, 2019, by and between the GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS ("CITY") and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority ("LACMTA").

RECITALS:

A. The 2016 Consolidated Appropriation Act allowed the CITY to transfer its Federal Transportation Earmark(s) to LACMTA.

B. LACMTA Board of Directors approved the Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program on May 25, 2016.

C. As of April 19, 2017, CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Fund Balance of $774,167.89 was transferred to LACMTA.

D. As of October 29, 2019 City has exchanged $164,948 of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds for a like amount of Proposition C 25% per 2016 Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Agreement 920000000E1728A, Project "Imperial Highway Complete Street Study".

E. As of October 29, 2019 City has exchanged $139,175 of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds for a like amount of Proposition C 25% per 2016 Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Agreement 920000000E1728B, Project "Telegraph Road Complete Street Study".

F. As of October 29, 2019 City has exchanged $168,468 of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds for a like amount of Proposition C 25% per 2016 Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Agreement 920000000E1728C, Project "Alondra Blvd Complete Street Study".

G. CITY desires to exchange $139,175 of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds for a like amount of LACMTA Proposition C 25% ("LACMTA Funds").

H. LACMTA is willing to exchange $139,175 in LACMTA Funds for a like amount of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds, subject to the terms and conditions contained herein.

I. An exchange of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds with LACMTA Funds is beneficial to and in the general interest of CITY and LACMTA.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual benefits to be derived by CITY and LACMTA, and of the promises contained herein, it is hereby agreed as follows:
AGREEMENT:

1. Title of the Project (the "Project"): Slauson Avenue Complete Street Study. LACMTA Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program ID# E1728D, FTIP# LA0G1718.

2. CITY hereby assigns to LACMTA $139,175 of CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Funds. This assignment shall be automatically effective upon full execution of this AGREEMENT without the necessity of the execution, delivery or recording of any further instrument whatsoever. Notwithstanding the foregoing, at LACMTA's request, CITY shall execute and deliver such documents and instruments as may be required to evidence such assignment of Federal Transportation Earmark Funds.

3. LACMTA hereby accepts CITY’s assignment of CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Funds for use on Proposition C 25% eligible project, to be determined by LACMTA in its sole and absolute discretion.

4. On September 26, 2002, the LACMTA Board of Directors required that prior to receiving Proposition C 10% or 25% funds, CITY must meet a Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirement consistent with the State of California’s MOE as determined by the State Controller’s office. With regard to enforcing the MOE, LACMTA will follow the State of California’s MOE requirement, including, without limitation, suspension and re-implementation. As a participant in the Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program receiving Proposition C 25% funds, CITY is subject to MOE requirements.

5. Upon receipt of (i) a fully executed AGREEMENT, (ii) CITY's written certification of the amount of CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Fund Balance, as defined herein, which CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Fund Balance shows that CITY has sufficient Federal Transportation Earmark Funds to meet its obligations hereunder, and (iii) LACMTA's acceptance of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds as provided in paragraph 2 above, LACMTA shall pay CITY $135,000 of LACMTA Funds which amount reflects the deduction for the processing fee described in paragraph 10 below. For purposes of this AGREEMENT, CITY’s “Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Fund Balance” shall mean the amount of funds CITY transferred to LACMTA as of April 13, 2017. CITY is prohibited from requesting any amount of funding above the amount exchanged with LACMTA, inclusive of the processing fee described in paragraph 10 below.

6. CITY must complete an Automated Clearing House (ACH) form as provided in Attachment A to allow LACMTA to make disbursements electronically. Disbursements via ACH will be made at no cost to CITY. If electronic disbursements are not the preferred method of disbursement, CITY may request an exception in writing.

7. Unless otherwise stated in this Agreement, the Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report, with supporting documentation of expenses and Project progress as described in paragraph 9 of this Agreement, and other documents as required by LACMTA, shall satisfy LACMTA invoicing requirements.
8. Submit invoice with supporting documentation to:
   ACCOUNTSPAYABLE@METRO.NET (preferable) or mail to:
   Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
   Accounts Payable
   P. O. Box 512296
   Los Angeles, CA 90051-0296
   
   All invoice material must contain the following information:
   Re: LACMTA Project ID# E1728D, FTIP # LA0G1718, and FA# 920000000E1728D
   LACMTA Project Manager Annie Chou, MS 99-23-3

9. CITY will be reimbursed on a quarterly basis subject to satisfactory compliance to
    schedule as demonstrated in a quarterly progress/expense report supported by a detailed invoice
    demonstrating the staff and hours charged to the project, any consultant hours, materials, etc. An
    amount equal to five percent (5%) of each invoice will be retained until final completion of the
    project and audit. In addition, final retention payment will be withheld until the project is
    complete and approved by LACMTA and all audit requirements including before and after
    photographs have been satisfied. All quarterly progress/expense reports will be due on the last
    day of the months of November, February, May and August. Attachments B and C contain
    Reporting and Expenditure Guidelines and Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report template.

10. CITY shall pay LACMTA a three-percent (3%) processing and administrative fee ("the
    Processing Fee") in connection with the exchange contemplated by this AGREEMENT. The
    Processing Fee shall be assessed against the total amount of LACMTA Funds payable to
    CITY. CITY hereby authorizes LACMTA to deduct the Processing Fee from the amount
    LACMTA is to pay CITY hereunder.

11. The Project Budget report documents all sources of funds programmed for the Project
    as approved by LACMTA and is attached as Attachment D. The Project Budget report
    includes the total programmed budget for the Project, including the funds exchanged under this
    AGREEMENT and any CITY funds. The Project Budget also includes the fiscal years in
    which all the funds for the Project are programmed.

12. The Project Schedule report, included here as Attachment E, documents Project
    schedule performance measurements. The Project Schedule report identifies Project activity
    purchases, milestones, sequence, duration, and deliverable dates.

13. CITY shall complete the Project as described in the Scope of Work. The Scope of
    Work for the Project is attached to this AGREEMENT as Attachment F. The Scope of Work
    includes a description of the Project, a detailed description of the work to be completed by
    CITY including, without limitation, Project milestones consistent with the lapping policy and
    the schedule identified in the Project Schedule report. Work shall be delivered in accordance
    with that schedule unless otherwise agreed to by the parties in writing. If CITY is consistently
    behind schedule in meeting milestones or in delivering the Project, then LACMTA will have
the option to terminate this Agreement for default as described in paragraph 15.

14. CITY shall expend the LACMTA Funds on the Project by the Lapsing Date. For the purposes of this AGREEMENT, “the Lapsing Date” shall mean the date that is three (3) years from the date that this AGREEMENT is fully executed. Expenses shall be invoiced no later than 60 days after the LAPSING DATE.
   A. For the purposes of this AGREEMENT, the term “Proposition C 25%-Eligible Project” shall mean any transportation project or program that supports transit and/or decreases single-occupancy vehicle trips. In all cases, transit service must be provided on the road street on which the project or program is proposed.
   B. The term “expend” as used in paragraph 14 shall mean “encumbered by an awarded contract”.

15. A Default under this Agreement is defined as any one or more of the following: (i) CITY fails to comply with the terms and conditions contained herein or in the Guidelines; (ii) CITY is consistently behind schedule in meeting milestones or in delivering the Project; or (iii) CITY fails to perform satisfactorily or makes a material change, as determined by LACMTA at its sole discretion, to the Project Budget, Project Schedule, or the Scope of Work without LACMTA’s prior written consent or approval as provided herein.

16. After project is final vouchedered and closed, any cost savings funds greater than $1,000 not expended, will be eligible for use on Proposition C 25%-Eligible Project, to be determined by LACMTA in its sole and absolute discretion.

17. CITY must use the LACMTA Funds in the most cost-effective manner. If CITY intends to use a consultant or contractor to implement all or part of the Proposition C 25%-Eligible Project, LACMTA requires that such activities be procured in accordance with CITY’s contracting procedures and be consistent with State law as appropriate. CITY will also use the LACMTA Funds in the most cost-effective manner when the LACMTA Funds are used to pay "in-house" staff time. CITY staff or consultants with project oversight roles may not award work to companies in which they have a financial or personal interest. This effective use of funds provision will be verified by LACMTA through on-going project monitoring and through any LACMTA interim and final audits.

18. LACMTA, and/or its designee, shall have the right to conduct audits of CITY’s use of the LACMTA Funds, as deemed appropriate, such as financial and compliance audits; interim audits; pre-award audits, performance audits, and final audits. CITY agrees to establish and maintain proper accounting procedures and cash management records and documents in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). CITY’s records shall include, without limitation, any supporting evidence deemed necessary by LACMTA to substantiate CITY’s use of LACMTA Funds. These records must be retained by CITY for five years following CITY’s last use of the LACMTA Funds. CITY shall reimburse LACMTA for any expenditure not in compliance with the Scope of Work and/or not in compliance with other terms and conditions of this AGREEMENT. The allowability of costs for CITY's own
expenditures submitted to LACMTA for the Proposition C 25%-Eligible Project shall be in compliance with Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program Guidelines. The allowability of costs for CITY's contractors, consultants, and suppliers expenditures submitted to LACMTA through CITY's Monthly Progress Reports and Quarterly Expenditures shall be in compliance with Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program Guidelines. Findings of the LACMTA audit are final. When LACMTA audit findings require CITY to return monies to LACMTA, CITY agrees to return the monies within thirty (30) days after the final audit is sent to CITY.

19. The terms of this AGREEMENT shall commence on the date that this AGREEMENT is fully executed and shall terminate once CITY has expended all the LACMTA Funds and all LACMTA audit and reporting requirements have been satisfied.

20. CITY shall fully indemnify, defend and hold LACMTA and its officers, agents, and employees harmless from and against any liability and expenses, including, without limitation, defend costs, any costs or liability on account of bodily injury, death or personal injury of any person, or for damages of any nature whatsoever arising out of (i) a breach of CITY's obligations under this AGREEMENT; or (ii) any act or omission of CITY or its officers, agents, employees, contractors, or subcontractors in the use of the LACMTA Funds.

21. LACMTA shall fully indemnify, defend and hold CITY and its officers, agents, and employees harmless from and against any liability and expenses, including, without limitation, defend costs, any costs or liability on account of bodily injury, death or personal injury of any person, or for damages to or loss of risk of property, any environmental obligations, any legal fees and any claims for damages of any nature whatsoever arising out of (i) a breach of LACMTA's obligations under this AGREEMENT; or (ii) any act or omission of LACMTA or its officers, agents, employees, contractors, or subcontractors in the use of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds.

22. This AGREEMENT may be amended or modified only by mutual written consent of LACMTA and CITY.

23. Any correspondence, communication, or contact concerning this AGREEMENT shall be directed to the following:

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS:

Attn: Genny Cisneros
16401 Paramount Blvd
Paramount CA, 90723
Email: gcisneros@gatewaycog.org
Phone: 562.663.6858
Yvette Kirrin (Consultant Engineer)
Email: Yvette@kes-inc.com
Phone: 626.644.8058

LACMTA:
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, California 90012

Attn: Annie Chou
Sr. Administrative Analyst, Countywide Planning & Development
Grants Management & Oversight
Email: choua@metro.net
Phone: 213.418.3453

24. This AGREEMENT shall be interpreted and governed by the laws of the State of California.

25. This AGREEMENT constitutes the entire understanding between the parties with respect to the subject matter herein.

Attachment A – Reporting and Expenditure Guidelines
Attachment B – Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report
Attachment C – Project Budget
Attachment D – Project Schedule
Attachment E – Scope of Work
Attachment F – Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this AGREEMENT to be executed by their respective officers as of the date stated below.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

By: ____________________________

Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer

By: ____________________________

Nancy Pfeffer
Executive Director

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

APPROVED AS TO FORM

MARY C. WICKHAM
County Counsel

By: ____________________________

Deputy

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Ivy Tsai

By: ____________________________

Attorney
REPORTING PROCEDURES

- Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report (Attachment B) is required for all projects. The Grantee shall be subject to and comply with all applicable requirements of the funding agency regarding project-reporting requirements. In addition, Grantee will submit a quarterly report to the LACMTA at P.O. Box 512296, Los Angeles, CA 90051-0296. Please note that letters or other forms of documentation may not be substituted for this form.

- The Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report covers all activities related to the project and lists all costs incurred. It is essential that Grantee provide complete and adequate response to all the questions. The expenses listed must be supported by appropriate documentation with a clear explanation of the purpose and relevance of each expense to the project. Expenses must reflect the proportionate share of local match, including in-kind, charged to the grant.

- In cases where there are no activities to report, or problems causing delays, clear explanation, including actions to remedy the situation, must be provided.

- Grantees are required to track and report on the project schedule. LACMTA will monitor the timely use of funds and delivery of projects. Project delay, if any, must be reported each quarter. If CITY is consistently behind schedule in meeting milestones or in delivering the Project, then LACMTA will have the option to terminate this Agreement for default as described in paragraph 15.

- The Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report is due to the LACMTA as soon as possible after the close of each quarter, but no later than the following dates for each fiscal year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Report Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July - September</td>
<td>November 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October - December</td>
<td>February 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January - March</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April - June</td>
<td>August 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon completion of the Project a final report that includes project’s final evaluation must be submitted.

EXPENDITURE GUIDELINES

- Any activity or expense charged above and beyond the approved Scope-of-Work (Attachment F) is considered ineligible and will not be reimbursed by the LACMTA unless prior written authorization has been granted by the LACMTA Chief Executive Officer or designee.
ATTACHMENT A

FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION EARMARK EXCHANGE AGREEMENT
REPORTING & EXPENDITURE GUIDELINES

• Any expense charged to the grant or local match, including in-kind, must be clearly and directly related to the project.

• Any activity or expense charged as local match cannot be applied to any other LACMTA-funded or non-LACMTA-funded projects; activities or expenses related to a previously funded project cannot be used as local match for the current project.

• Administrative cost is the ongoing expense incurred by the Grantee for the duration of the project and for the direct benefit of the project as specified in the Scope-of-Work (Attachment E). Examples of administrative costs are personnel, office supplies, and equipment. As a condition for eligibility, all costs must be necessary for maintaining, monitoring, coordinating, reporting and budgeting of the project. Additionally, expenses must be reasonable and appropriate to the activities related to the project.

• LACMTA is not responsible for, and will not reimburse any costs incurred by the Grantee prior to the execution of the FA, unless written authorization has been granted by the LACMTA Chief Executive Officer or her designee.

• The FA is considered executed when the LACMTA Chief Executive Officer or designee signs the document.

DEFINITIONS

• Local Participation: Where local participation consists of “in-kind” contributions rather than funds, the following contributions may be included:
  • Costs incurred by a local jurisdiction to successfully complete the project. Examples include engineering, design, rights-of-way purchase, and construction management costs.
  • Donations of land, building space, supplies, equipment, loaned equipment, or loaned building space dedicated to the project.
  • Donations of volunteer services dedicated to the project.
  • A third-party contribution of services, land, building space, supplies or equipment dedicated to the project.

• Allowable Cost: To be allowable, costs must be reasonable, recognized as ordinary and necessary, consistent with established practices of the organization, and consistent with industry standard of pay for work classification.

• Excessive Cost: Any expense deemed “excessive” by LACMTA staff would be adjusted to reflect a “reasonable and customary” level. For detail definition of “reasonable cost”, please refer to the Federal Register OMB Circulars A-87 Cost Principals for State and Local Governments; and A-122 Cost Principals for Nonprofit Organizations.

• Ineligible Expenditures: Any activity or expense charged above and beyond the approved Scope-of-Work is considered ineligible.
LACMTA-EARMARK EXCHANGE
ATTACHMENT B
QUARTERLY PROGRESS / EXPENSE REPORT

GRANTEES ARE REQUESTED TO MAIL THIS REPORT TO
P.O. Box #512296, Los Angeles, CA 90051-0296 after the close
of each quarter, but no later than November 30, February 28,
May 31 and August 31. Please note that letters or other forms
of documentation may not be substituted for this form. Refer to the
Reporting and Expenditure Guidelines (Attachment C) for further information.

SECTION 1: QUARTERLY EXPENSE REPORT

Please itemize grant-related charges for this Quarter on Page 5 of this report and include totals in this Section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PC25 - Earmark Exchange</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project Quarter Expenditure
| This Quarter Expenditure
| Retention Amount
| Net Invoice Amount (Less Retention)
| Project-to-Date Expenditure
| Funds Expended to Date (Include this Quarter)
| Total Project Budget
| % of Project Budget Expended to Date
| Balance Remaining

Rev: 09.25.17
SECTION 2: GENERAL INFORMATION

PROJECT TITLE: SLAUSON AVENUE Complete Streets Study

FA #: 9200000000E1728D

QUARTERLY REPORT SUBMITTED FOR:

Fiscal Year: 
- [ ] 2017-2018
- [ ] 2018-2019
- [ ] 2019-2020
- [ ] 2020-2021
- [x] 2021-2022

Quarter: 
- [ ] Q1: Jul - Sep
- [ ] Q2: Oct - Dec
- [ ] Q3: Jan - Mar
- [x] Q4: Apr - Jun

DATE SUBMITTED: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LACMTA Project Mgr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor Contact / Project Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City / Agency:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3: QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

Deliverables & Milestones

List all deliverables and milestones as stated in the FA, with start and end dates. Calculate the total project duration. **DO NOT CHANGE THE ORIGINAL FA MILESTONE START AND END DATES SHOWN IN THE 2\textsuperscript{ND} AND 3\textsuperscript{RD} COLUMNS BELOW.**

Grantees must make every effort to accurately portray milestone dates in the original FA Scope of Work, since this will provide the basis for calculating any project delay. If milestone start and/or end dates change from those stated in the Original FA Scope of Work, indicate the new dates under Actual Schedule below and re-calculate the project duration. However, this does not change the original milestones in your FA. **PER YOUR FA AGREEMENT, ANY CHANGES TO THE PROJECT SCHEDULE MUST BE FORMALLY SUBMITTED UNDER SEPARATE COVER TO LACMTA FOR WRITTEN CONCURRENCE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FA Milestones</th>
<th>Original FA Schedule in Scope of Work</th>
<th>Actual Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Breaking Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribbon Cutting Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Duration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Months)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT COMPLETION**

A. Based on the comparison of the original and actual project milestone schedules above, project is (select only one):

- [ ] On schedule per original FA schedule
- [ ] Less than 12 months behind original schedule
- [ ] Between 12-24 months behind original schedule
- [ ] More than 24 months behind original schedule

B. Was the project design started within 6 months of the date originally stated in the FA?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Not Applicable

C. Was a construction contract or capital purchase executed within 9 months after completion of design / specifications?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Not Applicable
3. Tasks / Milestones Accomplished

List tasks or milestones accomplished and progress made this quarter.

4. Project Delay

If project is delayed, describe reasons for delay (this quarter). Pay particular attention to schedule delays. If delay is for the same reason as mentioned in previous quarters, please indicate by writing "Same as Previous Quarter".

5. Action Items to Resolve Delay

If the project is delayed (as described in #4), include action items that have been, or will be, undertaken to resolve the delay.
SECTION 4: ITEMIZED LISTING OF EXPENSES AND CHARGES THIS QUARTER

All expenses and charges, including grant and local match, must be itemized and listed below. Each item listed must be verifiable by an invoice and/or other proper documentation. The total amounts shown here must be equal to this quarter’s expenditures listed on page 1 of this report. All expenses and charges must be reflective of the approved budget and rates as shown in the FA Attachment B, Scope of Work. Use additional pages if needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>INVOICE #</th>
<th>TOTAL EXPENSES / CHARGES</th>
<th>$ CHARGED TO PC 25-EMARK EXCHANGE</th>
<th>$ CHARGED TO OTHER FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Local match spent in each quarter, must be in the appropriate proportion to LACMTA grant.
2. All receipts, invoices, and time sheets, attached and included with this Expense Report must be listed and shown under the Invoice Number column of the Itemized Listing (above).

Invoice Payment Information:
LACMTA will make all disbursements electronically unless an exception is requested in writing.
ACH Payments require that you complete an ACH Request Form and fax it to Accounts Payable at 213-922-6107.
ACH Request Forms can be found at www.metro.net/callforprojects.
Written exception requests for Check Payments should be completed and faxed to Accounts Payable at 213-922-6107.

I certify that I am the responsible Project Manager or fiscal officer and representative of ____________________________ and that to the best of my knowledge and belief the information stated in this report is true and correct.

Signature ____________________________ Date ____________________________

Name ____________________________ Title ____________________________
# ATTACHMENT C - PROJECT BUDGET
## 2016 FEDERAL EARMARK EXCHANGE

**PROJECT TITLE:** Slauson Avenue Complete Street Study  
**GRANTEE/PROJECT SPONSOR:** Gateway Cities Council of Governments  
(All figures are in actual dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMMED FUNDS</th>
<th>FY 2017-18</th>
<th>FY 2018-19</th>
<th>FY 2019-20</th>
<th>FY 2020-21</th>
<th>FY 2021-22</th>
<th>TOTAL BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LACMTA PROGRAMMED FUNDING:  
Proposition C 25%  
2016 Earmark Exchange | $0.00       | $0.00      | $0.00      | $135,000.00 | $0.00      | $135,000.00   |
| **LACMTA SUBTOTAL** | $0.00       | $0.00      | $0.00      | $135,000.00 | $0.00      | $135,000.00   |
| **GRANTEE/SPONSOR FUND CONTRIBUTION:** | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 |
| **SELECT:** | | | | | | |
| Local Contributions by participating Jurisdictions | | | | | | $0.00 |
| Other - specify type(s): | | | | | | |
| **GRANTEE/SPONSOR SUBTOTAL** | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 |
| **TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET** | | | | | | $135,000.00 |

Signature: ___________________________  Date: ____________

---

Rev: 08.22.18  FEMX - ATTACHMENT C
# ATTACHMENT D - PROJECT SCHEDULE

## 2016 FEDERAL EARMARK EXCHANGE

**PROJECT TITLE:** Slauson Avenue Complete Street Study  
**GRANTEE/ PROJECT SPONSOR:** Gateway Cities Council of Governments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Milestone Name/Phase</th>
<th>Milestone Definition and Status</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project Management and Administration</td>
<td>Project Initiation, Administration and Management</td>
<td>Jan-21</td>
<td>Dec-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review Existing Documentations</td>
<td>Research, obtain and review all relevant documentation that will utilized within the study to develop the masterplan.</td>
<td>Jan-21</td>
<td>Mar-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corridor Evaluations Documentations</td>
<td>Identify existing conditions, constraints and opportunities for each jurisdiction. Evaluate information to be used in Study.</td>
<td>Jan-21</td>
<td>Apr-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conduct Complete Streets Needs Analysis</td>
<td>Conduct detailed needs analysis for complete streets based on information gathered in Task 2 and Task 3.</td>
<td>Mar-21</td>
<td>Jun-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community and Stakeholder Outreach</td>
<td>Meet with Cities and County, as well as obtain input from various GCCOG Committees, open to the public.</td>
<td>Apr-21</td>
<td>Nov-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Complete Streets Implementation Alternatives</td>
<td>Develop concept plan alternatives for each jurisdiction.</td>
<td>May-21</td>
<td>Oct-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prepare Conceptual Complete Streets Plan</td>
<td>Prepare concept plan for Corridor and prepare report.</td>
<td>Jul-21</td>
<td>Sep-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Develop Conceptual Design Alternatives for Complete Streets Plan with Cost Estimates</td>
<td>Develop cost estimates based on preferred alternative.</td>
<td>Jul-21</td>
<td>Aug-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Presentation to Committees and City Councils, Describing Quantified and Other</td>
<td>Present PowerPoint to Committees to receive input and answer questions.</td>
<td>Aug-21</td>
<td>Oct-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signature:** ___________________________  
**Date:** ________________
## ATTACHMENT D - PROJECT SCHEDULE
### 2016 FEDERAL EARMARK EXCHANGE

**PROJECT TITLE:** Slauson Avenue Complete Street Study  
**GRANTEE/ PROJECT SPONSOR:** Gateway Cities Council of Governments  
**FTIP ID:** LA0G1718

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Milestone Name/Phase</th>
<th>Milestone Definition and Status</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project Management and Administration</td>
<td>Project Initiation, Administration and Management</td>
<td>Jan-21</td>
<td>Dec-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review Existing Documentations</td>
<td>Research, obtain and review all relevant documentation that will utilized within the study to develop the masterplan.</td>
<td>Jan-21</td>
<td>Mar-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corridor Evaluations Documentations</td>
<td>Identify existing conditions, constraints and opportunities for each jurisdiction. Evaluate information to be used in Study.</td>
<td>Jan-21</td>
<td>Apr-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conduct Complete Streets Needs Analysis</td>
<td>Conduct detailed needs analysis for complete streets based on information gathered in Task 2 and Task 3.</td>
<td>Mar-21</td>
<td>Jun-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community and Stakeholder Outreach</td>
<td>Meet with Cities and County, as well as obtain input from various GCCOG Committees, open to the public.</td>
<td>Apr-21</td>
<td>Nov-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Complete Streets Implementation Alternatives</td>
<td>Develop concept plan alternatives for each jurisdiction.</td>
<td>May-21</td>
<td>Oct-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prepare Conceptual Complete Streets Plan</td>
<td>Prepare concept plan for Corridor and prepare report.</td>
<td>Jul-21</td>
<td>Sep-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Develop Conceptual Design Alternatives for Complete Streets Plan with Cost Estimates</td>
<td>Develop cost estimates based on preferred alternative.</td>
<td>Jul-21</td>
<td>Aug-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Presentation to Committees and City Councils, Describing Quantified and Other</td>
<td>Present PowerPoint to Committees to receive input and answer questions.</td>
<td>Aug-21</td>
<td>Oct-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signature:**  
**Date:**
ATTACHMENT E
Metro Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program
SCOPE OF WORK

Project ID: LA0G1718

Project Title: Slauson Avenue Complete Street Study

Project Limits: The project is located at Santa Fe Springs Road in the Cities of Santa Fe Springs and Whittier west to Wilmington Avenue in the City of Huntington Park, for a total of 12.34 miles.

Which traverses through the jurisdictions of Santa Fe Springs, Whittier, Unincorporated LA, Pico Rivera, Montebello, Commerce, Bell, Maywood, Huntington Park, and Vernon,

in the Gateway Cities Council of Governments area.

Project Description:
Develop a subregional Complete Street master plan for Slauson Avenue, which is a high priority high quality transit arterial within the Gateway Cities. This high priority corridor is based on the Gateway Cities COG Board approved prioritization process. The limits extend from COG boundary to COG boundary for a total of approximately 12.34 miles (total). This masterplan will maximize multimodal opportunities on this E/W arterial corridor within the Gateway Cities, as well as maximize our ability to obtain grants for design and construction.

Project Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ITEM</th>
<th>Grant funds (LACMTA)</th>
<th>LOCAL AGENCY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Design, Engineering</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$000,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BUDGET COST</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$000,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCOPE:

I. Task 1: Project Management and Administration
   a. Project Initiation

   The GCCOG will hold a kick-off meeting with the Cities and Metro to discuss the project scope of work, goals and objectives. A meeting agenda, minutes and action items listing will be produced.

   b. Project Administration

   The GCCOG will submit complete invoice packages to Metro based on existing/status quo protocol. The progress report will contain the following components:

   1. Executive summary
   2. Description of the tasks or deliverables completed
   3. Management issues, including status, resolution and action items
   4. Project task schedule describing percentages of completeness of each task
   5. Schedule and schedule tracking narrative
   6. List of deliverable items
   7. Dollar amount for which payment is requested.

   c. Project Management

   The GCCOG will complete the project including the technical tasks included in this scope as well as the Project Management of the overall project.

II. Task 2: Review Existing Documentations

   The GCCOG will gather all relevant document and literature for review and summarize useful information and findings relating to the Corridor, including the STP, relevant transit plans, relevant agency land use plans, and relevant as-builts.


III. Task 3: Corridor Evaluation Documentations
   a. Existing Conditions Corridor Evaluation and Analysis

   The GCCOG will conduct thorough existing conditions analysis by identifying opportunities and constraints for the multimodal Corridor. This is partially obtained via a 1-on-1 meeting with each agency, which will be documented in the report. Evaluation analysis could include the current traffic conditions and Levels of Service, truck volumes/impacts, pavement needs, pedestrian and bicycle traffic, transit connections, parking and other commercial and residential
linkages, and City entryways, or gateways, and potential safe routes to school options.

b. Future Conditions Corridor Evaluation and Analysis

The GCCOG will use data and information from recent studies on future conditions along the project Corridor and conduct thorough future conditions analysis for the multimodal Corridor. Evaluation analysis would include the 2035 traffic conditions and Levels of Service, truck volumes/impacts, pavement needs, pedestrian and bicycle traffic, transit connections, parking and other commercial and residential linkages, and City entryways, or gateways, and potential safe routes to school options.

Deliverable: Technical memo/ summary report regarding the existing conditions, constraints, opportunities.

IV. Task 4: Conduct Complete Streets Needs Analysis

The GCCOG will conduct a detailed needs analysis for complete streets and multimodal Corridor development, along with identifying constraints/opportunities.

Deliverable: Technical memo/ summary report regarding the needs and along with providing recommendations for consideration based on the constraints and opportunities.

V. Task 5: Community and Stakeholder Outreach

a. Stakeholder and Community Outreach

The GCCOG will coordinate meetings to discuss project with various stakeholder agencies. The GCCOG will also conduct stakeholder outreach after developing the concept alternatives and after the development of the draft Master Plan.

The GCCOG will develop a workshop to introduce the project to the public, define project parameters, inform community of project opportunities and constraints, and solicit opinions from the community. The GCCOG will also conduct community outreach after developing the concept alternatives and after the development of the draft Master Plan.

Deliverable: Coordinate and attend Meetings and a coordinate and conduct a Workshop.
VI. Task 6: Complete Streets Implementation Alternatives  
   a. Develop Alternatives

   Based on the existing and future conditions evaluation and the stakeholder/community input, the GCCOG will develop alternative concepts for complete street implementation, and will include plans, sketches, and photos.

   Two primary alternatives considered include 1) the Florence Avenue Corridor as a “Complete Street” in an “unconstrained” condition to quantify the high level engineering and feasibility, and 2) as a multi-modal Corridor evaluated for consistency across the sub-region, including a potentially phased approach to a Complete Street, along with any major challenges as well as project benefits so that potential funding partners could understand the holistic context of the improvements.

   Deliverable: Develop concepts and exhibits, via alternatives, to support the needs identified.

VII. Task 7: Prepare Conceptual Complete Streets Plan  

   Based on the preferred design alternative chosen in the stakeholder and community outreach efforts and discussions with the Cities, the GCCOG will develop a draft Concept Master Plan.

   Deliverable: Develop concept plan to incorporate into the Draft Report. This is the first step in creating the Draft Report.

VIII. Task 8: Develop Conceptual Design Alternatives for Complete Streets Plan with Cost Estimates

   The GCCOG will develop conceptual design alternatives with cost estimates. Illustrations will be made in plan view, as street cross sections, and as sketches.

   Deliverable: Develop cost estimates to accompany the concept alternative preferred, to incorporate into the draft Report.

IX. Task 9: Presentation to Committees and City Councils, Describing Quantified and Other Benefits

   The GCCOG will prepare and present PowerPoint presentations to Committees and City Councils, describing quantified and other benefits.

   Deliverable: Develop presentations and present at needed.
X. **Task 10: Finalize Conceptual Design of Complete Streets Master Plan with Needed Delivery Schedule for Preliminary Engineering, Design, and Construction**

The GCCOG will finalize the Master Plan, with proposed implementation schedule concepts indicating funding opportunities to leverage.

**Deliverable:** Prepare final report for approval by the Corridor Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESIGN:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>January 1, 2020</td>
<td>December 30, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIGHT-OF-WAY:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLOSE -Out</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ATTACHMENT F - FTIP

**Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority**  
2019 Federal Transportation Improvement Program ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIP ID</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Various Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA0G1718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description:** Stauson Avenue Complete Street Study - The GCCCOG will evaluate the high quality transit Corridor for Complete street features via a planning analysis. These streets are based on the Gateway Cities Strategic Transportation Plan (STP) and were prioritized by the STP Technical Advisory Committee. The Complete Street Study will maximize multimodal opportunities along the Corridor.

**System:** Local Hwy  
**Route:**  
**Postmile:**  
**Distance:**  
**Phase:** Engineering/Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E)  
**Completion Date:** 12/31/2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane Exid</th>
<th>Lane Prop</th>
<th>Improv Desc</th>
<th>Toll Rate</th>
<th>Toll Col Location</th>
<th>Toll Method</th>
<th>Hov Lane EG Location</th>
<th>Air Basin</th>
<th>Envir Doc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCAB</td>
<td>CATEGORICALLY EXEMPT - 07/01/2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Code:** STUDY - PROJECT STUDY  
**Stoo Loc:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>PRIOR 19/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22</th>
<th>22/23</th>
<th>23/24</th>
<th>BEYOND PROG TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **General Comment:** Earmark repurpose to smaller projects within subregion.  
- **Modeling Comment:**  
- **TCM Comment:** Scope and Cost change from original earmark for smaller manageable studies along high quality transit corridors.  
- **Amendment Comment:**  
- **CIP Comment:**  
- **Narrative:**

**Last Revised** Amendment 19-09 - CTC PENDING  
**Change reason:** New Project  
**Total Cost:** $135

---

*Page 1*  
*Tuesday, October 29, 2019*
2016 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION EARMARK EXCHANGE PROGRAM — LOCAL FUNDS

This Exchange Agreement ("AGREEMENT"), is made and entered into as of October 29, 2019, by and between the GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS ("CITY") and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority ("LACMTA").

RECITALS:

A. The 2016 Consolidated Appropriation Act allowed the CITY to transfer its Federal Transportation Earmark(s) to LACMTA.

B. LACMTA Board of Directors approved the Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program on May 25, 2016.

C. As of April 19, 2017, CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Fund Balance of $774,167.89 was transferred to LACMTA.

D. As of October 29, 2019 City has exchanged $164,948 of CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Funds for a like amount of Proposition C 25% per 2016 Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Agreement 920000000E1728A, Project “Imperial Highway Complete Street Study”.

E. As of October 29, 2019 City has exchanged $139,175 of CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Funds for a like amount of Proposition C 25% per 2016 Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Agreement 920000000E1728B, Project “Telegraph Road Complete Street Study”.

F. As of October 29, 2019 City has exchanged $168,468 of CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Funds for a like amount of Proposition C 25% per 2016 Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Agreement 920000000E1728C, Project “Alondra Blvd Complete Street Study”.

G. As of October 29, 2019 City has exchanged $139,175 of CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Funds for a like amount of Proposition C 25% per 2016 Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Agreement 920000000E1728D, Project “Slauson Avenue Complete Street Study”.

H. CITY desires to exchange $162,402 of CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Funds for a like amount of LACMTA Proposition C 25% ("LACMTA Funds").

I. LACMTA is willing to exchange $162,402 in LACMTA Funds for a like amount of CITY’s Federal Transportation Earmark Funds, subject to the terms and conditions contained herein.
J. An exchange of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds with LACMTA Funds is beneficial to and in the general interest of CITY and LACMTA.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual benefits to be derived by CITY and LACMTA, and of the promises contained herein, it is hereby agreed as follows:

AGreement:

1. Title of the Project (the "Project"): Long Beach Blvd Complete Street Study. LACMTA Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program ID# E1728E, FTIP# LA0G1719.

2. CITY hereby assigns to LACMTA $162,402 of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds. This assignment shall be automatically effective upon full execution of this AGREEMENT without the necessity of the execution, delivery or recording of any further instrument whatsoever. Notwithstanding the foregoing, at LACMTA's request, CITY shall execute and deliver such documents and instruments as may be required to evidence such assignment of Federal Transportation Earmark Funds.

3. LACMTA hereby accepts CITY's assignment of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds for use on Proposition C 25% eligible project, to be determined by LACMTA in its sole and absolute discretion.

4. On September 26, 2002, the LACMTA Board of Directors required that prior to receiving Proposition C 10% or 25% funds, CITY must meet a Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirement consistent with the State of California's MOE as determined by the State Controller's office. With regard to enforcing the MOE, LACMTA will follow the State of California's MOE requirement, including, without limitation, suspension and re-implementation. As a participant in the Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program receiving Proposition C 25% funds, CITY is subject to MOE requirements.

5. Upon receipt of (i) a fully executed AGREEMENT, (ii) CITY's written certification of the amount of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Fund Balance, as defined herein, which CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Fund Balance shows that CITY has sufficient Federal Transportation Earmark Funds to meet its obligations hereunder, and (iii) LACMTA's acceptance of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds as provided in paragraph 2 above, LACMTA shall pay CITY $157,530 of LACMTA Funds which amount reflects the deduction for the processing fee described in paragraph 10 below. For purposes of this AGREEMENT, CITY's "Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Fund Balance" shall mean the amount of funds CITY transferred to LACMTA as of April 13, 2017. CITY is prohibited from requesting any amount of funding above the amount exchanged with LACMTA, inclusive of the processing fee described in paragraph 10 below.

6. CITY must complete an Automated Clearing House (ACH) form as provided in Attachment A to allow LACMTA to make disbursements electronically. Disbursements via ACH will be made at no cost to CITY. If electronic disbursements are not the preferred method
of disbursement, CITY may request an exception in writing.

7. **Unless otherwise stated in this Agreement**, the Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report, with supporting documentation of expenses and Project progress as described in paragraph 9 of this Agreement, and other documents as required by LACMTA, shall satisfy LACMTA invoicing requirements.

8. Submit invoice with supporting documentation to:
   ACCOUNTSPAYABLE@METRO.NET (preferable) or mail to:
   Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
   Accounts Payable
   P. O. Box 512296
   Los Angeles, CA 90051-0296

   All invoice material must contain the following information:
   Re: LACMTA Project ID# E1728E, FTIP # LA0G1719, and FA# 920000000E1728E
   LACMTA Project Manager Annie Chou, MS 99-23-3

9. **CITY will be reimbursed on a quarterly basis subject to satisfactory compliance to schedule as demonstrated in a quarterly progress/expense report supported by a detailed invoice demonstrating the staff and hours charged to the project, any consultant hours, materials, etc. An amount equal to five percent (5%) of each invoice will be retained until final completion of the project and audit. In addition, final retention payment will be withheld until the project is complete and approved by LACMTA and all audit requirements including before and after photographs have been satisfied. All quarterly progress/expense reports will be due on the last day of the months of November, February, May and August. Attachments B and C contain Reporting and Expenditure Guidelines and Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report template.**

10. **CITY shall pay LACMTA a three-percent (3%) processing and administrative fee ("the Processing Fee") in connection with the exchange contemplated by this AGREEMENT. The Processing Fee shall be assessed against the total amount of LACMTA Funds payable to CITY. CITY hereby authorizes LACMTA to deduct the Processing Fee from the amount LACMTA is to pay CITY hereunder.**

11. The Project Budget report documents all sources of funds programmed for the Project as approved by LACMTA and is attached as Attachment D. The Project Budget report includes the total programmed budget for the Project, including the funds exchanged under this AGREEMENT and any CITY funds. The Project Budget also includes the fiscal years in which all the funds for the Project are programmed.

12. The Project Schedule report, included here as Attachment E, documents Project schedule performance measurements. The Project Schedule report identifies Project activity purchases, milestones, sequence, duration, and deliverable dates.
13. CITY shall complete the Project as described in the Scope of Work. The Scope of Work for the Project is attached to this AGREEMENT as Attachment F. The Scope of Work includes a description of the Project, a detailed description of the work to be completed by CITY including, without limitation, Project milestones consistent with the lapping policy and the schedule identified in the Project Schedule report. Work shall be delivered in accordance with that schedule unless otherwise agreed to by the parties in writing. If CITY is consistently behind schedule in meeting milestones or in delivering the Project, then LACMTA will have the option to terminate this Agreement for default as described in paragraph 15.

14. CITY shall expend the LACMTA Funds on the Project by the Lapsing Date. For the purposes of this AGREEMENT, “the Lapsing Date” shall mean the date that is three (3) years from the date that this AGREEMENT is fully executed. Expenses shall be invoiced no later than 60 days after the LAPSING DATE.
   A. For the purposes of this AGREEMENT, the term “Proposition C 25%-Eligible Project” shall mean any transportation project or program that supports transit and/or decreases single-occupancy vehicle trips. In all cases, transit service must be provided on the road street on which the project or program is proposed.
   B. The term “expend” as used in paragraph 14 shall mean “encumbered by an awarded contract”.

15. A Default under this Agreement is defined as any one or more of the following: (i) CITY fails to comply with the terms and conditions contained herein or in the Guidelines; (ii) CITY is consistently behind schedule in meeting milestones or in delivering the Project; or (iii) CITY fails to perform satisfactorily or makes a material change, as determined by LACMTA at its sole discretion, to the Project Budget, Project Schedule, or the Scope of Work without LACMTA’s prior written consent or approval as provided herein.

16. After project is final vouchered and closed, any cost savings funds greater than $1,000 not expended, will be eligible for use on Proposition C 25%-Eligible Project, to be determined by LACMTA in its sole and absolute discretion.

17. CITY must use the LACMTA Funds in the most cost-effective manner. If CITY intends to use a consultant or contractor to implement all or part of the Proposition C 25%-Eligible Project, LACMTA requires that such activities be procured in accordance with CITY's contracting procedures and be consistent with State law as appropriate. CITY will also use the LACMTA Funds in the most cost-effective manner when the LACMTA Funds are used to pay "in-house" staff time. CITY staff or consultants with project oversight roles may not award work to companies in which they have a financial or personal interest. This effective use of funds provision will be verified by LACMTA through on-going project monitoring and through any LACMTA interim and final audits.

18. LACMTA, and/or its designee, shall have the right to conduct audits of CITY's use of the LACMTA Funds, as deemed appropriate, such as financial and compliance audits; interim audits; pre-award audits, performance audits, and final audits. CITY agrees to establish and
maintain proper accounting procedures and cash management records and documents in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). CITY's records shall include, without limitation, any supporting evidence deemed necessary by LACMTA to substantiate CITY's use of LACMTA Funds. These records must be retained by CITY for five years following CITY's last use of the LACMTA Funds. CITY shall reimburse LACMTA for any expenditure not in compliance with the Scope of Work and/or not in compliance with other terms and conditions of this AGREEMENT. The allowability of costs for CITY's own expenditures submitted to LACMTA for the Proposition C 25%-Eligible Project shall be in compliance with Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program Guidelines. The allowability of costs for CITY's contractors, consultants, and suppliers expenditures submitted to LACMTA through CITY's Monthly Progress Reports and Quarterly Expenditures shall be in compliance with Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program Guidelines. Findings of the LACMTA audit are final. When LACMTA audit findings require CITY to return monies to LACMTA, CITY agrees to return the monies within thirty (30) days after the final audit is sent to CITY.

19. The terms of this AGREEMENT shall commence on the date that this AGREEMENT is fully executed and shall terminate once CITY has expended all the LACMTA Funds and all LACMTA audit and reporting requirements have been satisfied.

20. CITY shall fully indemnify, defend and hold LACMTA and its officers, agents, and employees harmless from and against any liability and expenses, including, without limitation, defend costs, any costs or liability on account of bodily injury, death or personal injury of any person, or for damages of any nature whatsoever arising out of (i) a breach of CITY's obligations under this AGREEMENT; or (ii) any act or omission of CITY or its officers, agents, employees, contractors, or subcontractors in the use of the LACMTA Funds.

21. LACMTA shall fully indemnify, defend and hold CITY and its officers, agents, and employees harmless from and against any liability and expenses, including, without limitation, defend costs, any costs or liability on account of bodily injury, death or personal injury of any person, or for damages to or loss of risk of property, any environmental obligations, any legal fees and any claims for damages of any nature whatsoever arising out of (i) a breach of LACMTA's obligations under this AGREEMENT; or (ii) any act or omission of LACMTA or its officers, agents, employees, contractors, or subcontractors in the use of CITY's Federal Transportation Earmark Funds.

22. This AGREEMENT may be amended or modified only by mutual written consent of LACMTA and CITY.

23. Any correspondence, communication, or contact concerning this AGREEMENT shall be directed to the following:
GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS:

Attn: Genny Cisneros
16401 Paramount Blvd
Paramount CA, 90723
Email: gcisneros@gatewaycog.org
Phone: 562.663.6858

Yvette Kirrin (Consultant Engineer)
Email: Yvette@kes-inc.com
Phone: 626.644.8058

LACMTA:

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, California 90012

Attn: Annie Chou
Sr. Administrative Analyst, Countywide Planning & Development
Grants Management & Oversight
Email: choua@metro.net
Phone: 213.418.3453

24. This AGREEMENT shall be interpreted and governed by the laws of the State of California.

25. This AGREEMENT constitutes the entire understanding between the parties with respect to the subject matter herein.

Attachment A – Reporting and Expenditure Guidelines
Attachment B – Quarterly Progress/Expenditure Report
Attachment C – Project Budget
Attachment D – Project Schedule
Attachment E – Scope of Work
Attachment F- Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this AGREEMENT to be executed by their respective officers as of the date stated below.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  

By: ____________________________________________  
  Phillip A. Washington  
  Chief Executive Officer

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  

By: ____________________________________________  
  Nancy Pfeffer  
  Executive Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM

MARY C. WICKHAM  
County Counsel

By: ____________________________________________  
  Deputy

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Ivy Tsai

By: ____________________________________________  
  Attorney
LACMTA-EARMARK EXCHANGE
ATTACHMENT B
QUARTERLY PROGRESS / EXPENSE REPORT

GRANTEES ARE REQUESTED TO MAIL THIS REPORT TO
P.O. Box #512296, Los Angeles, CA 90051-0296 after the close
of each quarter, but no later than November 30, February 28,
May 31 and August 31. Please note that letters or other forms
of documentation may not be substituted for this form. Refer to the
Reporting and Expenditure Guidelines (Attachment C) for further information.

SECTION 1: QUARTERLY EXPENSE REPORT

Please itemize grant-related charges for this Quarter on Page 5 of this report and include totals in this Section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PC25 - Earmark Exchange ($)</th>
<th>Other Funds ($)</th>
<th>Total ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Quarter Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Quarter Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Invoice Amount (Less Retention)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-to-Date Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Expended to Date (Include this Quarter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Project Budget Expended to Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Remaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SECTION 2: GENERAL INFORMATION

PROJECT TITLE: LONG BEACH BLVD Complete Streets Study

FA #: 9200000000E1728E

QUARTERLY REPORT SUBMITTED FOR:

Fiscal Year :

- □ 2017-2018
- □ 2018-2019
- □ 2019-2020
- □ 2020-2021
- □ 2021-2022

Quarter :

- □ Q1: Jul - Sep
- □ Q2: Oct - Dec
- □ Q3: Jan - Mar
- □ Q4: Apr - Jun

DATE SUBMITTED:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LACMTA Project Mgr.</th>
<th>Name: Annie Chou</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
<td>213-418-3453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:choua@metro.net">choua@metro.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor Contact / Project Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name: Yvette M. Kirrin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title: Consulting Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City / Agency: Gateway Cities Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address: 16401 Paramount Boulevard Paramount CA 90723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number: 626-644-8058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail: <a href="mailto:Yvette@kes-inc.com">Yvette@kes-inc.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**SECTION 3: QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT**

**DELIVERABLES & MILESTONES**

List all deliverables and milestones as stated in the FA, with start and end dates. Calculate the total project duration. **DO NOT CHANGE THE ORIGINAL FA MILESTONE START AND END DATES SHOWN IN THE 2ND AND 3RD COLUMNS BELOW.**

Grantees must make every effort to accurately portray milestone dates in the original FA Scope of Work, since this will provide the basis for calculating any project delay. If milestone start and/or end dates change from those stated in the Original FA Scope of Work, indicate the new dates under Actual Schedule below and re-calculate the project duration. However, this does not change the original milestones in your FA. **PER YOUR FA AGREEMENT, ANY CHANGES TO THE PROJECT SCHEDULE MUST BE FORMALLY SUBMITTED UNDER SEPARATE COVER TO LACMTA FOR WRITTEN CONCURRENCE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FA Milestones</th>
<th>Original FA Schedule in Scope of Work</th>
<th>Actual Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid &amp; Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bid &amp; Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Breaking Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribbon Cutting Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Duration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT COMPLETION**

A. Based on the comparison of the original and actual project milestone schedules above, project is (select only one):

- [ ] On schedule per original FA schedule
- [ ] Less than 12 months behind original schedule
- [ ] Between 12-24 months behind original schedule
- [ ] More than 24 months behind original schedule

B. Was the project design started within 6 months of the date originally stated in the FA?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Not Applicable

C. Was a construction contract or capital purchase executed within 9 months after completion of design / specifications?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Not Applicable
3. TASKS/MILESTONES ACCOMPLISHED

List tasks or milestones accomplished and progress made this quarter.

4. PROJECT DELAY

If project is delayed, describe reasons for delay (this quarter). Pay particular attention to schedule delays. If delay is for the same reason as mentioned in previous quarters, please indicate by writing "Same as Previous Quarter".

5. ACTION ITEMS TO RESOLVE DELAY

If the project is delayed (as described in #4), include action items that have been, or will be, undertaken to resolve the delay.
SECTION 4: ITEMIZED LISTING OF EXPENSES AND CHARGES THIS QUARTER

All expenses and charges, including grant and local match, must be itemized and listed below. Each item listed must be verifiable by an invoice and/or other proper documentation. The total amounts shown here must be equal to this quarter's expenditures listed on page 1 of this report. All expenses and charges must be reflective of the approved budget and rates as shown in the FA Attachment B, Scope of Work. Use additional pages if needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>INVOICE #</th>
<th>TOTAL EXPENSES / CHARGES</th>
<th>$ CHARGED TO PC 25-EARMARK EXCHANGE</th>
<th>$ CHARGED TO OTHER FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Local match spent in each quarter, must be in the appropriate proportion to LACMTA grant.
2. All receipts, invoices, and time sheets, attached and included with this Expense Report must be listed and shown under the Invoice Number column of the Itemized Listing (above).

Invoice Payment Information:
LACMTA will make all disbursements electronically unless an exception is requested in writing.
ACH Payments require that you complete an ACH Request Form and fax it to Accounts Payable at 213-922-6107.
ACH Request Forms can be found at www.metro.net/califorprojects.
Written exception requests for Check Payments should be completed and faxed to Accounts Payable at 213-922-6107.

I certify that I am the responsible Project Manager or fiscal officer and representative of ________________ and that to the best of my knowledge and belief the information stated in this report is true and correct.

Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Name ___________________________ Title ___________________________
### PROJECT TITLE: Long Beach Boulevard Complete Street Study

**GRANTEE/ PROJECT SPONSOR:** Gateway Cities Council of Governments

($ in Actual Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMMED FUNDS</th>
<th>FY 2017-18</th>
<th>FY 2018-19</th>
<th>FY 2019-20</th>
<th>FY 2020-21</th>
<th>FY 2021-22</th>
<th>TOTAL BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA PROGRAMMED FUNDING:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$157,530.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition C 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Earmark Exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$157,530.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$157,530.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRANTEE/SPONSOR FUND CONTRIBUTION:**

- **SELECT:**
  - Local Contributions by participating Jurisdictions: $0

**Other - specify type(s):**

| GRANTEE /SPONSOR SUBTOTAL | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 |

**TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET** $157,530

Signature: _______________________________ Date: ________________

Rev. 08.22.18
# ATTACHMENT D - PROJECT SCHEDULE
2016 FEDERAL EARMARK EXCHANGE

## PROJECT TITLE: Long Beach Boulevard Complete Street Study

## GRANTEE/PROJECT SPONSOR: Gateway Cities Council of Governments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Milestone Name/Phase</th>
<th>Milestone Definition and Status</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project Management and Administration</td>
<td>Project Initiation, Administration and Management</td>
<td>Jan-21</td>
<td>Jul-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review Existing Documentations</td>
<td>Research, obtain and review all relevant documentation that will utilized within the study to develop the masterplan.</td>
<td>Jan-21</td>
<td>Apr-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corridor Evaluations Documentations</td>
<td>Identify existing conditions, constraints and opportunities for each jurisdiction. Evaluate information to be used in Study.</td>
<td>Jan-21</td>
<td>May-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conduct Complete Streets Needs Analysis</td>
<td>Conduct detailed needs analysis for complete streets based on information gathered in Task 2 and Task 3.</td>
<td>Mar-21</td>
<td>Jun-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community and Stakeholder Outreach</td>
<td>Meet with Cities and County, as well as obtain input from various GCCOG Committees, open to the public.</td>
<td>Jun-21</td>
<td>Jan-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Complete Streets Implementation Alternatives</td>
<td>Develop concept plan alternatives for each jurisdiction.</td>
<td>Aug-21</td>
<td>Jan-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prepare Conceptual Complete Streets Plan</td>
<td>Prepare concept plan for Corridor and prepare report.</td>
<td>Jan-22</td>
<td>Apr-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Develop Conceptual Design Alternatives for Complete Streets Plan with Cost Estimates</td>
<td>Develop cost estimates based on preferred alternative.</td>
<td>Jan-22</td>
<td>Mar-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Presentation to Committees and City Councils, Describing Quantified and Other</td>
<td>Present PowerPoint to Committees to receive input and answer questions.</td>
<td>Mar-22</td>
<td>May-22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature: _______________________________  Date: __________
ATTACHMENT E
Metro Federal Transportation Earmark Exchange Program
SCOPE OF WORK

Project ID: LA0G1719

Project Title: Long Beach Boulevard Complete Street Study

Project Limits: The project is located at East Ocean Boulevard in Long Beach, north to 15' South of Cudahy Street in South Gate, for a total of 14.03 miles.

Which traverses through the jurisdictions of Long Beach, Compton, Lynwood, and South Gate.

in the Gateway Cities Council of Governments area.

Project Description:
Develop a subregional Complete Street master plan for Long Beach Boulevard, which is a high priority high quality transit arterial within the Gateway Cities. This high priority corridor is based on the Gateway Cities COG Board approved prioritization process. The limits extend from COG boundary to COG boundary for a total of approximately 14.03 miles (total). This masterplan will maximize multimodal opportunities on this E/W arterial corridor within the Gateway Cities, as well as maximize our ability to obtain grants for design and construction.

Project Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ITEM</th>
<th>Grant funds (LACMTA)</th>
<th>LOCAL AGENCY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Design,</td>
<td>$157,530</td>
<td>$000,000</td>
<td>$157,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BUDGET COST</td>
<td>$157,530</td>
<td>$000,000</td>
<td>$157,530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCOPE:

I. Task 1: Project Management and Administration
   a. Project Initiation

   The GCCOG will hold a kick-off meeting with the Cities and Metro to discuss the project scope of work, goals and objectives. A meeting agenda, minutes and action items listing will be produced.

   b. Project Administration

   The GCCOG will submit complete invoice packages to Metro based on existing/status quo protocol. The progress report will contain the following components:

   1. Executive summary
   2. Description of the tasks or deliverables completed
   3. Management issues, including status, resolution and action items
   4. Project task schedule describing percentages of completeness of each task
   5. Schedule and schedule tracking narrative
   6. List of deliverable items
   7. Dollar amount for which payment is requested.

   c. Project Management

   The GCCOG will complete the project including the technical tasks included in this scope as well as the Project Management of the overall project.

II. Task 2: Review Existing Documentations

   The GCCOG will gather all relevant document and literature for review and summarize useful information and findings relating to the Corridor, including the STP, relevant transit plans, relevant agency land use plans, and relevant as-builts.


III. Task 3: Corridor Evaluation Documentations
   a. Existing Conditions Corridor Evaluation and Analysis

   The GCCOG will conduct thorough existing conditions analysis by identifying opportunities and constraints for the multimodal Corridor. This is partially obtained via a 1-on-1 meeting with each agency, which will be documented in the report. Evaluation analysis could include the current traffic conditions and Levels of Service, truck volumes/impacts, pavement needs, pedestrian and bicycle traffic, transit connections, parking and other commercial and residential
linkages, and City entryways, or gateways, and potential safe routes to school options.

b. Future Conditions Corridor Evaluation and Analysis

The GCCOG will use data and information from recent studies on future conditions along the project Corridor and conduct thorough future conditions analysis for the multimodal Corridor. Evaluation analysis would include the 2035 traffic conditions and Levels of Service, truck volumes/impacts, pavement needs, pedestrian and bicycle traffic, transit connections, parking and other commercial and residential linkages, and City entryways, or gateways, and potential safe routes to school options.

Deliverable: Technical memo/ summary report regarding the existing conditions, constraints, opportunities.

IV. Task 4: Conduct Complete Streets Needs Analysis

The GCCOG will conduct a detailed needs analysis for complete streets and multimodal Corridor development, along with identifying constraints/opportunities.

Deliverable: Technical memo/ summary report regarding the needs and along with providing recommendations for consideration based on the constraints and opportunities.

V. Task 5: Community and Stakeholder Outreach

a. Stakeholder and Community Outreach

The GCCOG will coordinate meetings to discuss project with various stakeholder agencies. The GCCOG will also conduct stakeholder outreach after developing the concept alternatives and after the development of the draft Master Plan.

The GCCOG will develop a workshop to introduce the project to the public, define project parameters, inform community of project opportunities and constraints, and solicit opinions from the community. The GCCOG will also conduct community outreach after developing the concept alternatives and after the development of the draft Master Plan.

Deliverable: Coordinate and attend Meetings and a coordinate and conduct a Workshop.
VI. Task 6: Complete Streets Implementation Alternatives
   a. Develop Alternatives

Based on the existing and future conditions evaluation and the stakeholder/community input, the GCCOG will develop alternative concepts for complete street implementation, and will include plans, sketches, and photos.

Two primary alternatives considered include 1) the Florence Avenue Corridor as a “Complete Street” in an “unconstrained” condition to quantify the high level engineering and feasibility, and 2) as a multi-modal Corridor evaluated for consistency across the sub-region, including a potentially phased approach to a Complete Street, along with any major challenges as well as project benefits so that potential funding partners could understand the holistic context of the improvements.

Deliverable: Develop concepts and exhibits, via alternatives, to support the needs identified.

VII. Task 7: Prepare Conceptual Complete Streets Plan

Based on the preferred design alternative chosen in the stakeholder and community outreach efforts and discussions with the Cities, the GCCOG will develop a draft Concept Master Plan.

Deliverable: Develop concept plan to incorporate into the Draft Report. This is the first step in creating the Draft Report.

VIII. Task 8: Develop Conceptual Design Alternatives for Complete Streets Plan with Cost Estimates

The GCCOG will develop conceptual design alternatives with cost estimates. Illustrations will be made in plan view, as street cross sections, and as sketches.

Deliverable: Develop cost estimates to accompany the concept alternative preferred, to incorporate into the draft Report.

IX. Task 9: Presentation to Committees and City Councils, Describing Quantified and Other Benefits

The GCCOG will prepare and present PowerPoint presentations to Committees and City Councils, describing quantified and other benefits.

Deliverable: Develop presentations and present at needed.
X. Task 10: Finalize Conceptual Design of Complete Streets Master Plan with Needed Delivery Schedule for Preliminary Engineering, Design, and Construction

The GCCOG will finalize the Master Plan, with proposed implementation schedule concepts indicating funding opportunities to leverage.

Deliverable: Prepare final report for approval by the Corridor Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIGN:</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>January 1, 2021</td>
<td>July 1, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIGHT-OF-WAY:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOSE-Out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Map:
ATTACHMENT F- FTIP
Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority
2021 Federal Transportation Improvement Program ($000)

TIP ID: LA0G1719
Implementing Agency: Various Agencies

Project Description: Long Beach Boulevard Complete Street Study- The GCCOG will evaluate the high quality transit Corridor for Complete street features via a planning analysis. These streets are based on the Gateway Cities Strategic Transportation Plan (STP) and were prioritized by the STP Technical Advisory Committee. The Complete Street Study will maximize multimodal opportunities along the Corridor.

System: Local Hwy Route: Postmile: Distance: Phase: Engineering/Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) Completion Date: 12/31/2023
Lane # Exit: Lane # Prop: Impv Desc: Air Basin: SCAB Envr Doc: CATEGORICALLY EXEMPT - 07/01/2023
Toll Rate: 0.00 Toll Colc Loc: Toll Method: Hov acs eg loc: Utk: Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana Sub-Area: Sub-Region:
CTIPS ID: EA #: PPNO:

Program Code: STUDY - PROJECT STUDY Stop Loc:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PC25 - 2016 Earmark Repurposing</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22</th>
<th>22/23</th>
<th>23/24</th>
<th>24/25</th>
<th>25/26</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- General Comment: Incorrect amount input error.
- Modelling Comment: NA
- TCM Comment: NA
- Amendment Comment: NA
- CPM Comment: NA
- Narrative:

Last Revised Adoption 21-00 - Submitted Change reason: Carry over from 19-09 Total Cost: $158
## ATTACHMENT C - PROJECT BUDGET
### 2016 FEDERAL EARMARK EXCHANGE

**PROJECT TITLE:** Long Beach Boulevard Complete Street Study  
**GRANTEE/PROJECT SPONSOR:** Gateway Cities Council of Governments  

### PROGRAMMED FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2017-18</th>
<th>FY 2018-19</th>
<th>FY 2019-20</th>
<th>FY 2020-21</th>
<th>FY 2021-22</th>
<th>TOTAL BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LACMTA PROGRAMMED FUNDING:  
Proposition C 25%  
2016 Earmark Exchange | $0.00      | $0.00      | $0.00      | $157,530.00 | $0.00      | $157,530.00 |
| LACMTA SUBTOTAL      | $0.00      | $0.00      | $0.00      | $157,530.00 | $0.00      | $157,530.00 |

### GRANTEE/SPONSOR FUND CONTRIBUTION:

**SELECT:**

Local Contributions by participating Jurisdictions  

Other - specify type(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2017-18</th>
<th>FY 2018-19</th>
<th>FY 2019-20</th>
<th>FY 2020-21</th>
<th>FY 2021-22</th>
<th>TOTAL BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRANTEE/SPONSOR SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET  

|                      |            |            |            |            |            | $157,530     |

Signature: ____________________________  
Date: ____________________________
VII. CONSENT CALENDAR
ITEM F
Gateway Cities COG Check Signing Policy
and Payment Processing Policy
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Nancy Pfeffer, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Gateway Cities COG Check Signing Policy and Payment Processing Policy

Background

Since September 2000 the COG has been operating with a check signing policy that allows the Executive Director to authorize payments on behalf of the COG for $1000 or less. Any payments over $1000 requires two signatures, which includes any combination of Executive Director, President, Vice President, or Treasurer.

Issue

In recent years the current policy creates issues with payments that are due prior to the approval of the next warrant by the COG Board. Payments to vendors such as Konica Copier are over $1000, including taxes, which means staff is bound to the current policy to seek another signature or split the payments so that we stay in compliance with the set policy.

Staff is requesting a limit increase from $1000 to $2000, authorizing the Executive Director to approve payments below $2000 prior to the approval of the next warrant register. As has always been customary, all payments issued are listed on the warrant register for approval.

Recommended Action

Approve Resolution 2020-01 and the revised Check Processing Policy.
RESOLUTION NO. 2020-01

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS ESTABLISHING A CHECK SIGNING POLICY.

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The following persons are authorized to sign checks on behalf of the Gateway Cities Council of Governments: President of the Board of Directors; Vice President of the Board of Directors; Executive Director; and Treasurer.

SECTION 2. Checks in the amount of less than two thousand dollars shall require the signature of one of the persons listed in Section 1 of this Resolution.

SECTION 3. Checks in the amount of two thousand dollars or greater shall require the signature of two of the persons listed in Section 1 of this Resolution. A facsimile may be used for one signature in the event that three persons are unavailable to sign.

SECTION 4. The Secretary shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.


____________________________
DIANE DUBOIS, PRESIDENT

ATTEST:

SECRETARY
STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ) ss

I, Nancy Pfeffer, Secretary to the Board of Directors of the Gateway Cities Council of Governments hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted by the Board of Directors of the Gateway Cities Council of Governments at a regular meeting thereof, held on February 5, 2020, by the following vote:

AYES: ALL MEMBERS PRESENT

____________________________
NANCY PFEFFER, SECRETARY
1. All payments must be supported by an invoice and a COG reference memo (check request).

2. If the invoice is per a written contract, the reference memo should identify the contract and indicate the contract provision under which the invoices should be paid.

3. In the case of non-contracts, the reference memo should describe the service or goods received and indicate the name of the person who received the service or goods.

4. Reference memos may be called check requests, check requisitions, or payment requests.

5. All reference memos should indicate the payee, address, date service was provided, date goods were ordered and received, budget authorization or account number, and a brief description of the service or goods.

6. Payments of less than $2,000 may be paid based on the written approval of the COG Executive Director.

7. Payments equal to or greater than $2,000 must be approved by the Board of Directors.

Approved by the Gateway Cities COG Board of Directors on:

_______________________

Date
VII. CONSENT CALENDAR
ITEM L
Report from PATH (COG Homeless Program Implementation Agency)
### July 2020 through January 2021
#### January 20 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Transgender/Gender Queer Conn/Harm</th>
<th>Disabled/Brain</th>
<th>January ’20</th>
<th>January ’21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 12 (Infants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 – 24 (Youth)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 44 (Adults)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 + (Senior Adults)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>January ’20</th>
<th>January ’21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paranoid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety Disorders</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Illness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Related</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Disability</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Categories</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>January ’20</th>
<th>January ’21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/African</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Amer./Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Races</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note that information is tracked as it becomes available. Many cases are initially unable to share personal info.*
### Board of Directors Meeting Agenda

#### February 5, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Title</th>
<th>January '20</th>
<th>YTD (July '19 - June '20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 1: Counted Entry System (CES) Assessment Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>January '20</th>
<th>YTD (July '19 - June '20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance Score</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance Score</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 2: Counted Entry System (CES) Assessment Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>January '20</th>
<th>YTD (July '19 - June '20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unplanned Exits</strong></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unplanned Incidents</strong></td>
<td>357</td>
<td>3463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>491</td>
<td>3803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3: Counted Entry System (CES) Assessment Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>January '20</th>
<th>YTD (July '19 - June '20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unplanned Incidents</strong></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note:**

- Table 1: Counted Entry System (CES) Assessment Completed: The table details the number of cases completed in January '20 and the corresponding YTD (July '19 - June '20) figures.
- Table 2: Counted Entry System (CES) Assessment Completed: This table shows the number of unplanned exits and incidents, along with their cumulative totals for January '20 and YTD.
- Table 3: Counted Entry System (CES) Assessment Completed: This table highlights the total number of unplanned incidents and their cumulative totals for January '20 and YTD.
Board of Directors Meeting Agenda  
February 5, 2020
Huntington Park
- Conducted regular case management services to the City of Huntington Park.
- PATH conducted ongoing and follow-up appointments for housing case management on a weekly basis to individuals in the City of Huntington Park.
- Continued to respond to LA HOP request as needed.
- PATH staff met with Huntington Park Police Department in regards to future outreach opportunities.
- Huntington Park has received a total of 8 LA HOP requests.

Floywd
- PATH contacts weekly toibe in case management and crises to Timer (or other WCC departments) and any outreach services needed throughout the week.
- Floywd has received a total of 3 LA HOP requests.

Venice
- Conducted scheduled outreach as determined by assignment or need.
- Continue to respond to LA HOP request as needed.
- Continue to be available for referrals for mental/health/alcohol issues.
- Venice has received a total of 8 LA HOP requests.

South Gate
- Distribution delivered to the City of South Gate City staff informing them of the South Gate Prevention program managed by Hospitality Outreach.
- Distribution outreach at mobile clinic and South Gate Outreach home on Thursday, January 29th, 2020 with Alameda Cement.
- Outreach staff from Hospitality Outreach participated in the "Youth ITH" event in South Gate.
- PATH MDT conducts weekly ongoing collaborative outreach with OMT and LAHSA to engage new people and/or follow up with new clients, appointments, and any outreach sessions.
- PATH MDT responded to 1 LA HOP request in the City of South Gate.
- 1 PATH MDT participant entered detox and residential treatment for substance use.
- 1 PATH MDT participant was linked to MDT medically oriented treatment for substance use.
- 1 PATH MDT participant, who had been engaged by PATH MDT for 4 months, was linked to treatment and referred to DPM to enroll in General Benefits.
- 1 PATH MDT participant was linked to SVRI Full Service Partnership (FSP)
- South Gate has received a total of 2 LA HOP requests.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| La Mirada | - Whittier First Day Outreach staff and Community Engagement Specialist attended the La Mirada Business Jogs Meeting on January 7th, 1973.  
- PATH/MHT responded to (3) LA-HOP requests in the City of La Mirada. |
| Montebello | - PATH/MHT conducted a presentation to the LA County Public Library System on outreach coordination.  
- PATH/MHT responded to (1) LA-HOP requests as needed and regularly scheduled. |
| Pico Rivera | - PATH/MHT conducts weekly outreach and continues to follow up with referrals, appointments, and any outreach services needed throughout the week.  
- (2) PATH/MHT participant linked to medical health urgent care and shelter in Long Beach.  
- Continue to respond to (1) LA-HOP request in the City of Pico Rivera. |
| Santa Fe Springs | - Whittier First Day Outreach staff and their Homeless Services Team (HST) staff conducted a joint outreach in Santa Fe Springs on January 9th, 2020.  
- PATH/MHT conducts weekly outreach and continues to follow up with referrals, appointments, and any outreach services needed throughout the week.  
- (2) PATH/MHT participant linked to dental services and scheduled a medical appointment with primary care physician. |
| Whittier | - Whittier First Day Outreach staff attended an inter-community hospital Connection Meeting (CHCM) meeting at Pitt Health Hospital on January 7th, 2020.  
- Whittier First Day Homeless Services management attended a Supervision Meeting at the Center for Nonprofit Management on January 9th, 2020.  
- Whittier First Day Mobile Shower program staff brought showers to Liberty Community Plaza in Whittier on January 17th, 2020. |
Narrative

Whittier (Cont.)

- Whittier First Day Outreach staff participated in the January 22nd 2020 point-in-time count in Whittier.
- PATH/UOR conducts weekly outreach multiple times per week and continues to follow up with referrals, appointments, and any outreach services needed throughout the week.
- PATH/UOR responded to 100 LAHCD requests in the City of Whittier.
- PATH/UOR, UORSA, DAH, city officials, policy board, and lawens etc. participated in the monthly LOR 3 Case Coordination meetings on January 9th 2020 at Whittier Community Resource Center.
- (1) UORSA participant was linked to the Whittier City Winter Shelter program at St. Mark's Church.
- Whittier has received a total of 18 of LAHCD requests.

Whittier: Unincorporated

- Whittier First Day staff meet with Supervisor Hahn’s office, LACO, LAPD, and other outreach teams to review approaches to serving the residents of Farrell Park on January 6th 2020.
- Whittier First Day Homeless Services Program Manager attended the Safe Parking informational meeting for Unincorporated Whittier on January 9th 2020.
- Whittier First Day Outreach staff and UORSA (UOR) staff conducted a joint outreach in Unincorporated Whittier on January 9th 2020.
- Call-in case conference meeting with PATH, UOR, LACO, and Whittier First Day Outreach staff to discuss and coordinate outreach efforts at Farrell Park on January 15th 2020.
- Whittier First Day Outreach staff provided outreach services at the Farrell Connect Event on January 15th 2020.
- Whittier First Day Outreach staff participated in the January 22nd 2020 point-in-time count in Unincorporated Whittier.
- Whittier First Day staff attended a Compassion Fatigue Training on January 27, 2020.
- Whittier has received a total of 18 LAHCD requests.
Narrative

ICA 9:

Artesia
- PATH MTI continues to follow up on referrals, appointments, and any outreach services needed throughout the week.
- PATH MTI continued to follow up on referrals, appointments, and any outreach services needed throughout the week.

Artesia has received a total of 5 LA-HOP requests.

Bellflower
- PATH MTI conducted outreach and continues to follow up on referrals, appointments, and any outreach services needed throughout the week.
- PATH Public Health team conducted outreach at Bellflower Library weekly during January.
- PATH MTI conducted outreach at Salvation Army Bellflower Access Center on January 13th, 2020.
- PATH MTI conducted outreach in collaboration with Rosewood church that allows community members to buy goods at extremely low costs.
- PATH MTI conducted outreach with Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles regarding the new rental laws and tenant rights.
- PATH MTI staff continues to respond to LA-HOP requests as needed.
- PATH MTI has received a total of 4 LA-HOP requests.

Compton
- PATH MTI continues to conduct outreach and continues to follow up on referrals, appointments, and any outreach services needed throughout the week.
- PATH MTI responded to LA-HOP requests as needed.
- PATH MTI staff continues to respond to LA-HOP requests as needed.
- PATH MTI has received a total of 7 LA-HOP requests.

Corona
- PATH MTI continues to conduct outreach and continues to follow up on referrals, appointments, and any outreach services needed throughout the week.
- PATH MTI responded to LA-HOP requests as needed.
- PATH MTI staff continues to respond to LA-HOP requests as needed.
- PATH MTI has received a total of 5 LA-HOP requests.

Downey
- PATH MTI continues to conduct outreach and continues to follow up on referrals, appointments, and any outreach services needed throughout the week.
- PATH MTI staff continues to respond to LA-HOP requests as needed.
- PATH MTI has received a total of 8 LA-HOP requests.

(1) PATH MTI has completed 32 new intake cases.
Board of Directors Meeting Agenda
February 5, 2020

Narrative

Paramus
- Kingdom Causes Bellflower continues to regularly outreach in Paramount withköpfe.
- In January 2020, KCD and Paramount kicked off their partnership in a prevention program funded through Measure H. The prevention program aims to provide financial assistance for households who are at risk of becoming homeless. The first referral for this program has already been provided with financial assistance through the program.
- Paramount has received a total of 7 LA-HOP requests.

Norwalk
- MDI canvasses once a week and continues to follow up with referrals, appointments, and any outreach services needed throughout the week.
- MDI continues to collaborate with the Norwalk Homeless Task Force and Norwalk Social Services for outreach needs and referrals.
- MDI team attends the Norwalk homeless task force meeting and participates in the monthly Norwalk Social Services event every third Monday.
- MDI attended monthly case conference at Journey’s (Norwalk) on 1/15/20.
- Pat H participant had successful family reunification in South Carolina with brother.
- (2) PAT H participant, with mental health, substance use, and Medicaid, and long-term MDI participant, was housed in Long Beach.
- Norwalk has received a total of 6 LA-HOP requests.

Lynwood
- Kingdom Causes Bellflower continues to provide periodic outreach services in the area.
- Lynwood has received a total of 2 LA-HOP requests.
Narrative

LCA-4:

**Hawaiian Gardens**
- MOT twice a week, and continues to follow up with referrals, appointments, and any outreach services needed throughout the week. MOT provides outreach services every Tuesday at Key Out Airline.
- PATH team attended the LCA-4 Care Coordination meeting on January 23, 2020, for all homeless providers serving Hawaiian Gardens, Signal Hill, and Lakewood. The meeting takes place at the Hawaiian Gardens Public Safety Office.
- PATR participant has decided to pursue treatment for substance use with MOT assistance.
- Hawaiian Gardens has received a total of 6 LA-HOP requests.

**Lakewood**
- MOT conversations once a week and continues to follow up with referrals, appointments, and any outreach services needed throughout the week.
- Continue to respond to LA-HOP requests as needed and regularly scheduled.
- PATR participant went to OR and attended needed medical health appointment.
- MOT connected with a participant and was able to assist him submit a request for a unit.
- Participant, who has been resistant to MOT, agreed to go to OR with MOT.
- Lakewood has received a total of 1 LA-HOP requests.

**Signal Hill**
- MOT conversations once a week and continues to follow up with referrals, appointments, and any outreach services needed throughout the week.
- Continue to respond to LA-HOP requests as needed and regularly scheduled.
- Signal Hill has received a total of 9 LA-HOP requests.
VII. CONSENT CALENDAR
ITEM P
Matters from the League of California Cities
Programs and Announcements

LA County Division Media and Communications Training. February 13, 2020, 4-8pm at the San Gabriel Adult Recreation Center. Event is free for all Division Members. Register at www.lacities.org.

LA County Division General Membership Meeting. March 5, 2020, 6-8pm. Register at www.lacities.org.


League Releases 2019 Annual Report

Legislation and Advocacy
The legislature reconvened in January to finish the second year of the two-year session. Bills remaining from 2019 will have until January 31 to pass out of the house of origin to remain active for the year. On a parallel track, the Legislature has until February 21 to introduce new bills to take action on before the end of session.

Two-Year bills of interest (current as of 1/27/20)

**AB 516 (Chiu) Authority to remove vehicles*. Eliminates the ability for cities and law enforcement to 1) "immobilize," or place a boot on a vehicle, for motorists who ignore paying five or more parking tickets, 2) remove vehicles with expired registration that are operating illegally; and 3) remove vehicles in violation of parking time restrictions

Division Position: Oppose
Status: May be acted upon January 2020

**AB 1182 (Carrillo) Post-release supervision of offenders*. Requires persons, if they have been scored as low or moderate risk by the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation risk assessment tool, to be released if they have been on parole continuously for 180 days and have not committed any new offenses.

Division Position: Oppose
Status: May be acted upon January 2020

**AB 1356 (Ting) Cannabis: local jurisdictions: retail commercial cannabis activity*. Would, if more than 50% of the electorate of a local jurisdiction voted in favor of AUMA, require a local jurisdiction to issue a minimum number of local licenses authorizing specified retail cannabis commercial activity within that jurisdiction that would be
permitted by a retailer license issued under MAUCRSA.
  
  **Division Position: Oppose**
  
  **Status: Third Reading**

**AB 1568 (McCarthy)** Housing law compliance: prohibition on applying for state grants*. Withholds and diverts critical transportation funds from the Road Repair and Accountability Act (SB 1, Beall), for cities’ basic maintenance and road repair needs.
  
  **Division Position: Oppose**
  
  **Status: Third Reading**

**SB 50 (Wiener)** Planning and zoning: housing development: streamlined approval: incentives, (as amended 1/6/20)*. Would authorize a development proponent of a neighborhood multifamily project located on an eligible parcel to submit an application for a streamlined, ministerial approval process that is not subject to a conditional use permit. The bill would define a “neighborhood multifamily project” to mean a project to construct a multifamily structure on vacant land, or to convert an existing structure that does not require substantial exterior alteration consisting of up to 4 residential dwelling units.
  
  **Division Position: Oppose Unless Amended**
  
  **Status: Rules Committee to be assigned for floor vote**

**SB 266 (Leyva)** Public Employees’ Retirement System: disallowed compensation benefit adjustments. Requires public agencies to directly pay retirees and/or their beneficiaries disallowed retirement benefits using general fund dollars.
  
  **Division Position: Oppose**
  
  **Status: May be acted upon January 2020**

**SB 795 (Beall/Portantino/McGuire)** Building Affordable and Inclusive Communities. Would commit up to $2 billion in ongoing state funding for local governments to collaborate on state-approved redevelopment plans, which would be funded by reducing their contributions to local Education Revenue Augmentation Funds (ERAFs). Funding can be used for the following five purposes: (1) affordable housing, (2) transit-oriented development, (3) infill development, (4) revitalizing and restoring neighborhoods, and (5) planning for projects that mitigate the effects of climate change. The bill will ensure schools are held harmless to meet the Prop 98 guarantee.
  
  **Division Position: Support**
  
  **Status: Waiting committee assignment to be acted upon after February 6, 2020**

**SB 732 (Allen)** Transactions and use tax: South Coast Air Quality Management District, (as amended 1/14/20)*. Authorizes the south coast district board to impose a transactions and use tax within the boundaries of the south coast district, as specified, with the moneys generated from the transactions and use tax to be used to supplement existing revenues being used for south coast district purposes, as specified
  
  **Division Position: Oppose**
  
  **Status: Pulled off Senate Appropriations by Author.**
Note: bill likely to be introduced by February 21st in another bill number with a different author

*Bill must pass house of origin by January 31, 2020

For additional information or resources on these items, contact Kristine Guerrero at kguerrero@cacities.org.

**Recommended Action**

Receive and file report.
VII. CONSENT CALENDAR
ITEM R
Matters from Eco-Rapid Transit (WSAB)
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Mike Kodama, Executive Director – Eco-Rapid Transit JPA

SUBJECT: Eco-Rapid Transit/West Santa Ana Branch (WSAB/Eco-Rapid) Update – January - 2020

Background

Environmental Review Process
The MTA continues to move forward with preparation of environmental clearance for the Corridor with the expectation that a draft document will be eligible for circulation in the summer of this year. Corridor cities continue to work with the MTA on defining and addressing potential environmental impacts from the construction and operation of the WSAB/Eco-Rapid Light Rail.

In December the MTA Board made available $1 million to support corridor cities planning activities for the Transit Oriented Development Strategic Implementation Plan (TODSIP). This will allow Metro staff to enter into agreements with corridor cities and LA County to fund implementation activities including specialized studies and providing matching funds for grants. Each jurisdiction will be limited to $200,000 in grants.

Lastly, the WASB/Eco-Rapid City Managers met for the first time as a corridor TAC.

Recommended Action

Receive and file
VIII. REPORTS
ITEM C
SB 50 Update and Recommendation – Oppose Content of Bill
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Nancy Pfeffer, Executive Director
Julia Stewart, Planning Director

SUBJECT: SB 50 Update and Recommendation for COG Position – Oppose Content of Bill

Background

Senate Bill 50 was introduced by Senator Scott Wiener on December 3, 2018 and was amended in the Senate both in 2019 and in early 2020. The bill proposes to remove much of the opportunity for local control and community input on housing developments. The COG partnered with the Los Angeles County League of California Cities to reach out to each Gateway City to provide input on the proposed bill in 2019. The League first issued a letter in response to the bill on December 13, 2019, followed by a second letter (see attachment) in response to the Senator’s January 6, 2020 amendments to SB 50 on January 14, 2020. The bill went to the full Senate for a vote on January 29, 2020 and did not pass. However, it is likely that the bill will be brought up again in the future.

Issue

The Gateway Cities COG is committed to addressing the housing crisis in a balanced way that favors the quality of life for all residents. Further, the Gateway Cities COG has been strategizing to find methods to facilitate new housing production within the region. An overarching approach from homelessness through the spectrum of varying rental and ownership housing options is part of that strategy. While Senate Bill 50 could be considered consistent with this housing strategy because the bill incentivizes new residential production, the current bill, without amendments, goes too far in removing input from local municipalities and community stakeholders.

The Gateway Cities COG is in a position to advocate for striking a balance between the need for housing and allowing for local community input, as well as reliance on the expertise of local municipal officials to properly and adequately analyze the quality of proposed residential projects.

Areas of consideration for possible amendments to SB 50 are identified as follows:

- Create predictability in the entitlement process for housing;
- Provide greater financial incentives for new construction of and updates to infrastructure needed to allow for greater residential density;
- Provide minimum amounts of inclusionary housing in multi-family residential projects;
- Provide subsidies for existing residents to remain in new or renovated housing developments when rising rents from the improvements put those residents at-risk for displacement;
- Eliminate or more consistently apply the carve outs mentioned in the bill, so as to not arbitrarily benefit some cities/counties;
• Local municipalities should be allowed to define “job-rich area”;
• Draw distinctions in density requirements between urban settings containing corridors with high capacity for density versus urban areas with existing single-family development with high numbers of unpermitted ADUs;
• Remove the references to fourplexes in single family zones; and
• Cities with a higher existing density should be given greater flexibility for implementation in all stipulations of the bill including waivers in areas of design and also including, but not limited to, other areas such as density, parking requirements, building heights and Floor Area Ratio maximums.

While the bill was not passed through a vote of the full Senate on January 29, 2020, it is likely that the bill will be brought up again in the future. Taking a formal position on the bill will enable the COG to fully engage in future legislative efforts.

**Recommended Action**

The COG staff recommends the COG Board take a position to oppose the approach taken in SB 50.

**Attachment**

January 14, 2020 response letter regarding SB 50 from the League of California Cities, Los Angeles County Division.
January 14, 2020

Honorable Scott Wiener
California State Senate
State Capitol, Room 5100
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: SB 50 (Wiener) Planning and zoning: housing development: streamlined approval: incentives.
Oppose Unless Amended (as amended 1/6/20) as recommended

Dear Senator Wiener,

I write to you today in response to your January 6, 2020 amendments to SB 50. In line with you and other legislative leaders, the Los Angeles County Division of the League of California Cities® (Division), representing 86 cities in the county, recognizes the urgent and unprecedented housing crisis that our state is facing and we commend you and other legislative leaders for your efforts to develop concepts to tackle this challenge. In this spirit, the Division has proactively made continued efforts to engage with you, beginning with our July 12, 2019 driving tour through Southeast Los Angeles County, to initiate consistent personal messages and most recently to produce our December 15, 2019 letter and white paper outlining our concerns with your bill. We offered viable and proactive solutions that could increase housing, provide affordability and sustain community services, in order to meet our state’s collective housing needs sooner rather than later.

Our Division Board was intentional and proactive in creating the SB 50 Working Group that developed our alternative proposal. Our group was comprised of mayors and council members with diverse backgrounds, political perspectives, professional disciplines, and represented different regions with varying populations in Los Angeles County. We invested an incredible amount of time and resources to demonstrate our genuine goal and sincerity to be a partner with you and provide viable solutions to the state’s housing crisis. Additionally, I took personal efforts to reach out to you with our proposal prior to distributing the letter to our Los Angeles Delegation and other stakeholders. This is why we are very disappointed that despite our efforts to create an open dialogue, our proposal, from the largest Division and group of cities in our state, was unanswered and not reflected in the amended version of your bill.

We are left with no alternative but to continue to oppose SB 50 unless amended not only on its lack of sound planning and real affordability measures, but because our good-faith efforts to work with you have not been reciprocated.

Our alternative proposal to SB 50 is updated below. We have also attached our white paper that includes an expanded discussion based on the proposed amendments.

**Recommended Locally-Led Alternatives to Addressing the Housing Crisis**

- Create entitlement certainty for multi-family housing. The “local flexibility plan” developed under the amended version of SB 50 is duplicative of existing
planning processes, and establishes hypothetical development baselines that depend on a city speculating developer interest in equitable community incentives.

Alternative: A mandatory local entitlement process (entitlement incentives) for multi-family housing developments, in areas selected by local governments (transit corridors, commercial corridors, downtown districts, and other locally defined areas) could give certainty to the development community while preserving local control and protecting community engagement. A process similar to SB 540 (Roth, 2017), which created a voluntary entitlement program and was sponsored by the League of California Cities, could be replicated and required.

- **Density must be combined with long-term funding tools.** SB 50 does not provide funding for local governments to sustain exponential long-term density.

  Alternative: Incentives should be offered that provide permanent, ongoing funding sources for multi-family and affordable housing projects to ensure their sustainability and success. These can include housing block grants or tax increment programs like SB 795 (Beall/Portantino/McGuire) that provide a long-term financing tool for cities to address increased vital services for infrastructure, park, public safety and other community priorities resulting from the greater demand for such services that occurs with new construction. We recognize the state’s effort to provide funding through SB 2 and AB 101/SB 102. However, those funding sources are either one-time uses or insufficient to sustain the state’s housing goals.

- **Affordability must be prioritized and sensitive communities must be protected from displacement.** SB 50 gives generous “equitable community incentives” to a developer within a specified radius of a “transit rich” or “jobs rich” area. However, the affordability requirement in SB 50 does little to address rising housing costs that affect our communities’ most vulnerable residents.

  Alternative: Multi-family housing developments must provide a minimum of 25% inclusionary housing, unless a local agency has enacted a higher minimum, to receive any development incentives and entitlement certainty incentives for multifamily developments. The State should also encourage the development of more local Housing Authorities to facilitate construction of affordable housing.

**Why SB 50 (as amended 1/6/20) is Not a Practical Solution to the Housing Crisis**

Notwithstanding the alternatives to SB 50 recommended above, there continues to be unsustainable flaws to the bill in its current form:

- **The Local Flexibility Plan established under the amended SB 50 is duplicative of existing planning process.** This Plan lacks any real local flexibility and would establish a hypothetical development baseline that depends on a city speculating developer interest in and use of various equitable community incentives. The Division remains concerned that “one size fits all” metrics of SB 50 do not work in real world circumstances that exist in many of our communities. Cities and California’s Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) have an established Housing Element process created through state law along with financial penalties for non-compliance. The Housing Element process requires significant city resources to develop, obtain public input, and receive approval from HCD. SB 50 would require cities to use precious time and resources to create a duplicative process that competes with the Housing Element.

  Alternative: The Division proposes amending SB 50 to “create entitlement certainty for multi-family housing” in urban areas of California. The mandatory local entitlement process (entitlement incentives) for multi-family housing developments, in areas selected by local governments (transit corridors, commercial corridors, downtown districts, and other locally defined areas) would give entitlement certainty to the development community, while preserving local control and protecting community engagement. A process similar to SB 540 (Roth, 2017), which created a voluntary entitlement program and was sponsored by the League of California Cities, is proposed to be replicated and required in SB 50.
• **Carve outs must have merit.** The proposed carve-outs in SB 50 are arbitrary and will do little to solve the crisis.  
  *Alternative:* While the Division believes that the entire state should contribute to solving our unprecedented housing crisis, we believe that carve outs should only be carefully considered for the most dense and sensitive areas of the state, as well as coastal zones and historical districts. Carve outs for coastal zones recognizes the unique landscape in these areas and carve outs for historical districts would prevent the demolition of historic resources and protect the planning and architectural character of neighborhoods with a high number of historic residences and other historically significant buildings.

• **Focus should be on Multi-Modal Transportation Options.** Definitions of “transit rich” areas in SB 50 are poorly defined, in many cases, based on routes that were established decades ago and in some cases, temporary in nature.  
  *Alternative:* Access to transit varies widely throughout the state, including providing limited or no weekend services, which do not fulfill the mobility needs for residents to reach employment or other destinations. Local leaders are in the best position to address transportation options and transit access as part of the multi-family housing development planning process.

• **Jobs Accessibility Areas should be defined by the local agency.** Current definitions of “jobs rich” is loosely defined in SB 50.  
  *Alternative:* Replace the ambiguous “jobs rich” definition with the locally defined “jobs accessibility areas”. Local leaders have the most intimate knowledge of their communities to map these areas based on real local data that will take into account local zoning, the safety and appropriate co-location of jobs and housing, and to successfully connect them with effective transportation options and development.

• **Recent State legislation already eliminates Single Family Residential (SFR) neighborhoods.**  
  Four-plexes or other small developments in former SFR zones are unnecessary as new legislation currently allow up to three units of housing in existing SFR neighborhoods. Further, none of these units are required to have an affordability requirement.  
  *Alternative:* Remove language related to four-plexes to allow local governments to implement Accessory Dwelling Unit legislation.

• **Commercial/Multi-Family areas need flexible ratios to accommodate different neighborhoods.**  
  SB 50 requires commercial/multi-family ratios that may not be logistically or financially feasible in some communities.  
  *Alternative:* Allow a lower residential threshold that may expand the number of commercial developments open to mixed-use residential uses.

**Conclusion**

The state and our region have faced many housing crises. The causes of the latest crisis are multi-faceted and complex. There is no single solution. Our discussion on solutions cannot happen in a vacuum without tackling various related issues such as CEQA obstacles, potential revisions of the housing element and zoning laws and practices. It will take a long-term effort of engagement, education and consensus building with all stakeholders. It is our hope that our proposal is included in that spirit of open dialogue and cooperation.

Again, we acknowledge your and other state leaders’ bold efforts to tackle our state’s housing crisis. We appreciate efforts to work with all stakeholders to ensure that the goals of any housing solutions are balanced with community essentials like equity, infrastructure, and public safety, among other important values. We continue to be prepared to work with the legislature in January 2020 and beyond to find long-term, viable and sustainable solutions to this crisis, and look forward to discussing our proposals with you in greater detail and context in the near future. Despite the aforementioned lack of response from you, I continue to be hopeful that, through a collaborative and sincere approach in resolving our state’s comprehensive housing needs,
together we can all contribute towards solving this problem and especially help those most vulnerable in our mutual communities.

If you have any questions, please contact Division Staff, Jennifer Quan at quan@cacities.org or 626-786-5142.

Regards,

[Signature]

Juan Garza
President, Los Angeles County Division, League of California Cities
Mayor, City of Bellflower

cc: Office of Governor Gavin Newsom
Los Angeles County Legislative Delegation

Attachment: Goals and Objectives for Amendments to SB 50 as approved by the Los Angeles County Division, League of California Cities, November 22, 2019
Goals and Objectives for Amendments to SB 50
as approved by the Los Angeles County Division, League of California Cities
November 22, 2019

Provide Local Government with the flexibility, tools and resources to meet their housing needs

✓ SB 50 should be amended to provide cities with the flexibility, planning tools and resources they need to meet the housing shortage

The Los Angeles County Division of the League of California Cities supports the concepts in SB 50. However, the State of California is too large and diverse for a “one-size fits all” solution to the housing shortage. Cities know their communities best and require planning flexibility in order to locate multi-family housing in areas that are most conducive to community acceptance and support. In order to be effective, cities will require additional planning tools and financial resources in order to facilitate additional multi-family housing.

There are rural areas in Los Angeles County and the State where SB 50’s requirements will not work. In order to be successful, SB 50 should be amended to encourage maximum flexibility for cities to meet their housing needs. There are many good examples of how this planning flexibility has been organically occurring in a number of Los Angeles County cities, including in Bellflower\(^1\), Carson\(^2\), Los Angeles\(^3\), Pasadena\(^4\), and Signal Hill\(^5\).

Create Entitlement Certainty for Multi-Family Housing Developments

✓ Assist cities in meeting multi-family housing goals
✓ Streamline the entitlement process for the development community
✓ Provide a defined public hearing process for addressing community concerns and the need for neighborhood input
✓ Respect the CEQA process, but eliminate CEQA challenges at the project level

Discussion

SB 50 should be amended to establish a mandatory local entitlement process for multi-family developments that will substantially reduce the uncertainty for all stakeholders. Developers are reluctant to invest the time and resources when there is a great degree of development uncertainty in the local planning process and at the project level. Local officials are often called to mediate between developers, community stakeholders and apply local, regional and state development policies and regulations in a transparent manner. The current multifamily entitlement process can take years and require multiple steps, including and up to litigation.

\(^2\) https://www.dailybreeze.com/2017/06/19/carson-kicks-off-a-major-planning-overhaul-to-transform-city/
\(^5\) https://www.cityofsignallhall.org/611/Heritage-Square
Current general plan law requires that local governments identify “sufficient sites” for a range of housing income types through the housing element update process. This general plan requirement eliminated some development uncertainty, by identifying sites. However, a great deal of development uncertainty remains for all stakeholders even with sites being identified. The recommended next step in the process should be a step where communities ensure that new multi-family projects are not only properly located, but that projects are designed and mitigated in an efficient planning process.

Local governments should be required to prepare multi-family area plans consistent with their housing elements. Cities with existing plans that address multi-family development and meet RHENA projections would be substituted for these plans. SB 50 includes a provision to financially assist cities in revising their housing elements. This financial assistance should be extended to local governments as they fund the preparation of the multi-family area plans. The State should also provide funding for the planning staffing and services that each city will require to expedite multi-family projects.

The multi-family area plans could take the form of community level plans, such as transit corridor plans, downtown plans, conversion of obsolete strip commercial zoned areas, properly remediated brownfield and former industrial sites, identification of surplus governmental properties, such as school sites, State facilities and other neighborhood plans. The multi-family area plans would address development standards, infrastructure needs, urban design and planning issues unique to each community, such as historic preservation or parking needs.

The multi-family area plans would provide for public and stakeholder input prior to the approval of the plan. The plans would include appropriate development standards to mitigate concerns over setback, height, parking and other community issues. The plans would include implementation of housing incentives and development bonus programs.

The multi-family area plans would be accompanied by the appropriate Master CEQA document that would identify and mitigate environmental issues. Future multi-family projects, that are consistent with the general plan, the development standards in the multi-family area plan and the master environmental document, would receive expedited development review and would be exempted from further CEQA review. Additional public hearings would be limited to ensuring that the development standards have been implemented to protect surrounding properties.

**Improve the Housing Element Certification Process**

- Establish time frames for HCD to complete their review of housing elements
- Provide financial resources to cities to complete their Housing Elements and the Multi-Family Area Plans

**Discussion**

SB 50 includes a series of financial penalties should cities fail to receive HCD approval of their housing elements. SB 50 amendments should address HCD’s responsibilities in the housing element review process, which can be a complex and multi-year effort. During this multi-year review time the requirements can change and the individual HCD staff reviewing the element can change. Draft housing elements can be outdated by the time HCD comments are provided back to the city.

The housing element review process would be improved if housing elements were required to meet the requirements of the statutes when they are submitted. SB 50 amendments should include a processing timeline for HCD to submit their comments and for the cities to respond, with an initial review and a recheck by HCD. There should be consequences for HCD failing to meet the review deadlines. One consequence may be the automatic approval of the housing element.
Mitigate the Long-Term Impacts that Multi-Family Developments place on critical Local Services and Infrastructure

✓ Provide a new State subvention/ or an adjustment to existing subventions to help cities mitigate the impacts on local services from multi-family developments

Discussion

Property taxes in many communities are insufficient to support basic municipal services. Additional multi-family residential development will place new demands on municipal services that are currently strained in our communities. Providing police or sheriff services, along with fire and paramedic services can be as much as 70% of a city’s entire general fund budget. There are rare mixed-use projects that provide a combination of revenues to support their municipal service costs; however, the majority of multi-family housing for moderate and low-income families does not provide sufficient revenues to offset their service demands.

SB 50 should include a new or adjusted State subvention to provide revenues to support local services. Another approach may be to reduce the existing county share of property tax revenues from multi-family projects to fund safety service. This may require amendments to AB 1197 or to AB 8 implementation. It is important that the new funding source for multi-family developments be secured and not subject to State “take-aways” as in the past. The new revenues should be applied to all ADUs. The State should also consider making the new revenues available to serving existing multi-family developments as well.

AB 50 should be amended to address affordable housing needs

✓ With Federal housing support being limited, California should establish a housing block grant program to provide consistent revenue to local governments on an annual basis for the construction of affordable housing
✓ Require that cities in metropolitan areas adopt a housing authority to address affordable housing issues, for receiving State and federal grants and other funds and for working with developers and non-profit affordable housing providers
✓ Regional housing authorities based on IPA’s or COG’s can be formed to create economies of scale
✓ Staffing for housing authorities should be funded through property tax revenues or a State subvention

Discussion

The planning and construction of affordable housing requires commitments of time and consistency in planning and funding. When the State disbanded redevelopment agencies in 2011, it also dismantled the local organizations and funding that was producing affordable housing projects, including city staffing working on these projects. Effective affordable housing projects can require time consuming land assembly, complex financing mechanisms and city staff with knowledge of the process.

SB 50 should include a housing block grant for local government. SB 50 should be amended to require that local governments in metropolitan areas adopt housing authorities to address affordable housing issues unique to their communities. These authorities would be empowered to receive State and Federal grants and funds, issue housing bonds and negotiate incentives to developers of multi-family housing. Housing authorities can also be used to address specific homeless issues in each community. The housing authorities would be a logical agency for the SB-5 funds. The housing block grant program should assist cities in funding the staffing and resources necessary to operate the housing authority.

Providing Effective Multi-Modal Transportation Options for Multi-Family Projects

✓ The transit provisions in SB 50 simply do not work for many communities in Los Angeles County and may inadvertently limit multi-family housing locations
Reductions in parking standards should be carefully considered by each community based on available street parking and neighborhood car ownership rates, as well as access to transit.

Cities should be allowed to establish reasonable parking minimums when they prepare their multi-family area plan.

SB 50 should be encouraging alternatives to expensive onsite construction of parking, such as centralized parking and fee payments.

Studies conclude that the quality of life for low income residents is improved by car ownership, since they can more easily reach and maintain their employment.

Discussion

A recent University of Minnesota study reported that less than 1% of Los Angeles County residents can reach their job by transit in 30 minutes, by car 33% can reach their job in 30 minutes. The average commute in Los Angeles County is 28 minutes by car and 51 minutes by transit. Eighty-four percent of employees in Los Angeles County drive to work. Transit ridership in the county is lower now than it was in 1990 and continues to fall despite $16 billion in investment in rail construction since 1990.  

The transit headway concept in SB 50 does not work in Los Angeles County, since it does not account for the multiple transfers necessary for transit users to reach their place of employment. SB 50 ignores weekend ridership, when people need to reach their employment or other destinations in a reasonable time frame.

A variety of factors limit effective transit to many Los Angeles County communities. SB 50 amendments should recognize that multi-family projects should not be permitted to be “under parked” if public transit is providing inadequate service to the area. Under parking projects in these circumstances will only result in public backlash.

Issues with the “Jobs Rich” Definition in SB 50 – The Problems of Relying on Census Tract Information

- SB 50 relies on Census Tracts as the planning unit for locating multi-family projects. This is the wrong planning guideline.
- Local communities are in the best position to locate multi-family projects
- Census tract planning should be eliminated from SB 50

Discussion

SB 50 defers the defining of “jobs rich” to a “black box” process that HCD will undertake in the future. Cities need to understand what areas in their communities will have local zoning and general planning overridden by SB 50 in advance of the bill being supported. SB 50 implies that job rich areas will be measured relying on U.S. Census Tracts. The use of census tracts for SB 50 implementation will prove to be extremely problematic, creating major inconsistencies with local general plans, zoning and transit.

Census tracts are too small of a geographic unit to complete effective community planning, which calls for larger, more comprehensive geographic areas to plan for increased residential density.

In order to test this concern- that Census Tracts are the wrong planning unit – the Working Group examined three census tracts in the San Gabriel Valley, using the Mapping Opportunity tool. We examined the bus lines serving three census tracts in order to determine if they met the current transit definition in SB 50.

Census Tract – Cal State LA – City of Alhambra

The Mapping Opportunity tool identifies this census tract as “jobs rich.” This is understandable, since the university has 2,100 faculty and staff. The census tract is a small 20-block area, with the campus as the largest single land use. The campus is surrounded by single family homes on small lots. Requiring development incentives and overriding local general plan and zoning will create chaos in this neighborhood. The university is served by METRO 258 and meets the peak time headways identified in SB 50. The University is also the location of a Metro Link station.

Census Tract – SCE Headquarters – City of Rosemead

SCE’s Corporate Headquarters is identified as a “jobs rich” census tract, as would be expected. The corporate headquarters is located on Walnut Grove Avenue. However, it is surrounded by single-family neighborhoods. Requiring development incentives and overriding local general plan and zoning will create chaos in this neighborhood. Transit access is provided from Walnut Grove and Garvey Avenue. The headquarters is served by METRO Rapid Line 770.

Census Tract – Avocado Heights – Industry

This census tract is identified as “job rich” and primarily consists of heavy industrial and warehouse uses. The tract is served by Foothill Transit’s Line 194, which meets SB 50 headway times. The tract contains single family homes to the west of the industrial area and is surrounded on the north by single family neighborhoods in La Puente. Requiring development incentives and overriding local general plan and zoning will create chaos in this neighborhood. The tract is bounded by the Pomona Freeway on the south side.

SB 50 should be exploring mechanisms that create regional opportunities for housing for communities that have existing uses incompatible with housing. Beginning in 1992 the City of Industry was authorized by State law to transfer its CRA’s housing set aside funds to the Los Angeles County Housing Authority. Prior to the dissolution of RDA’s by the State in 2011, the City of Industry had transferred approximately $239 million in housing funds, resulting in the construction of 8,700 units, with 6,700 deed restricted to low income and special needs housing groups.

Account for the Demographic Aging Trends in California

✓ Provide cities and counties with residential unit credits for assisted living developments, since these residents are moving from homes and apartments into these facilities, freeing up existing housing stock.
✓ Provide credits for long-term rental for single-room occupancies.

Discussion

There are a series of credible studies arguing that public policy is focused on the wrong metrics and we are ignoring the rapid growth of an aging population, where government should be focusing its problem solving. California’s Department of Aging reports that the State’s population over the age of 60 is expected to grow by more than three times the rate of the general population from 2010 to 2060. Los Angeles County will experience a 171.3% population growth in adults over the age of 60 in this time period. By 2030 the State will be home to over 10 million persons over the age of 60.9

We are also finding that older residents will take in roommates by renting bedrooms. This should be encouraged and counted towards providing housing. Cities can keep track of long term rentals by requiring a low-cost business license and reporting annually to HCD the long term rentals in their communities.

---

9 https://www.aging.ca.gov/Data_and_Reports/Facts_About_California%27s_Elderly/
9 https://www.aging.ca.gov/download.aspx?E0rcNUV9zbUy1lwYmWKug%3D%3D
**Encourage Mixed Use Development**

- Many cities have been encouraging mixed use commercial/residential developments in their communities, including their historic downtowns. SB 50 should not discourage mixed use development and allow communities to protect historic resources.

**Discussion**

SB 50 currently defines a mixed-use development as a project where two-thirds of the floor area is devoted to residential development. This provision should be eliminated from SB 50, giving communities more flexibility to plan mixed use projects or convert existing commercial buildings that might not meet the proposed two-thirds rule in SB 50. We should be encouraging all types and sizes of mixed-use developments.

**Freeze on Additional State ADU Regulations**

- SB 50 proposed that four units be allowed in single-family neighborhoods by right, with no parking required. This will prove to be disruptive to established neighborhoods, where property owners do not fully understand that 2 ADUs are already permitted.

**Discussion**

The State has passed a series of new regulations on ADUs, which cities are attempting to comply with. We have received reports that the HCD review of local ADU ordinances has backlog and cities are required to default to the State’s regulations. The State’s ADU requirements are not well understood by the general public and we remain concerned that when a significant number of ADU’s are constructed, further negatively impacting residential neighborhoods, that the public will grow increasingly concerned. Cities need time to develop ADU regulations that address the specific issues in their communities.
VIII. REPORTS
ITEM D-1
Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Project – Additional Environmental Consideration/Letter of Support for the Washington Boulevard Alignment
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Nancy Pfeffer, Executive Director

BY: Karen Heit, Transportation Analyst

SUBJECT: Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Project – Additional Environmental Consideration/Letter of Support for the Washington Boulevard Alignment

Background

In a report released last spring, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) outlined that the potential exists for a rare but not unimaginable “mega-storm”. A mega-storm is characterized as a 900-year storm. Should a storm of this magnitude occur water could crest and wash out the Whittier Narrows Dam (WND) resulting in severe flooding in the Gateway Cities area. A survey and study by the USACE determined that the WND no longer meets Corps’ standard for tolerable risk. This information did not come in time to ask the MTA to consider the impact of structures from the SR-60 alignment on the extreme flood hazard.

The attached letter asks that analysis considering the potential for a mega-storm on the Whittier Narrows dam be included in the project.

Also attached is the April 2019 GCCOG letter supporting the selection of the Washington Blvd. as the “pillar project” alignment to be built under the 28X28 Initiative.

Recommended Action

Approve letter requesting additional environmental consideration and resubmittal of letter of support.

Attachments

Draft letter to MTA Chief Planning Officer
ATTACHMENT “A”

James de la LOZA – Chief Planning Officer
LACMTA
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Attn: David Meiger

Dear Mr. de la LOZA

Re: Additional Environmental Consideration with The Metro Gold Line Eastern Extension Phase II

In a report released last spring, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) outlined that the potential exists for a rare but not unimaginable “mega-storm”. A mega-storm is characterized as a 900-year storm. Should a storm of this magnitude occur, water could crest and wash out the Whittier Narrows Dam (WND) resulting in severe flooding in the Gateway Cities area. A survey and study by the USACE determined that the WND no longer meets Corps’ standard for tolerable risk.

The WND handles effluent from the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River watersheds. During an extremely large and rare storm, storm water could crest and wash away the sandy soil underneath the exterior earthen façade. Excessive amounts of water may also crest and wash open the dam’s spillway releasing more than twenty-times the water that could be handled downstream. The chances of such a mega-storm are rare, however the unsettling and unusual weather that has been occurring related to climate change increases the likelihood of such a storm.

Cities that would be impacted by the dam’s failure are: Artesia, Bell Gardens, Bellflower, Carson, Commerce, Compton, Hawaiian Gardens, La Palma, Lakewood, Long Beach, Lynwood, Montebello, Norwalk, Paramount, Rossmoor, Santa Fe Springs, Seal Beach and Whittier.

Cities that would experience the worst impacts, flood waters in excess of 8 feet, are Pico Rivera, Downey, Lynwood and Santa Fe Springs. For these cities the anticipated water levels would be catastrophic in human and property costs.

There is a potential environmental impact with the SR-60 Alignment of the Metro Gold Line Eastern Extension Phase II (MGLEE). This alignment would place a station and parking lot in the Whittier Narrows basin. The Santa Anita Station would be an elevated station structure with a parking structure. The proposed design for the station and park
n’ ride leaves the at-grade portion of the facility vacant to facilitate evacuation during a flood. The MGLEE DEIR/DEIS states that:

“The proposed Santa Anita Avenue station and park and ride facility would be located in the flood control basin of Whittier Narrows on elevated platforms and elevated structures supported by columns similar to those supporting the LRT guideway....Compensatory mitigation would be required for the potential loss of flood storage capacity at Whittier Narrows, and the structure would be designed so it does not impede the flow of floodwaters in any direction. In total, the columns associated with the LRT track, the Santa Anita Avenue station, and the associated park and ride facility would result in the loss of approximately 83 cubic yards of volume of Basin storage capacity. This would have the potential to change the total water level rise in the Basin by 0.02 inches if the entire Basin were to be inundated. Replacement of the lost 83 cubic yards of storage capacity would offset any potential impacts associated with water level rises during Basin inundation.”

Possible proposed mitigations for this risk include: raising the height of the existing channel banks; construction of a flow bypass or providing an inline or offline flood storage facility.

In response to the proposed Santa Anita Station location, the USACE sent a response letter in October of 2014 citing the need for more analysis and the lack of resolution to the flooding issue. The Corps states that:

“The reference to USACE finding the SR-60 LRT alignment to be generally acceptable is premature, and that any such statement made by USACE staff does not suggest USACE would necessarily find the project acceptable under the Section 408 requirements. Therefore, if this alignment is recommended as the Locally Preferred Alternative, Metro will be required to submit a formal Section 408 request to USACE, at which time USACE will require additional details on the plans and may have further comments at that time.”

The letter also indicates that the description of compliance with Federal flood risk management laws and policies in the FEIS would not be sufficient to meet USACE standards, based on the DEIS:

“...USACE staff cannot conclude at this time that there is no feasible alternative outside the floodplain, as required by Executive Order 11988. For example the Washington Boulevard alternative might be considered a practicable alternative outside a floodplain”

The USACE has determined that the MTA DEIS/DEIR is optimistic in its representation of resolution of floodplain issues with the SR-60 alignment. The USACE expresses concerns that, at minimum, require additional analysis and several USACE permits in addition to a possible NEPA analysis.

None of the situations examined takes into account the identified inadequacies of the WND as identified by the USACE report. The addition of structures in the flood plain needs to be analyzed in terms of the weaknesses of the WND.
Considering the potential for inundation, the following path forward should be considered; the COG requests that MTA and USACE consider the flood displacement of the Santa Anita station and column structures anticipated to be placed in the flood plain under a variety of flooding scenarios including a mega-storm that may result in, or exacerbate, WND failure as part of the environmental documentation for the SR-60 alignment.

Thank you in advance for this consideration. If there are any questions, please do not hesitate to call GCCOG Executive Director Nancy Pfeffer at 562 663 6850.

Sincerely,

Diane DuBois, President
Gateway Cities Council of Governments

cc: GCCOG Board of Directors
Supervisor Janice Hahn
Supervisor Hilda Solis
Mayor Robert Garcia
April 4, 2019

The Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG) supports the Washington Blvd. Alignment LRT as the project that should be selected to be advanced under the 20x20 Initiative. GCCOG cities are encouraged by the Metro Board’s commitment to the Metro Gold Line Eastern Extension Phase II project as one of the “4 pillars” projects.

GCCOG and alignment cities understand that the ultimate decision on the alignment alternative selected will be made with the benefit of the results of the environmental analysis currently underway. We look forward to participating in the environmental review process.

The Washington Blvd. alignment joins workers and jobs through the heart of Los Angeles County’s manufacturing center, provides mobility to underserved, transit-dependent residents, and promotes sustainable transit-oriented development including a connection to major medical facilities.

This project will provide a much needed mobility opportunity to an area that has not seen a rail line opening since 1905 with the opening of the Metro Green Line. The alignment area includes potential land uses that can create opportunities for Transit Oriented Community development along the alignment.

The Washington Blvd. alignment goes through an active industrial manufacturing corridor with large established employment centers (Commerce, East Los Angeles, Pico Rivera, and Whittier). This alignment supports job retention and business expansion in economically depressed areas that will gain the potential to provide sustainable mobility and a jobs/housing balance.
The Whittier alignment offers benefits beyond Los Angeles County by providing the potential to capture ridership from Orange County as well as an opportunity to create a multi-County transportation corridor as the alignment terminus will be visible from OC. There will be potential for rail-bus interface across County lines and a reduction for cross-County traffic.

From an equity perspective, moving forward with this line will help local governments serve historically underinvested communities by creating economic opportunities that are incumbent with major infrastructure improvements. As mentioned above, the Southeast Los Angeles County subregion has not experienced the opening of a new rail line since 1995 with the commencement of revenue service operations on the Metro Green Line. The designation of both the Metro Gold Line Phase II Extension (Washington Blvd. Alignment) and the West Santa Ana Branch as pillar projects sets the stage for enhanced, high quality transit service that will ensure reliable operations for LA County’s most underserved community members, and enable economic mobility that can help those populations overcome historic disadvantages and disparities.

Sincerely,

Fernando Dutra, President
Gateway Cities Council of Governments.

cc: GCCOG Board of Directors