

**COMPENDIUM OF SURVEY RESPONSES
DECEMBER 2014**

Question 1. Does respondent participate in Call? yes (28) no (4) no response (2)

Question 1a. Strengths of Existing Call Process

- Metro staff assistance to applicants (4)
- Sub-regional/applicant workshops (3)
- Metro staff availability
- Provides funding for large projects
- Large agencies receive majority of funds, as have staff resources to prepare applications
- Distribution and award of grants based on merit, not regional distribution.
- Additional points for higher local match.
- Overall a very good program.
- Current countywide Call process is the most cost effective and justifiable means of selecting projects. Should remain as is.
- Communication and outreach
- Process highlights local needs.
- Offers forum to review projects throughout the County.
- Modal categories help ensure each mode receives consideration.
- Sectional weighting
- Application guidelines are very comprehensive
- The Call provides funding to local agencies to implement “Regionally significant” projects that exceed available local funding.
- The Call equitably distributes grant funds through the County.
- The Call funds innovative transportation programs and projects which then can be replicated throughout the County.
- The Call provides significant funding for TDM and non-motorized modes.
- The Call provides a consistent set of goals and objectives allowing Cities to develop projects which will compete well.
- The workshop at the beginning that gives us access to the Modal Leads is very helpful in understanding what types of projects might be successful.
- Availability of on-line application
- Provision of electronic communication with Metro staff to answer application questions
- Metro staff extremely responsive to questions.
- Significant amount of funding (2)
- Good to have multiple categories

- Helps fund vehicle replacement or other significant capital investments that local jurisdictions would not otherwise be able to cover.
- Variety of modes (2)
- Range of funding amounts.
- Good way to distribute funding to local projects.
- Application process is well defined and administered.
- Lot of informative communication available through workshops, brochures, website
- Fair selection process of projects.
- Tech support for online application
- Didn't understand the question of what "strength" to describe.
- Call gives chance to request funding for projects that are not eligible for other sources
- Scoring metrics focused on enhancing antiquated urban infrastructure
- Regional significance cannot be equitably evaluated among varied cities.
- Application process requires tens of thousands for each application
- Funding availability is often 4-5 years out.
- Funding opportunity for various types of projects. (2)
- Categorical separation of modal types
- Opportunity to extend the scope of improvements while utilizing limited agency funds.
- Fair and open competition.
- Submission and grading process is transparent
- Appeals process is fair.
- Metro staff does a good job at presenting the Call application and process
- Metro's outreach
- Metro's willingness to make "some" changes, especially related to the appeal process
- Funding opportunity – the ability to attract other funding sources.
- Awarded funds can be advanced easily by working with Metro staff is very helpful
- CFP is a well-established process for evaluating projects, awarding funds. It has been tweaked over time and refined to be a generally good process for the distribution of funds.
- Since it is an already established process, the Call can be used for any future funds that require a similar evaluation process. (If the State required regional allocation of funds through an evaluation process, the Call method can be used)
- The Call is usually tweaked and adjusted each year, based on feedback and comments from applicants, so it is a living process.
- Application is easily understandable
- Project categories insure that funding restrictions are adhered to
- Needs are addressed on a countywide basis
- Multijurisdictional applications are encouraged
- Project coordination on a regional basis

- Application on website – user friendly
- Availability of IT technical staff to assist
- Keeping transit agencies informed during the process
- Priorities and objective of Call are clearly stated both in the application and questions.
- The process is well defined
- The best projects get funded. There is a good effort to evaluate projects objectively vs. subjectively
- The Call provides a potential source of funding for transportation projects/programs at local levels that otherwise may not be funded through formula allocation programs.
- The Call provides funding for projects that may have regional significance but that may not reach high levels of priority for any individual or set of local agencies.
- Consideration is given to all modes of transportation
- Agencies must be able to timely spend Call funds once they are obligated and abide by terms/conditions in funding agreements.
- This competitive funding allocation process on the regional scale allows high-quality projects to get funded in it's entirety, as some of these projects would have difficulty getting funded if not through such competitive process. Take, for example, bus replacement/expansion projects. These kinds of projects are usually high-cost. However, without the option of getting funding through a regional competitive process, it would be very difficult for some transit agencies to be able to obtain the necessary funding to acquire the buses to maintain the existing service and/or to expand service.
- High priority:
 - Ratings are based on the technical merits of projects using established metrics
 - Call has evolved to award points to projects that focus on Complete Streets, First-Mile/Last Mile, Sustainability
- Medium priority:
 - Current process allows for appeals
 - Metro staff is very supportive and response to agency's questions
 - Relative consistency of when Calls are held (every 2 years) and reliability of process
- Regional Transportation Funding distribution based on project merit and scoring
- Flexibility in delivering the project as funding is programmed ahead of the project
- Metro's assistance in scope changes
- Metro's workshop and assistance in explaining the Call Process and intent.
- The Call is overall consistent with the Federal, State and regional intent of how these regional funds should be distributed
- Continuous assistance from Metro staff during the process.
- Amount of funding available

Question 1b. Weaknesses of Existing Call Process

- Metro staff inability to meet in person or at proposed project site
- Inability to provide previously successful applications to current applications
- Larger agencies with more staff are more successful and able to submit more projects, to the disadvantage of smaller jurisdictions
- Lack of geographical consideration in how funds are distributed
- Larger agencies more successful in receiving funds.
- Federal requirements are labor intensive and increase administrative costs, which discourage small cities from preparing applications.
- Requiring projects be within low income areas eliminates some potential projects (ed. note: this is not a Call requirement)
- Prior Call requirements for CCC participation was cumbersome and made some projects ineligible (ed. note: was a State requirement, now rescinded)
- Small agencies no longer have staff to prepare applications.
- Current Call does not allow multi-modal projects. Project can only be listed in one category.
- None. (3)
- Dilution of award amounts by funding all categories in each Call cycle.
- Recommend reviews by local personnel.
- Established previously studied projects are given too much weight while new project ideas that might have greater impact have trouble competing.
- Grant deadline should be moved to February instead of January due to holiday season
- Increase number of workshops
- Reduce grant match to 15 percent.
- Limited funds available for “regionally significant” projects.
- Project development costs (design, env. Review, PS&E) can be prohibitive
- Funds being awarded several years in the future is difficult for projects with immediate/short term funding needs.
- It can be a little tricky to place a project if it involves different modes.
- The application can be a bit daunting for City Staff without the help of a consultant.
- Seems like process is geared slightly toward larger agencies.
- Deadline did not provide adequate timing for cities to understand and incorporate new requirements.
- Priorities are given to less conventional and unproven improvements, particularly for bicycle projects.
- Some aspects difficult to understand for those not experienced in process
- On-line document was a little cumbersome
- Lack of funding for maintenance/3R work

- Very time consuming process, may put smaller jurisdictions with limited staff/resources at disadvantage
- Often requires significant input and data that is not always readily available for very limited funding pool.
- More funds needed than resources to support
- Not clear that funds are fairly allocated to sub-region relative to other major projects.
- Lack of communication between MTA and Caltrans
- Inability to cross different modal categories when submitting projects requiring need to submit various applications in different modes.
- Does not take into account priorities for sub-regions different from one another or Metro
- Still requires printed application to be sent. Needs to be electronically sent for future.
- Time allotted does not provide for inter-jurisdictional projects to be fully developed, as application development period is during the holidays.
- Didn't understand question of what "weaknesses" to describe.
- A few redundant and irrelevant questions for each category
- Unfair scoring based on the same measures. Gives smaller projects a higher score due to higher local match percentage, while bigger projects with greater regional impact get disqualified.
- Application, process and required documentation are costly, tedious and time consuming requiring significant research and analysis and may not be funded.
- New Call cycles have new sections/requirements added further committing local agency resources.
- PSR-PDS requirements and Caltrans concurrence for projects on/at State highways/freeways
- PSR-PDS or PSR are extremely costly and time consuming. Most agencies not willing to gamble on being awarded funding. Discourages smaller agencies and unfairly limits field to larger agencies with available resources.
- Application preparation time is too short and impossible for projects requiring a PSR
- Subjectiveness of the ranking/scoring system
- Cap/limitations on each modal category
- Lengthy application
- Funding is almost always scheduled for "out years" (four to five years out)
- "Some" cities not following Metro's rules
- Current methodology pertaining to funding equity is flawed
- Priority appears to be focused on the LA Basin – proactive vs. reactive
- Methods should be rewarded.
- Application values project readiness, but funding is typically not available for 4-5 years.

- Projects receiving funds 4-5 years out may change, and the change process for awarded funds is cumbersome and there is a high risk of losing the funds.
- The entire Call has become more and more cumbersome over the years, with new, unwieldy initiatives becoming part of the requirements.
- Tends to be a one size fits all application of the rules, which is not always helpful for those agencies that don't fit nicely into a category.
- Not being able to submit everything online.
- Having to provide printout and DVD/CDs
- Smaller agencies have limited staff resources to properly compete for funding
- Sub-region equity becomes an issue
- Sub-region priorities are not accounted for in project ranking/selection
- Funding allocations between categories may not reflect actual need
- Representation of local agencies by selection/appeals committee is limited
- Some questions are redundant. Could help to consolidate questions in part I, II, and III.
- Would be helpful to announce funding amounts in each mode so agency have an idea of chances of being funded before exerting serious amounts of effort that may not be productive.
- More good projects than funding available in most modes
- Application components somewhat tedious for routine bus capital requests – could be simplified for vehicle acquisition for ongoing transit systems.
- As with any grant program, the application process requires significant effort and resources, with uncertainty of success
- The grant program in particular cobbles together funding from multiple sources, and thus introduces uncertainty in the final sources of funding to be received , meaning the funding restrictions and requirements is unknown until after the proposal period and when funds are awarded
- Funding source uncertainty makes it difficult to plan and nominate projects that require long lead times to develop and good information to prioritize
- Some believe that the Call process is vulnerable to political interests that are motivated to spread resources among jurisdictions, rather than select projects based on merit, need, or effectiveness of investments.
- The grant funding availability is too far out – we need to have earlier grant funding availability so it doesn't prevent us from implementing the projects as soon as they are ready.
- The applications are broken into different modes, and this makes it difficult for agencies who want to propose projects with improvements that fall under multiple modes as the current Call process requires such projects to apply under multiple modes, and this leads to a burdensome application preparation process. We should be allowed to turn in one application for a multi-modal project and have such project be evaluated as one complete

project, and its' up to Metro to decide internally how much funding from the available funding sources to fund such multi-modal projects

- The performance measures are auto-oriented. Person throughput should be added as part of the measures.
- High priorities:
 - Modal categories should be revisited to account for current goals and programs related to Complete Streets
 - Fund distribution does not match change in modal options
 - Administratively burdensome and resource-intensive for Metro and agencies
 - No established formulas or methodologies for quantitative questions (b/c calculations, mode shift)
 - Too much lead time for programming of funds. Funding years should be within 2 years of award to keep all outreaching efforts valid.
 - There is an existing overlap between ATP and Bike and Pedestrian projects. If the Call does not support TEA projects anymore, then there should be a special consideration to safety factors in Bike and Pedestrian category projects.
- Medium priority:
 - Points for overmatch should not be included – this is not a merit based factor
 - Funding caps in different modes restrict higher-scale, corridor-wide congestion relief opportunities
 - Applications are lengthy; questions lead to repetitive answers
 - Does not provide adequate time with lapsing policies for larger-scaled projects
 - No open forum to discuss projects that have not been successful. This is to help project sponsors improve their projects for the next Call.
 - Would like to see Call Application/Guidelines released sooner to allow for more time to prepare applications.
- Low priority:
 - High modal lead staff turnover
 - Amount of funding allocated to RSTI category has been diminishing throughout the years. Board needs to make a decision if this is no longer a viable category for the Call and divert funds to other categories, especially to Pedestrian and Bike safety projects.
 - Applicants required to re-submit entire application(s) if Metro staff recommends alternate mode category (in a very short time frame)
- The sometimes uncertainty of the availability and amount of Call funding can inhibit local agencies' long term transportation planning.
- Certain years' Call are more competitive than others which results with inconsistent quality of funded projects region wide.
- Funding seems to be awarded to obtain equality among geographic areas, not necessarily based on the merit of the application

Question 1c. Why you do not participate in Call?

- City has participated in past with great results. City does not have a project to bring forward for upcoming Call.
- Restricted timeline for grant submittal
- Matching requirements are high
- Application is a large undertaking that staff does not have time to accomplish without consultant help. No funding is available for hiring a consultant.
- Type of eligible projects, along with weighting criteria, make it difficult for smaller cities to compete with larger cities and larger projects.
- Application process can be very formidable, with the preparation of the PSRE and the requirements association with the Complete Streets Act
- Process and staff time involved in administering federally funded projects can be overwhelming. Greater Caltrans assistance with administration process would be helpful.
- Funding not typically available for a minimum of 5 years, which makes it difficult for projects which need to be constructed in a more timely manner
- Prior years' workload did not allow time to prepare application.
- Do not often have projects that compete well.
- Level of effort to apply can be cumbersome for a project with a low chance of funding.
- Did not have time to obtain Caltrans' approval of PSR/PSRE
- Projects not big enough to justify the effort needed to go through process.
- No regionally significant projects to submit.
- Participation is based on calculation whether a project has a strong chance of being competitive.
- Smaller agencies/smaller projects are not worth the extended effort.
- City did not prioritize funds for engineering consultants to prepare applications and necessary studies.

Question 2. Types of projects you would like to fund in Call

- Green Street projects in response to federal storm sewer requirements.
- Upgrade traffic signal equipment (non-synchronizing) to comply with Federal mandates, especially adjacent to active railroads where battery backup systems are required.
- Upgrade traffic signals to provide emergency vehicle priority (EVP)
- Upgrade traffic signals to install accessible pedestrian signals (APS), countdown signals and access ramps to current ADA standards.
- No. Likes current project eligibility. (2)
- Small city arterials impacted by neighboring jurisdictions but receives small amount of gas tax and local return funds. Only 10 percent of maintenance covered and would like to have Call funds for maintenance.
- Water quality projects that mitigate pollutants from transportation infrastructure.
- Pedestrian and bicycle projects.
- Street lighting improvements
- Less stringent requirements for median landscaping/irrigation
- Streets preservation measures
- Development of First/Last Mile Plans to identify and design needed improvements.
- Small scale local street improvements. Call seems to focus on large arterial improvements.
- Concepts funding in addition to shovel ready project funding.
- Projects that not only provide access to transit centers, but also reduce VMT by encouraging pedestrian and bike travel to/from local businesses, point of interest, schools, places of work, such as upgrades to sidewalks and ADA ramps, new sidewalk construction, bike lane maintenance on locally used routes (as opposed to regional transit centers).
- Alt Fuel requirement for transit operators required conversion of Gas fleet to LPG. Without requirement, would have maintained gas fleet.
- Existing roadway improvements for major thoroughfares. Needs exist beyond local return allocations.
- 3R work and maintenance.
- Preventative maintenance of streets (resurfacing, slurry seal, reconstruction projects)
- Intersection improvements that would be beneficial, where other widening options are limited as ROW cannot be obtained.
- Transportation related utility construction/relocation
- Local projects with local benefits.
- State of good repair, local capacity enhancements to minor arterials and collectors and beautification projects smaller in scope.
- Interchange beautification projects (landscape)

- Facility or service feasibility studies
- Rail track construction for a Metrolink Station.
- Current call modal applications are sufficient
- Difficulty identifying the modal category for projects such as CAD/AVL projects.
- Maintenance training for Innovative capital projects.
- Permanent art installations tied to transit
- Sustainability enhancements, i.e. solar lighting at bus stop or solar panels on facilities – may be eligible but would not rank high.
- Feasibility/preliminary design for projects that require some type of feasibility study in order to compete for funding. For example, a transit center projects would require some type of feasibility study that assesses potential locations and come up with the preliminary design and cost estimate; this information is critical in helping the agency move forward with preparing the application for future Call to implement the design and construction portion of the project. Allowing at least the feasibility study to be funded through the Call really would make it possible for agencies with tight budget to be able to implement such projects.
- High priorities:
 - Safety, traffic calming projects
 - Advanced Planning/Pre-Development Efforts
 - Projects not along transit lines
- Medium priorities:
 - Multi-phased projects
 - Major investment Studies
 - Operation and maintenance/State of Good Repair Improvements (Resurfacing/sidewalk repair)
- Projects which are otherwise qualified for Federal and State funding such as roadway resurfacing, rehabilitation, and reconstruction work
- While not necessarily appropriate for Call, money is needed to fund the operations of deployed systems.
- Projects that improve transportation mobility but are not directly related to public transit.
- Funding for the implementation for new fixed route transit services

Question 3. Barriers for inter-jurisdictional projects

- Could be improved by information applicants of similar project concepts in each mode or neighboring jurisdictions.
- Budget cuts have impacted resources to maintain additional striping of bike lanes desired as a multi-jurisdictional project.
- Low funding limits, which impact completing larger, regional projects.
- None within LA County. Would like to see projects with adjacent counties get funded through Call.
- Multi-agency projects require upfront coordination and agreements. Call does not allow necessary coordination. Could be possible to do with time to properly develop, but coordination can be time consuming.
- Lower the matching requirement
- Stringent timeline for grant submittal, making collaboration with other agencies more difficult.
- Provide a more simplified grant application.
- No substantial barriers to intercity cooperation.
- As incentive, count staff time as “hard match” for lead agency of multi-jurisdictional application. There are substantial time commitments for lead agency to administer grant fund distribution to participating cities.
- Problem in 2005 Call on multi-jurisdictional bike project. Process required one agency to take lead in federal funding allocation process and several agreements needed to be finalized. All jurisdictions needed to complete their own public process through their City Councils. Funds were finally de-obligated. Process needs to be better defined to ensure each jurisdiction is aware of requirements prior to application submittal.
- Lack of staff to coordinate and bureaucratic hurdles. A central lead, like a COG, would help.
- Allow 3R regional projects
- None (3)
- Coordination and prioritizing and decision on who will lead, transfer of funds between agencies, and need for agreement and city approval processes.
- Application period is insufficient. Process for two agencies to go through their city bureaucracy takes more time than application period allows.
- Call is more geared for single agency applications. Unless one agency is willing to be lead and take on the work, it is difficult to get various agencies on same application.
- When inter-jurisdictional projects are identified, do not have difficulty partnering.
- Extensive and costly studies and analysis, such as PSRs
- Smaller cities don’t have staff to prepare applications. Use consultants and need to pay for their time.
- Metro could add greater weight on joint applications.

- Projects awarded funds so far into the future is a barrier to timely planning and execution of a “shovel-ready” multi-jurisdictional project.
- Allow JPA’s to apply directly for project funding. Allow several jurisdictions to formally select a lead agency for application and project implementation
- You already do a good job promoting the regional connectedness. Local jurisdictions are such underfunded or under staffed that they don’t have capacity to work through the planning process to bring a multi-jurisdictional project forward.
- Possibly Metro could pick a couple of countywide initiatives, do some planning groundwork, and get local jurisdictions to cover on board, i.e., old signal sych. project.
- Successful inter-jurisdictional projects require strong working relationships between agencies/jurisdictions that may have competing or conflicting interests. Grant programs can be the catalyst for incentivizing agencies to work collaboratively while competing aggressively based on the merits of their projects.
- At county level, working relationships and trust do take time to foster. One strategy is to make Call as reliable as possible with defined parameters so that jurisdictions/agencies have certainty upon which to build sometimes (real or perceived) risky partnerships. Also, another change may be to remove the requirement that applicants rank their projects, thus eliminating the problem of reaching consensus on how a joint project will be ranked among each jurisdiction’s individual priorities.
- The current Call funding agreement requires one lead agency for joint projects. This makes it cumbersome for the agencies involved as the lead agency will incur a lot more administrative burdens of having to sign sub-agreements with other agencies in the joint project and invoicing and project management tasks. Please revise this so that each agency can sign individual funding agreements (under the umbrella of the joint project) with Metro and each agency handles its own project management/invoicing directly with Metro. If awarded, each agency under the joint application gets a defined amount of funding (from the total amount requested under the joint application) and scope of work. This would make it a lot easier for agencies to want to work together on inter-jurisdictional projects and even multi-modal projects.
- Funding caps limit scopes for larger multi-jurisdictional projects
- Deadlines/funding lapse policy make it challenging to coordinate efforts with other jurisdictions.
- Difficult to collaborate with other agencies within the short duration provided to prepare applications.
- Many smaller jurisdictions are not familiar with Federal and State processing of project. Right of way issues, inter-jurisdictional maintenance responsibilities, and availability of local match funds also limit inter-jurisdictional projects.

Question 4a. Strengths of Sub-regional Call process

- Staff with specific knowledge of jurisdictions and potential projects.
- Could allow more local control of where funds are expended.
- Could fund neighborhood multimodal complete street projects.
- Equality of funding distribution which should be set by formula (square mile area, population)
- Not enough information on sub-regional process
- City's COG currently receives Measure R. Sub-regional priorities are set and funds are allocated more effectively, however Metro staff need to be a part.
- Such an organizational approach to CFP Funding (sub-regional priority setting?) would be a critical component to multi-agency projects and coordination.
- Have funds available that match needs of the sub-region
- Enable local agencies to compete fairly as competition would likely be with surrounding cities rather than a small city competing with a large city
- Would provide relatively predictable fund stream for local agencies
- Would provide access to funding for smaller agencies
- Might allow for more fund distribution to smaller agencies
- Local agencies would not have to compete with large cities/projects
- Smaller communities could focus on alternatives that work on a smaller scale. Call is more suitable for larger cities
- Projects could focus more on community needs rather than weighted criteria. Criteria do not always result in a project that meet local needs and improve multi-modal circulation and VMT reductions.
- Since priorities vary by sub-region, each sub-region would be able to set priorities according to needs of area
- Might or might not encourage cooperation between jurisdictions
- Might or might not ensure allocation of funds according to need
- Better representation and understanding of local needs.
- Ability to coordinate projects inter-jurisdictionally
- Better funding opportunities
- Competition on a local scale
- Better process for selection
- COGs would respond to local needs better
- Potentially more direct access to support for the application process
- Potentially more direct access to support for the grant administrative process
- None (2)
- Sub-regional priorities would be addressed.
- Agencies would only be competing with other agencies in that sub-region.

- Sub-region can act as lead on inter-jurisdictional projects
- Project will be scored based on impact and importance to the region
- More inter-jurisdictional projects will be proposed
- Sub-regional definitions of “regional significance could be more accurately applied
- More equitable distribution of funds.
- Sub-regions have familiarity with local regional and local jurisdiction needs and understand the local political dynamics to foster support among jurisdictions.
- Funding may be more evenly divided, allowing greater level of sub-regional improvements.
- Coordination between COGs and local agencies is simplified
- Utilize COG’s bench consultants to conduct initial studies and feasibility analysis
- Encourages smaller agencies to become involved in large or broad base projects.
- COG will get the job done.
- Well-staffed, well-funded.
- More local input and oversight of projects
- Local oversight of funding
- Level playing field (smaller agencies would not compete against large agencies
- Better funding opportunities for various projects within the sub-region by mode.
- Sub-regions can determine priority of modes and projects to be funded.
- More information needed.
- Leaders in the region would be able to prioritize projects of importance for their respective jurisdictions.
- Ideally, overall distribution of funding would be more equitable by region.
- Project selection would represent sub-region’s priorities
- Larger agencies would not dominate the process.
- Greater potential for sub-regional equity
- Greater participation would be encouraged
- Potential for funding to be allocated in a manner that provides for greater distribution of available funding.
- Transit planning decisions can be made at a more sub-regional level
- For some types of projects or transportation modes, sub-regional allocation may make sense based on the rationale that (1) local (sub-regional) agencies would know best what their constituents and local transportation systems need. On the other hand, projects of regional significance will be disadvantaged if funds are spread across sub-regions based on geographic equity (i.e. spreading the peanut butter)

A prime example is goods movement, in which facilities and projects may be localized but the environmental impacts and economic activities generated are regional in nature. In addition to goods movement, transit and signal prioritization projects may be other

candidates for maintaining the current regional approach due to the importance of connectivity between cities and network effects across a region. Pedestrian and bicycling (though one could argue bike networks rely on connectivity and networks) may be better candidates for devolved funding through sub-regions.

- None. We strongly oppose this approach to allocate funding through sub-regional COGs/agencies.
- More discretion to fund local agency priorities
- Less administrative and less resource-intensive
- Projects with sub-regional consensus will lend themselves to better coordinated delivery
- One lead agency could handle a broader project for several agencies which will cut down the administrative processing related to the grants
- Would help ensure that sub-regional priorities are being addressed rather than just the priorities of a single agency
- It will bring additional smaller agencies to the sub-regional table
- May result in a greater number of collaborative, multi-jurisdictional projects

Question 4b. Weaknesses of Sub-regional Call process

- Too many applicants may apply within sub-region
- Limited dollar amounts and number of projects within sub-region
- May dilute focus away from larger regionally significant projects.
- Would be tough job for Board to assess amount of funding to be allocated to each sub-region.
- Eliminating existing merit based system and switching to COG formula distribution may dilute grant award amounts if distributed to all cities.
- Not enough information on sub-regional process.
- None (4).
- Potential for unequal distribution of funds among sub-regions.
- Little to no autonomy for sub-regions to make decisions on elements such as scoring criteria used for applicants
- Fund allocations would not be aligned with Metro's regional transportation priorities.
- Projects without regionally significant mobility benefits could receive funding, preventing regionally significant projects from receiving funds.
- Small agencies may not receive sufficient funding to complete a project.
- Cities who have not adopted land use policies to support transit or non-motorized modes would receive regional transportation funds.
- Challenges to ensure distribution of funds in a fair and equitable manner.
- Difficult in establishing new criteria by which project grants are awarded.
- Not sure that Metro's experience and expertise of funding and regional issues could be replicated on a decentralized level.
- Since transportation is a regional issue, decentralizing could lead to more fragmented system.
- If project evaluation happens locally, is it duplicative to have many different review processes. How is consistency and compliance guaranteed for outside funding sources?
- How do you guarantee that funding decisions are made fairly? Would Metro still have oversight?
- COGs may be subject to limited interests.
- Metro expertise may be diluted.
- Create another layer of oversight
- More paperwork to sub-regions, local agencies, and MTA.
- Overall pot of money in sub-region may preclude bigger projects from being funded.
- Allocation method between cities may create disagreements between cities.
- Who would determine which projects would be funded? COGs are made up of member cities. No impartial evaluators. Bias may be present.
- Sub-regional approach may divert needed funds from bigger and larger scale projects.

- One more layer of review.
- Distribution of funds might take longer.
- Allocation of funds and priority projects – who decides?
- Equity issues.
- Possible delays to funding and hence project timelines
- Possible political motivation for funding or not funding projects (rather than merit)
- Less funding for smaller sub-regions (large regions would take most of funding)
- Inconsistent rating of projects between regions (if each sub-region rated their own proposals).
- Some sub-regions may be too small to fund or fairly rate all Call modes.
- More information needed.
- Not certain that all sub-regions see the value in transit equally. Some regions would be at a disadvantage with a lack of transit support.
- There may not be transit experts in sub-regions who would be able to fairly evaluate transit projects if a sub-regional call for projects were implemented.
- There may be differing priorities which might cause the appearance of favoritism
- Some sub-regions are more influential than others which could lead to variances in allocations to the sub-regions
- Funding in a particular category may not be sufficient to fund an entire project at the regional level. Whereas at the Metro level, sufficient funds would be available for the entire project. (For example, a \$3 million project applied for in a countywide \$15 pot might have a better chance of being funded than in a sub-regional pot where only \$3 million was available.)
- COG staffing required to administer a sub-regional process
- Project coordination among sub-regions
- Multi-jurisdictional (across COG boundaries) project submittals would be difficult to evaluate
- While COGs may have a better understanding of local transit needs, they may not understand regional transit planning and this could cause a disjointed regional transit network.
- Local political interest may distract during the development and project selection process.
- Fund apportioned to the sub-region may not match the project needs –so poor or less desirable projects may get funded by COG and leave other great projects in other areas unfunded.
- Will be more political vs. professional.
- COG evaluators may not have capability of performing adequate evaluation process.
- Lack of regional connectivity

- Regional projects may not receive the funding levels needed if the funding is allocated to sub-regions based on a population factor or formula. In the case of goods movement in particular, a sub-region that includes a port would therefore be expected to fund its port projects in addition to other modes.
- Devolving the funding allocation to sub-regions would require councils of governments – many of which are small and have limited resources – to administer a competitive process; Metro has had years of experience administering this program and has developed the resources to do so over many years.
- Devolution would remove the regionally competitive nature of the Call, which may produce suboptimal results in the set of funded projects.
- This would prevent high-quality projects from getting funded through a fair and competitive process. Some of the bigger projects will not be able to obtain enough funding if not through this Metro administered competitive process on a regional scale.
- The allocation of funding through sub-regional COGs would make the process a lot more political and cause conflicts between agencies/cities under each COG.
- This process would be detrimental to some agencies without the political and/or additional financial resources that would be required to get the full funding to implement high-quality projects.
- City is within multiple sub-regions.
- Smaller cities would get very little funding
- Sub-regional agencies' goals may not line up with Metro's policies and objectives; local projects may not integrate well with Countywide initiatives, such as Measure R
- Would add another administrative layer if applications are processed through sub-regions
- Does not address allocation issues experienced recently under MAP-21
- Countywide and MPO mobility priorities may be diluted in favor of priorities with a strictly sub-regional emphasis
- Sub-regional control must result in the funding of fewer projects that demonstrate innovative new solutions of the type currently being advocated by Metro.

Question 5. Issues to be addressed if a Sub-regional Call process was instituted.

- Pre-application process to streamline review process, as applicants put a lot of effort into application development.
- More local control without Federal or State burdensome requirements.
- Allow each sub-region to determine maximum award amounts per category.
- Allow project to be funded over several years.
- No restrictions on COGs to determine award types, amounts, or duration of funding.
- Not enough information regarding sub-regional process, favor leaving process as is. Need forum to discuss proposed changes to process
- Distribute grant funds to sub-regions or local agencies per an acceptable formula without the need for a call process.
- Distribute funds equally to sub-regions
- That agencies receiving funds are implementing transportation improvement projects that support regional mobility.
- Funding for small local projects.
- Assistance for project concept funding as opposed to shovel ready projects.
- Sufficient training and workshops to ensure agencies are familiar with new process/guidelines
- Assurance that local agencies could apply for local projects, not limited to multi-jurisdictional projects.
- Concerns with fund availability being delayed, as most projects are needed immediately.
- Would Metro still provide Technical Assistance?
- Would each local sub-region be responsible for project evaluation?
- Bringing the COG to the process as a centralized clearing house
- 3R work needs additional funding for sub-regional Calls to be effective.
- Method of evaluating applications.
- Need a set of guidelines to ensure funds are distributed fairly and benefit entire sub-region as well as individual local agencies.
- A shorter and more direct application might be helpful to save staff time and other resources.
- Ability to develop criteria and guidelines by sub-regional agencies
- Ability to develop criteria and guidelines unique to the sub-region's needs.
- Would support the effort as long as every city gets their fair share.
- Possible delays to funding and hence project timelines
- Possible political motivation for funding or not funding projects (rather than merit)
- Less funding for smaller sub-regions (large regions would take most of funding)
- Inconsistent rating of projects between regions (if each sub-region rated their own proposals).

- Some sub-regions may be too small to fund or fairly rate all Call modes.
- Solid methods and formulas that guarantee fairness in terms of funding allocation and distribution. Regional equity.
- Requiring a guaranteed amount of funds be spent on transit.
- Allow sub-regions to establish project categories that will encourage agencies within the sub-region to submit projects that will further the sub-region's priorities.
- The current Call application process would need to be replicated somehow at the sub-regional level
- Selection Committee members would need to possess transit and regional transit qualifications
- Unsure if could support or recommend a sub-regional Call projects until a process is developed and fully vetted.
- Concern how money would be apportioned to COGs.
- Who would have oversight on quality of project selection?
- How would an appeals process work?
- Could COGs with excellent but unfunded projects pull money from COGs with poor project selections?
- Though we favor keeping the program at the regional (Metro) level, if the Call must move to a sub-regional model, it does not have to be an all-or-nothing proposition. We encourage you to consider allowing some modes/types of projects to be funded at the sub-regional level, while retaining at Metro other regionally significant modes or types of projects/programs; these regional projects rely heavily on network effects and connectivity across multiple sub-regions, and are therefore better suited for competition at the regional level.
- We oppose the institution of such sub-regional Call process for reasons stated above. If such process is to be further explored per Metro Board direction, stakeholder meetings must be held to compile and address all issues before further actions can be taken.
- This would not work for City of Los Angeles which is within multiple sub-regions, unless funds allocated directly to the City as a whole on a formula basis.
- Sub-regions should be required to comply with Metro-approved project evaluation criteria to ensure that County and MPO mobility policies are adhered to in a consistent manner across sub-regions and to ensure an equitable, transparent, and fair project evaluation process
- Fewer administrative requirements for project processing and reporting
- Sub-regions would need to build technical expertise for their sub-regional project evaluation process
- Sub-regions should be required to meet Metro-approved modal funding targets (with some flexibility provided) similar to those established in the traditional Metro Call

process for RSTI, GMI, TSSP, TDM, Bike, Pedestrian, and Transit in order to meet Countywide and MPO transportation policy goals.

- While sub-regions should be given flexibility to adopt protocols for disposition of lapsing funds, these protocols have to be consistent with a Countywide Metro-approved lapsing policy

Question 6. If sub-regional process instituted, how should funds be allocated?

- Funds allocated to sub-regions based on needs assessment.
- Based on percentage of countywide population.
- Minimum allocation should be set for smaller agencies.
- Funds should be allowed to be banked to fund larger projects.
- Lump sum amounts based upon workday/nighttime resident population (75%) and freeway congestion (25%).
- No requirement for funding mark by category.
- How the money is allocated to this sub-region.
- Funding allocated to the COG.
- Funding would not work on a population basis for small COG, but land area
- Funds should be allocated equally or per capita.
- That agencies receiving funds are implementing transportation improvement projects that support regional mobility.
- The formula should include both population and jobs for each city
- Based on population and land area formula, or land miles. Unused project funds could be reassigned as needed.
- So many different ways to allocate funds, it would be difficult to find a fair method. Could include population, income, transit dependency, access to regional services, commitment to alternative transit modes, percentage of transit dependent riders, past funding history. All factors but don't tell the whole story.
- Break into categories by project type.
- Allocate some funds to inter-jurisdictional projects.
- Let each sub-region define its funding criteria and allocation categories/percentages.
- Allocate by residential population.
- Heavily weigh traffic volumes and congestion as well as unmet potential transit ridership.
- Funding by population and attraction destination location/point of interest. If city attracts visitors nationally, this should have weight.
- Mixture of funding mechanisms, 50 percent as formulate based on population to each city. 50 percent as an open sub-regional Call process.
- 70 percent distributed by population, 30 percent distributed by merit of projects to sub-region. (or 60-40 or 80-20 depending on needs of each sub-region)
- Projects to be funded based on priority within the region, as determined by COG
- Allocate by sub-regional geographic area, or lane miles rather than population. Transportation needs are not directly proportional to population.
- Various project types, such as state of good repair, bicycle/pedestrian enhancement beautification, capacity enhancement signal coordination/upgrades, ITS/ATMS
- Encourage small and large projects

- Formula based on sale tax generation, per capita, daytime or night time population, whichever is greater, lane miles of roadway.
- Population and poverty level.
- FAP
- Formula: more information needed
 - Equitable
 - Fair
 - Legally binding
 - More funding in local return
- Difficult to imagine a formula that would take all key factors into account: population, access to transit, congestion, previous investments, regional significance, existing transit services, age of infrastructure
- Formula should be by sub-region population for non-vehicle improvements such as transit and active transportation, and by sub-region VMT (in lieu of highway mileage) for highway related improvements.
- Not ready to recommend alternative funding strategy for a sub-regional allocation process at this time. Willing to discuss if another method such as the Highway Operational Improvement Program could produce an assessment formula that could result in greater funding parity while not at the expense of the regional transit network.
- Formula may not be effective
- What if COGs did first cut of projects then have a final review and recommendation by Metro process.
- Should funding be allocated to sub-regions, it should be done with some consideration that some but not all sub-regions will have greater needs in particular modal categories such as goods movement. We strongly recommend additional outreach to local agencies by Metro before a decision is made.
- If funding was allocated to sub-regions, how would you want to see funding allocated? If allocated by formula, what formula would you recommend and why?
- Funding directly to sub-regions would not work for the City of Los Angeles. If funding were to flow directly to agencies, the following a local returns, population-based formula is recommended.
- Support a population-based formula distribution to sub-regions. Population based distribution of funds will give sub-regions an element of local control and a reasonably predictable funding stream which affords them the opportunity for longer term planning for essential sub-regional priorities

Formula distribution will also allow sub-regions and local jurisdictions to pool resources for grant preparation, project development and delivery, and grant tracking and reporting.

Question 7. Alternative Call processes

- Funds not used by approved projects should be evenly distributed to non-successful candidates based on ranking.
- Eliminate the Call for Projects and allocate funding directly to local agencies for local mobility improvements
- Allocate a portion of the Call for maintenance of project improvements.
- Allocate portion of the Call to local agencies for implementing unfunded Federal and State mandates.
- Keep countywide call process but increase award limits by focusing on one mode per Call cycle.
- Give all Call funds to sub-region unconditionally.
- Stop diluting funding by spreading money over all Call categories.
- Go with the sub-regional process from now on, as COG process works well.
- Distribute the funds to local agencies.
- None (8)
- Recommend category for smaller projects or smaller jurisdictions.
- Streamlined process for projects of \$1.5 million or less.
- Metro and Caltrans need to coordinate Calls, especially with advent of ATP cycles and with Metro's emphasis on Complete Streets.
- Instead of spending all money on smaller, short term and near sighted projects that will not solve problems in long run, a comprehensive, all inclusive and long term forward thinking commuter freight rail network system should be planned as a regional super – project to address next 50 – 100 years.
- Metro research and evaluate other “similar” agencies and provide information to “Call” participants/agencies - more information is needed.
- Perhaps a hybrid program that would provide some distribution of funds to the sub-regions for certain categories and retain the remainder for categories of a more regional nature.
- Not at this time. Believes the current Call process, while not perfect, does produce a reasonable outcome and list of regional projects. As long as Metro works to maintain a fair and transparent process and adheres to the published Call criteria. Willing to discuss if another method such as the Highway Operational Improvement Program could produce an assessment formula that could result in greater funding parity while not at the expense of the regional transit network.
- What if COGs did first cut of projects then have a final review and recommendation by Metro process.
- The State's Prop. 1B TCIF model and the USDOT TIGER Grants process should be compared before the Metro Board finalizes its decisions.
- Formula- based distribution directly to agencies.

Question 8 – Preference ranking for Countywide Call

Question 9 – Preference ranking for Sub-regional Call

Question	NR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Question 8 (Countywide Call)	5	5	3	3	1	4	0	3	2	2	6
Question 9 (Sub-regional Call)	5	5	2	2	2	4	1	3	1	3	6

• **Question 8 (Countywide Call):**

- Strongly favor (8-10): 10
- Somewhat favor (6-7): 3
- Neutral (5): 4
- Somewhat dislike (3-4): 4
- Strongly dislike (1-2): 8
- No Response: 5

• **Question 9 (Sub-regional Call):**

- Strongly favor (8-10): 10
- Somewhat favor (6-7): 4
- Neutral (5): 4
- Somewhat dislike (3-4): 4
- Strongly dislike (1-2): 7
- No Response: 5

Question 10. Other comments?

- This survey and the sub-regional proposal is a great idea and shows that MTA is looking forward on how to improve funding process.
- Instead of going through the Call process, distribute funds to local agencies
- Reduce matching requirements to enable more participation and simplify grant application.
- Call has focused more on large, urban, regionally based projects. Focus should shift to individual city projects that reduce longer regional trips and VMT.
- Create hybrid of local input/local control and centralized administration and evaluation. While local communities have a better sense of what is needed, some regional oversight is necessary for efficient coordination.
- Metro calls should consider a process similar to Calrecycle; if you recently received awards the amount you are eligible to receive in the next Cal is reduced.
- If sub-regional process negatively impacts chances of getting projects then does not favor. If positively impact chances, then support.
- Sub-regional process would better service sub-regional priorities. Issues that need working out include method of evaluating and formula.
- Appreciates Metro Board exploring Call options. Current process good for large projects. Most cities don't have mega projects year after year. Sub-region role could be beneficial in distributing smaller amount of funds for smaller projects to smaller cities.
- Appreciate opportunities for additional revenue.
- Thanks for asking.
- It may be worth examining the sub-regional approach to future Call for Projects applications. However, an accepted formula for funding distribution amongst the sub-regions and a consistent methodology for rating the applications would need to be established first.
- Signed MOU's between Metro and COGs that include guarantees for an equitable funding distribution plan. Criteria for funding must consider the COG and its unique demographic, housing and transportation characteristics
- There is value in a well-established process, such as it is with the Metro Call. The process could use some additional refinement, if Metro staff were open to it.
- Submit online.
- Consider giving some priority to projects that promote zero emission, reduce GHG, innovativeness, and IT projects that enhance the customer experience.
- The current Call process has really tried to level the playing field across the county. For the most part, the best projects are funded and typically are spread throughout the county. The Regional funds should really be considered for those projects that would otherwise remain unfunded and/or have significance to sustaining the current systems in place. It should not supplant funding that otherwise would be the responsibility of the local jurisdiction.
- The Call process has been in place for many years. While it may not be perfect, the overall process has evolved and become very robust. Before Metro Board decides to overhaul the

Call or to make incremental procedural refinements, I would like to see additional outreach, workshops, case-studies be conducted. Each sub-region may have diverse views and unique circumstance on the needs of transportation programs/projects. Thus, any proposed changes to the funding distribution mechanism should be properly vetted and debated.

- The Call process definitely has its strengths and weaknesses
- Consideration should be given to developing a new “Complete Street” modal category for large capital roadway projects that encompasses the goals of the Complete Streets Act and addresses multi-modal solutions but does not eliminate the Bicycle or Pedestrian categories and funding associated with those modes
- Fund lapsing policies should be flexible to allow sufficient time to implement larger-scaled projects that may have environmental and ROW issues
- Sub-regional allocation of funds would pose significant challengers to large agencies that include multiple sub-regions.
- Very receptive to fund distribution directly to local agencies.
- Metro should have more control of funding streams that prevents them from requiring agencies to re-submit funding applications for projects already committed to other funding opportunities (ATP)
- Metro should consider eliminating the RSTI, PI, TE, and Bikeway categories and create a Complete Streets or Multi-Modal transportation Category.
- Future applications should look at metrics related to VMT and GHG reductions pursuant