



# San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

## AGENDA AND NOTICE OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Thursday, April 20, 2017 – 4:00 PM

Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District Office  
(602 E. Huntington Drive, Suite B, Monrovia, California, 91016)

The Transportation Committee encourages public participation and invites you to share your views on agenda items.

### Chair

John Fasana, Duarte

### Vice-Chair

Sam Pedroza,  
Claremont

### Members

Alhambra  
Claremont  
Diamond Bar  
Duarte  
El Monte  
Glendora  
La Cañada Flintridge  
Monterey Park  
Rosemead  
San Gabriel  
South El Monte  
South Pasadena  
Temple City  
Walnut  
First District, LA County  
Unincorporated  
Communities  
Fifth District, LA County  
Unincorporated  
Communities

**MEETINGS:** *Regular Meetings of the Transportation Committee are held on the third Thursday of each month at 4:00 PM at the Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District Office (602 E. Huntington Drive, Suite B, Monrovia, California, 91016).* The Transportation Committee agenda packet is available at the San Gabriel Valley Council of Government's (SGVCOG) Office, 1000 South Fremont Avenue, Suite 10210, Alhambra, CA, and on the website, [www.sgvkog.org](http://www.sgvkog.org). Copies are available via email upon request ([sgv@sgvcog.org](mailto:sgv@sgvcog.org)). Documents distributed to a majority of the Committee after the posting will be available for review in the SGVCOG office and on the SGVCOG website. Your attendance at this public meeting may result in the recording of your voice.

**CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:** Your participation is welcomed and invited at all Transportation Committee meetings. Time is reserved at each regular meeting for those who wish to address the Committee. SGVCOG requests that persons addressing the Committee refrain from making personal, slanderous, profane or disruptive remarks.

**TO ADDRESS THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE:** At a regular meeting, the public may comment on any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee during the public comment period and may also comment on any agenda item at the time it is discussed. At a special meeting, the public may only comment on items that are on the agenda. Members of the public wishing to speak are asked to complete a comment card or simply rise to be recognized when the Chair asks for public comments to speak. We ask that members of the public state their name for the record and keep their remarks brief. If several persons wish to address the Committee on a single item, the Chair may impose a time limit on individual remarks at the beginning of discussion. **The Transportation Committee may not discuss or vote on items not on the agenda.**

**AGENDA ITEMS:** The Agenda contains the regular order of business of the Transportation Committee. Items on the Agenda have generally been reviewed and investigated by the staff in advance of the meeting so that the Transportation Committee can be fully informed about a matter before making its decision.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:** Items listed on the Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and will be acted upon by one motion. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless a Committee member or citizen so requests. In this event, the item will be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered after the Consent Calendar. If you would like an item on the Consent Calendar discussed, simply tell Staff or a member of the Committee.



In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the SGVCOG office at (626) 457-1800. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the SGVCOG to make reasonable arrangement to ensure accessibility to this meeting.



## **PRELIMINARY BUSINESS**

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call
4. Public Comment (*If necessary, the Chair may place reasonable time limits on all comments*)
5. Changes to Agenda Order: Identify emergency items arising after agenda posting and requiring action prior to next regular meeting

## **CONSENT CALENDAR** (*It is anticipated that the Transportation Committee may take action on the following matters*)

6. Transportation Meeting Minutes (Page 1)  
*Recommended Action: Approve Transportation Committee minutes.*

## **PRESENTATIONS** (*It is anticipated that the Transportation Committee may take action on the following matters*)

7. 626 Golden Streets Recap – Sam Zneimer, City of South Pasadena, and Wes Reutimann, Bike SGV  
*Recommended Action: For information.*
8. Metro Bike Share Expansion Feasibility Study – Laura Cornejo and Avital Shavit, Metro  
*Recommended Action: For information.*

## **ACTION ITEMS** (*It is anticipated that the Transportation Committee may take action on the following matters*)

9. Measure M Draft Guidelines (Page 3)  
*Recommended Action: Recommend Governing Board send comment letter regarding draft guidelines.*
10. Letter of No Prejudice for Lemon Avenue/ SR-60 Project (Page 8)  
*Recommended Action: Recommend that the Governing Board request that the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) issue a “Letter of No Prejudice” for the early construction of a Measure M eligible project for new ramps at State Route 60 and Lemon Avenue.*

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS** (*It is anticipated that the Transportation Committee may take action on the following matters*)

11. SB 1 (Beall)  
*Recommended Action: For information.*

## **METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (MTA) REPORT** (*It is anticipated that the Transportation Committee may take action on the following matters*)

12. Oral Report  
*Recommended Action: For information only.*

## **UPDATE ITEMS**

13. Metrolink Update  
*Recommended Action: For information only.*
14. Update on Active Transportation Planning Efforts  
*Recommended Action: For information only.*

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT** (*It is anticipated that the Transportation Committee may take action on the following matters*)

15. Oral Report  
*Recommended Action: For information only.*

## **COMMITTEE MEMBER ITEMS**

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

## **ADJOURN**



## SGVCOG Transportation Committee Unapproved Minutes

Date: March 16, 2017

Time: 4:30 PM

Location: USGVMWD

### PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1. Call to Order  
The meeting was called to order at 4:09 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Roll Call

#### Members Present

Alhambra	B. Messina
Claremont	S. Pedroza
Duarte	J. Fasana
Glendora	G. Murabito
La Canada Flintridge	T. Walker
South El Monte	J. Gonzales
South Pasadena	D. Mahmud
LA County District 1	J. Hernandez

#### Members Absent

Diamond Bar  
El Monte  
Monterey Park  
Rosemead  
San Gabriel  
South El Monte  
Temple City  
Walnut  
LA County District 5

#### Staff

M. Creter  
C. Cruz  
E. Wolf

4. Public Comment
5. Changes to Agenda Order: Identify emergency items arising after agenda posting and requiring action prior to next regular meeting

### CONSENT CALENDAR

6. Transportation Meeting Minutes

**There was a motion to approve the consent calendar (M/S: J. Hernandez/ D. Mahmud).**

**[MOTION PASSED]**

<b>AYES:</b>	Alhambra, Claremont, Duarte, Glendora, La Canada Flintridge, South El Monte, South Pasadena, LA County District 1
<b>NOES:</b>	
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Diamond Bar, El Monte, Monterey Park, Rosemead, San Gabriel, South El Monte, Temple City, Walnut, LA County District 5

### PRESENTATIONS

7. LA County Vision Zero  
Representatives from LA County DPH and DPW presented on this item.

8. Metro East Side Phase 2  
G. Kim (Metro) presented on this item.

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

9. Measure M Guiding Principles

**There was a motion to approve the consent calendar (M/S: S. Pedroza/ J. Hernandez).**

**[MOTION PASSED]**

<b>AYES:</b>	Alhambra, Claremont, Duarte, Glendora, La Canada Flintridge, South El Monte, South Pasadena, LA County District 1
<b>NOES:</b>	
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Diamond Bar, El Monte, Monterey Park, Rosemead, San Gabriel, South El Monte, Temple City, Walnut, LA County District 5

#### **METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (MTA) REPORT**

10. Oral Report  
The Chair reported on this item.

#### **UPDATE ITEMS**

11. Metrolink Update
12. Update on Active Transportation Planning Efforts  
M. Creter reported on this item.

#### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

13. Oral Report  
There was no report on this item.

#### **COMMITTEE MEMBER ITEMS**

#### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

#### **ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 PM.

# REPORT

---

DATE: April 20, 2017

TO: Transportation Committee  
Governing Board Delegates and Alternates

FROM: Phil Hawkey, Executive Director

RE: **MEASURE M COMMENT LETTER**

## **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Direct staff to send comment letter on draft Measure M Guidelines.

## **BACKGROUND**

Metro is currently in the process of developing Measure M Expenditure Guidelines, which will outline the eligible uses of and requirements for Measure M funds. Metro intends to finalize these guidelines by June 2017, so that they are in place when the sales tax begins being collected on July 1, 2017. As a part of the guideline development process, Metro has formed a Measure M Policy Advisory Council (PAC), with representatives from cities, transit providers, and transit and roadway users. Mark Christoffels (ACE CEO) is representing the SGVCOG on the Measure M Policy Advisory Council and Marisa Creter (SGVCOG Assistant Executive Director) is the alternate.

Last month, the Governing Board approved guiding principles to provide staff general policy direction. Staff is now seeking to authorization to submit a comment letter that addresses specific areas of concern. Attached is the draft letter.

Prepared by: Marisa Creter  
Marisa Creter  
Assistant Executive Director

Approved by: Phil Hawkey  
Phil Hawkey  
Executive Director

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A –Draft Measure M Comment Letter



April 10, 2017

**DRAFT**

**OFFICERS**

*President*  
**Cynthia Sternquist**

*1<sup>st</sup> Vice President*  
**Margaret Clark**

*2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President*  
**Vacant**

*3<sup>rd</sup> Vice President*  
**Vacant**

**MEMBERS**

*Alhambra*

*Arcadia*

*Azusa*

*Baldwin Park*

*Bradbury*

*Claremont*

*Covina*

*Diamond Bar*

*Duarte*

*El Monte*

*Glendora*

*Industry*

*Irwindale*

*La Cañada Flintridge*

*La Puente*

*La Verne*

*Monrovia*

*Montebello*

*Monterey Park*

*Pasadena*

*Pomona*

*Rosemead*

*San Dimas*

*San Gabriel*

*San Marino*

*Sierra Madre*

*South El Monte*

*South Pasadena*

*Temple City*

*Walnut*

*West Covina*

*First District, LA County*  
*Unincorporated Communities*

*Fourth District, LA County*  
*Unincorporated Communities*

*Fifth District, LA County*  
*Unincorporated Communities*

*SGV Water Districts*

Honorable John Fasana, Chairman  
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
One Gateway Plaza  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**RE: DRAFT MEASURE M GUIDELINES**

Dear Chairman Fasana:

The San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) has reviewed the draft Measure M Guidelines and provides the following comments and recommended changes:

**Comment No. 1:**

Throughout the document, Metro refers to the term “Project Sponsor” when discussing the programming and use of subregional funds. This term is not defined and opens the door for individual cities or other entities within a sub-region to take the lead in programming specific projects and seeking approval directly from Metro. The SGVCOG feels strongly that these are sub-regional funds established and defined by the sub-regions and any project to be funded under these programs must come to Metro through a programming effort by the sub-regions.

To insure this is accomplished, the Measure M Guidelines should include a provision requiring Project Sponsors to have the concurrence of the sub-region (essentially, the COG’s<sup>1</sup> and joint powers authorities officially identified by Metro as regional planning agencies) prior to being included by Metro in their annual funding plan even if already included in the various adopted Mobility Matrices. To provide this concurrence, each COG should be required to adopt a five-year programming plan for each sub-regional program within their respective sub-region. The five-year programming plan would have to identify specific projects and phasing, allocated funding amounts, and project timing and be submitted to Metro. These programming plans would be required to be updated or amended on an annual basis reflecting executed funding MOU’s and project additions or deletions. Unless prohibited by the adopted guidelines, revenue constraints, or the Measure M ordinance, Metro would be required to adhere to these COG adopted sub-regional programming plans when executing funding MOU’s for specific projects. Should a project included in a COG adopted sub-regional programming plan be denied by Metro, each COG shall have the right to appeal the denial to the Measure M Oversight Board. Attachment A proposed a flowchart of the proposed process.

**Comment No. 2:**

The guidelines allow for “Project Sponsors” to borrow from one Sub-Regional Program to accelerate the funding of a project in another Sub-Regional Program with the consent of

<sup>1</sup> Note: Throughout this letter the term “COG” is intended to reference both Councils of Governments and joint powers authorities that are identified by Metro as regional planning agencies.

the Metro Board and the “affected sub-region(s)”. The SGVCOG appreciates this flexibility, but would like to see language that requires the affected sub-regions to approve the proposed borrowing, by amending their affected adopted sub-regional programming plans as defined in our comment No. 1, to reflect the transfer of funds and acknowledging the associated timing impact for projects included in those sub-regional programs.

**Comment No. 3:**

The guidelines state that Measure M funds may be used for pre-construction as well as construction activities. Pre-construction activities are defined in the guideline and include “planning studies”. The SGVCOG recommends that this term be expanded to “planning and programming studies”. Adding the term “programming studies” will allow the sub-regions through their respective COGs to develop sub-regional project lists for corridor planning and coordination, and for subsequent project development and delivery. This will ensure that proposed projects complement each other and maximize mobility and/or sustainability.

**Comment No. 4:**

The Measure M Guidelines regarding Sub-Regional Equity funds state that Metro may meet these obligations using “any combination of federal, state or Metro controlled funds including, but not limited to, Measure M.” SGVCOG appreciates the need for this flexibility, however this flexibility being sought by Metro potentially places significant grant compliance requirements on sub-regions that may conflict with proposed projects or uses of those funds. The guidelines should be revised to not allow Metro the ability to unilaterally determine that a sub-region’s funding requirement under the “Sub-Regional Equity Fund” be met with something other than Measure M. Such a funding substitution should only be allowed with the affected COG (sub-region’s) concurrence. In addition, the SGVCOG requests that uses of the “Sub-Regional Equity Fund” be expanded to include the use of these funds for bonding capacity to accelerate proposed projects within the other sub-regional programs.

**Comment No. 5:**

The definition for eligible uses for the “Highway Demand Based Program” should include park and ride facilities, as well as other ridesharing related facilities.

**Comment No. 6:**

Under the section “3% Local Contribution to Major Transit Projects”, the guidelines state that “betterment work” funded by the local agency and as defined as “a change that will improve the level of service and/or capacity, capability, appearance, efficiency or function over that which is required by the Metro Design”, shall not be counted towards the 3% required local contribution. The SGVCOG disagrees with this exclusion and would like to see the guidelines amended to allow such betterment work to be counted towards the 3% local contribution. Any capital investment that enhances and improves the operation of the transit system and funded by a local agency should be desirable to Metro and should not be discouraged by not allowing this type of betterment work to be counted towards the required 3% contribution.

**Comment No. 7:**

Under the section “3% Local Contribution to Major Transit Projects”, “in kind” local contributions as defined should include the cost of staff time from the commencement of the environmental phase through the end of the warranty period.

**Comment No. 8:**

Under the section “3% Local Contribution to Major Transit Projects”, local contribution limits are determined at the conclusion of preliminary engineering (30% plans). The guidelines need to have language to address projects that have already exceeded this point such as the Gold Line Foothill Extension. How will local contribution be determined for that project? SGVCOG suggests that language be added that states for projects that have exceeded preliminary engineering as of the initial adoption of the these Measure M guidelines, Metro shall consult with the local affected agencies to determine the appropriate project scope and cost estimate to determine the local contribution limits.

**Comment No. 9:**

Under local return, Metro is currently recommending a \$100,000 annual minimum allocation for small population cities that would normally receive less than this amount. The SGVCOG does not object to this proposal, however is not in favor of increasing this amount beyond the current recommended \$100,000 minimum.

**Comment 10:**

Upon the approval of the Measure M Guidelines and the initiation of project funding MUO's, the SGVCOG requests that they be included in all communications from Metro to Project Sponsors related to the allocation and use of sub-regional funds assigned to the SGVCOG's sub-region.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Sternquist, President  
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments  
Councilmember, City of Temple City

c.c.: SGVCOG Board of Directors  
L. A. Metro Board of Directors  
Phillip Washington, CEO, L. A. Metro



## **SGVCOG proposed project funding approval process for sub-regional funds**

COG's adopt a five-year programming plan for each sub-regional program within their respective sub-region. The plan will identify specific projects and phasing, allocated funding amounts, and project timing.



COG adopted five-year programming plans are submitted for approval by Metro Board



Upon approval by Metro Board, project sponsors may apply for funding MOU's based on adopted five-year sub-regional fund programming plans



COG's update or amend their adopted five-year programming plans on an annual basis reflecting executed funding MOU's and project additions or deletions and submit for approval by Metro Board



# REPORT

---

DATE: April 20, 2017

TO: Transportation Committee  
Governing Board Delegates and Alternates

FROM: Phil Hawkey, Executive Director

VIA: Mark Christoffels, CEO, ACE Construction Authority

RE: **REQUEST FOR ISSUANCE OF A LETTER OF NO PREJUDICE FROM METRO FOR THE EARLY CONSTRUCTION OF NEW RAMPS AT STATE ROUTE 60 AND LEMON AVENUE.**

## **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Request that the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) issue a “Letter of No Prejudice” for the early construction of a Measure M eligible project for new ramps at State Route 60 and Lemon Avenue.

## **BACKGROUND:**

The cities of Diamond Bar and the City of Industry have for over a decade been working on a project to add new ramps at Lemon Avenue and State Route 60. The construction of the Lemon Ave ramps is intended to fix the existing non-compliant weaving that occurs between the Brea Canyon Road ramps and the State Route 57-60 interchange. Because the Brea Canyon on-ramp is so close to the interchange, drivers entering the freeway are required to cross many lanes quickly to orient themselves to either the SR57 or the SR60. This has been a particular problem for trucks. The Lemon Ave ramp construction includes the removal of the non-compliant Brea Canyon Road ramp and makes Lemon Ave the new point of entry to the freeway in this area. From a safety and traffic congestion perspective, this project will correct a current hotspot on the SR60 freeway and was included in the adopted Mobility Matrix for the San Gabriel Valley.

The cities of Diamond Bar and the City of Industry were able to secure \$17.5 million in funding for the initial phases of this project and working with Caltrans, completed the construction plans and acquired the necessary rights of way. In July of 2016, the two cities entered into a Betterment Agreement with ACE for construction of these new ramps to be done in conjunction with the Fairway Drive grade separation project. Concurrently ACE amended its construction contract for the Fairway Drive Grade Separation project to include this construction work. Total current cost of construction is estimated at \$22.8 million, which will exceed by \$5.3 million the funding obtained by the cities of Diamond Bar and the City of Industry.

To close this funding gap and allow for the timely completion of the new ramps, an early allocation of Measure M funds will be required. As shown in the attached, Project ID 384 is the program that got funded under Measure M and was intended to fix lane drops, construct auxiliary lanes and correct ramp geometrics such as this project. To allow for early construction of Measure M

projects such as this one, on March 9, 2017, Metro issued the attached letter authorizing Council of Governments (COG's) to request Metro to issue a "Letter of No Prejudice" for projects that a COG may want to advance.

With this vital safety related construction for new ramps at Lemon Avenue and State Route 60 already under construction, with an anticipated completion date of September 2017, it does not make sense to not complete the final phase of construction, and re-bid this work when Measure M funds are formally allocated. Staff and the two cities are requesting that the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments, through an action of the Governing Board, make a formal request to Metro to issue a "Letter of No Prejudice" allowing the project to proceed and remain eligible to receive Measure M funds upon formal allocation.

### **BUDGET IMPACT:**

As the requested action is to obtain a "Letter of No Prejudice" from Metro to allow the early construction of a Measure M eligible project, this action will have no budget impact as all funds expended would be eligible for reimbursement. Funds expended for construction prior to reimbursement by Metro will be provided by ACE.

### **ATTACHMENTS:**

Attachment A – Metro Correspondence Regarding Multi-Year Subregional Funding



**Metro**

Los Angeles County  
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

One Gateway Plaza  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

**Attachment A**  
213.922.2000 Tel  
metro.net

DATE: MARCH 9, 2017

TO: COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS

FROM: PHILLIP A. WASHINGTON *PAW*  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

SUBJECT: MEASURE M MULTI-YEAR SUBREGIONAL PROGRAM FUNDING

Metro appreciates the efforts of local and subregional agencies in the immediate delivery of high priority Measure M projects and their interest in determining how Measure M funding may be made available to support these activities. Metro staff recognizes that many of these projects were aggregated along with other subregional priorities into Multi-Year Subregional Programs in the Measure M Expenditure Plan. While individual projects in these programs were identified in the Mobility Matrices developed for each subregion, the identification of specific projects to be assigned funding from the Multi-Year Subregional Programs still needs to be done. Metro staff expects that procedures for assigning and scheduling funding to specific projects will occur through either the development of the Measure M Guidelines or a subsequent programming process as was done in the Measure R highway operations programs.

One of the major challenges in accessing the Multi-Year Subregional Measure M funding is that the Measure M Expenditure Plan identifies the availability of these funds ("Groundbreaking Start Date") broadly over the next 40 years. Across all nine subregions there are 37 Multi-Year Subregional Programs covering multiple categories/modes of transportation investments with a "Groundbreaking Start Date" beginning as early as fiscal year 2018 or as late as fiscal year 2048. Until the Measure M Guidelines are completed and adopted by the Board, staff has been asked to provide a mechanism that would allow projects on an early delivery schedule (under construction within the next 12 months) to secure some funding assurances from the subregional programs.

If a subregion has a near-term project that seeks Measure M funding, the subregion may request a Letter of No Prejudice (LONP) from Metro to allow the subregion to move forward with the delivery of the project using other local funds and be eligible for future reimbursement of Measure M funds by Metro when such funding is available. Actual LONPs can be developed on a case-by-case basis until the guidelines are finalized, currently targeted for June 2017. The Measure M Guidelines will include provisions for LONPs or other tools to address the subregional funding programs.

cc: Metro Board Staff



**Metro**

Final Report  
Appendix C – Project Detail Matrix

Program	Subprogram	MMT Project ID	Jurisdiction	Description
System Efficiency Program (continued)	Highway TSM Program	353	Industry	I-605 NB Ramps/Pellissier Road
		136	Alhambra, Baldwin Park, El Monte, Rosemead, San Gabriel, West Covina	I-10 - Conduct Eastern Gateway Freeway Corridor Improvement Study I-710 to San Bernardino County Line
		142	City of Los Angeles	I-10 - Corridor-wide Expansion of Freeway Service Patrol
		151	City of Los Angeles	I-10 - Corridor-wide - Coordinate construction schedules to avoid additional traffic conflicts
		155		SR-60- Expand FSP throughout San Gabriel Valley
		354	Caltrans	EB I-210-PM R44.38/R49.01: Restripe to add MFL from San Dimas Ave. to Fruit St. (Remove drop lane & restriping only. No ROW required. Remove Mainline Bottleneck.)
		383	SGVCOG	Eliminate lane drops, extend auxiliary lanes and correct ramp geometrics at various locations
		387	El Monte, Baldwin Park	Westbound I-10 from I-605 to Durfee Avenue. Braid the southbound I-605 to westbound I-10 connector ramp with the westbound I-10 Durfee Ave off ramp to improve traffic operations.
		125	SGVCOG	Highway - Interchange Improvements: I-10/I-605 Interchange Improvements
		384	SGVCOG	Eliminate lane drops, extend auxiliary lanes and correct ramp geometrics at various locations
		30	SGVCOG	Highway - Interchange Improvements: SR-60/I-605 Mixed Flow and HOV Direct Connectors
		31	SGVCOG, Diamond Bar, Industry	Highway - Interchange Improvements: SR-57/SR-60 Interchange (Future improvements include direct freeway connectors, HOV to HOV connectors, mainline improvements, and/or a westbound SR-60 bypass to Grand Avenue.)
		25	Pomona/SGVCOG	SR-71 Highway to Freeway Regional w/ Transit - (Phase I - Mission Boulevard to SR-71 Highway to Freeway Regional w/ Transit (Phase II - Interstate 10 to Mission Boulevard)
		223	Pomona/SGVCOG	SR-71 Highway to Freeway Regional w/ Transit (Phase II - Interstate 10 to Mission Boulevard)
		27	SGVCOG/ Caltrans	SR-710 North Gap Closure Project - mode/alignment depending on results of the alternatives analysis
		15	La Canada Flintridge	Metro Line 177 - Provide funding to increase headways on Metro Line 177 connecting the Metro Gold Line to Jet Propulsion Laboratory

SUBREGIONAL MOBILITY MATRIX – SAN GABRIEL VALLEY