

**South Bay Cities Council of Governments  
Measure M MSP Task Force Meeting Notes – October 17, 2018**

**Attendees:** Richard Garland (Carson); Ken Berkman (El Segundo); Louis Atwell (Inglewood); Bill Johnson (LA County DPW); Stephanie Katsouleas (Manhattan Beach); Ted Semaan (Redondo Beach); Greg Grammer (Rolling Hills Estates); Robert Beste (Torrance); James Lee (Torrance Transit); Lauren Nakano & Jacqueline Sun (Beach Cities Health District); Joyce Rooney (Beach Cities Transit); Isidro Panuco & Catherine Saint (Metro); Kerry Cartwright (POLA); Michael Ervin (Office of Sup. Hahn); Jacki Bacharach, Steve Lantz & David Leger (SBCCOG)

**I. Welcome / Self-Introductions**

Ms. Bacharach called the meeting to order at 2:41 p. m.

**II. South Bay Measure M MSP Task Force Meeting Notes – Received and Filed**

**III. Strawman Project Selection Criteria for HEOI, TSMIP I, TSMIP II Programs**

Mr. Lantz began the discussion by explaining the proposed project selection criteria were largely taken from Metro’s proposed criteria with the addition of a few others. Mr. Lantz opened up discussion to the group to get feedback on what proposed changes they would like to see, if any.

It was recommended that the Measure M HEOI MSP guidelines adopt almost identical rules as the Measure R SBHP with the exception of the 1-mile geographic nexus. There was consensus that MSP criteria should not limit project eligibility for HEOI funds to the SBHP requirement that projects be within 1-mile of a state highway or freeway.

There was considerable discussion over the issue of whether a local match should be required and, if so, how the local match would be weighted in selection criteria for each MSP. To be consistent with the SBHP program, it was suggested that the HEOI funding match requirement be consistent with the SBHP requirement that has a sliding scale based on the cost of the project. The group understood Metro’s position that a match ensures the city has “skin in the game” and encourages a more responsible project budgeting and project delivery. Disagreement arose over whether or not the match should be required in Measure M TSMIP projects because some attendees felt that the local match stifled project application submissions for many cities, particularly those that do not have excess funding to allocate to a local match such as this. Other attendees expressed the opinion that local matches are standard in many grants that they already apply for and are not a major area of concern in the TSMIP selection criteria. There was additional discussion as to whether or not the local match requirement in Measure R SBHP could be amended to address Metro’s concerns through other criteria, such as controlling support costs, etc. Mr. Lantz noted that the Measure R SBHP is a regional program while the Measure M MSPs are sub-regional programs. Mr. Lantz recommended revisions to the Measure R program selection criteria be considered as part of a process to reconcile the South Bay’s Measure R and M programs after the Measure M MSPs are fully developed

Regarding project readiness criteria, it was proposed that the MSP criteria be broken down into “Years 1 and 2” and “Years 3-5”. If a project was ready to enter in to a funding agreement with Metro, it would fall into the “Years 1 and 2” category readiness criteria, and if not, it would fall into the “Years 3-5” readiness criteria.

Issues needing additional discussion include:

1. Requiring a match or “good faith effort” to secure a match for TSMIP projects
2. providing MSP selection criteria points to cities who have never received projects or were ineligible due to Measure R rules and limitations;
3. providing priority for projects under \$10 million
4. including geographic equity in the project selection process.

Mr. Lantz noted the suggestions made and will amend the proposed selection criteria and present them again at the next MSP Task Force meeting.

**IV. Next Steps: Adoption of Project Selection Criteria; Adoption of Performance Measurement Requirements; Call for MSP Projects; Schedule for initial project selection; Tracking tool -** Mr. Lantz briefly reviewed the next steps with the Task Force and explained that a calendar of next steps will be included in the next meeting’s agenda packet.

**V. Adjournment -** The meeting was adjourned at 4:21 p. m. to Monday, November 19, 2018, 3:00 p. m. to 4:30 p. m.