

**South Bay Cities Council of Governments
Measure M MSP Task Force Meeting Notes – August 15, 2018**

Attendees: Lauren Nakano, Jacqueline Sun (Beach Cities Health District); Sarah Horn (Caltrans); Gilbert Marquez (Carson); Ken Berkman (El Segundo); Louis Atwell (Inglewood); Bill Johnson (LA County DPW); Isidro Panuco (Metro); Kerry Cartwright (Port of LA); Ted Semaan (Redondo Beach); Greg Grammer (Rolling Hills Estates); Rob Beste (Torrance); James Lee (Torrance Transit); Jacki Bacharach, Steve Lantz, David Leger (SBCCOG)

I. Welcome / Self-Introductions

Jacki Bacharach thanked everyone for their attendance and called the meeting to order at 2:33pm.

II. South Bay Measure M MSP Programs Background

Steve Lantz briefly reviewed the three multi-year subregional programs (MSPs). Mr. Lantz explained that the Highway Efficiency and Operational Improvements (HEOI) MSP is largely an extension of the Measure R South Bay Highway Program, with key subtle differences such as a case-by-case review for projects further than a mile from a state highway or freeway. The HEOI MSP has approximately \$58 million in funding available over the first 5 years.

Mr. Lantz then discussed the Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Programs (TSMIP), noting that there is a short-term program (TSMIP I) and long-term program (TSMIP II). TSMIP I has approximately \$18.5 million available over the first 5 years, while TSMIP II has \$103 million available in the same time frame.

III. Consideration of 2015 South Bay Mobility Matrix Project List

Mr. Lantz explained that the 2015 South Bay Mobility Matrix Project List was developed as part of the research for a potential sales tax measure at the time. Each jurisdiction in each subregion was asked to compile a list of projects that they would like to see funded. These lists of projects were aggregated without significant analysis to create the Mobility Matrix which totaled more than \$8 billion in needed infrastructure improvements. Mr. Lantz added that, per Metro's guidance, the projects listed in the Mobility Matrix are essentially pre-approved projects that the subregion could choose to fund through a MSP. Mr. Lantz clarified that MSP funding is not limited to Mobility Matrix projects, but that additional projects could be suggested. Mr. Panuco expressed the opinion that the Metro Highway Department would require more definition before approving MSP funding.

IV. Discussion of 5-Year HEOI and TSMI Program Goals

Mr. Lantz suggested that the MSPs may benefit from having a "program goal" such as: freeway vs. arterial improvements; corridor improvements vs. spot intersection improvements; transit capital projects; slow speed networks; early action vs. strategic planning; and others. Ms. Bacharach asked the group what they were here to try and get done for their respective agencies and the South Bay and mentioned ideas such as prioritizing north/south or east/west corridor arterial improvements to alleviate freeway delays. Mr. Grammer commented that he'd like to see improvements such as bike lanes, pedestrian pathways, and signal improvements in Rolling Hills Estates. Mr. Atwell noted that ITS projects, intersection improvements, and the people mover to the Stadium are Inglewood priorities.

V. Draft MSP Programs 5-Year Project Lists Selection Criteria

Mr. Lantz began by explaining that when the Mobility Matrix was developed, Metro also developed 5 qualitative metrics to be used to select and evaluate the performance of each of the proposed and implemented projects. These themes included: mobility, economic vitality, accessibility, safety, and sustainability/quality of life. There was discussion, but no recommendation, whether or not these measures should be weighted and, if so, which should be weighted higher than another. Mr. Cartwright noted that he feels weighting is an appropriate method and that safety and mobility should be weighted higher than the others. The group will continue to discuss this at the next meeting.

VI. MSP Performance Measurement

There was no discussion on this topic beyond their use in selection criteria noted above.

VII. Public Participation Requirements

Mr. Lantz explained that the Measure M ordinance required a public participation plan and that this must be a defined process. Mr. Lantz noted that the SBCCOG Board has decided to use its pre-existing public forums such as the Transportation Committee, Infrastructure Working Group, Transit Operators Working Group, Service for Seniors Working Group, and Board of Directors as the forums for public participation. Local jurisdictions must also have a public participation plan that is implemented during the

selection and implementation of their Measure M projects. They may choose to also use their existing public forums such as Public Works Commissions and City Council meetings. They also may choose to do additional public participation such as a town hall if they decide that should be part of their public participation plan.

VIII. Next Steps

The Working Group will continue developing the project selection criteria and performance measures. An MSP development timeline will also be needed, along with review of public participation processes. Attendees were asked to weigh the 5 themes and also begin developing a list of projects for funding over the next 5 years. The Working Group was also asked to identify a list of priority corridors for potential corridor-wide improvements.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p. m. to September 19th, 2018.