

**South Bay Cities Council of Governments
Measure M MSP Task Force Meeting Notes – September 19, 2018**

Attendees: Richard Garland (Carson); Ken Berkman (El Segundo); Louis Atwell (Inglewood); Bill Johnson (LA County DPW); Ted Semaan (Redondo Beach); Greg Grammer (Rolling Hills Estates); Robert Beste (Torrance); James Lee (Torrance Transit); Isidro Panuco (Metro); Tom Bakaly (Beach Cities Health District); Leslie Scott (Beach Cities Transit); Steve Lantz, David Leger (SBCCOG)

I. Welcome / Self-Introductions

Steve Lantz called the meeting to order at 2:41pm.

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

III. Consideration of 2015 South Bay Mobility Matrix Project List

Mr. Lantz reminded attendees 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 and that these projects are “pre-screened” for Measure M funding. Isidro Panuco noted that additional eligibility criteria might be applied to ensure projects conform to the Measure M Policy and Administrative Guidelines.

IV. Discussion of local project priorities; collaboration

Mr. Lantz began the discussion by briefly explaining the Measure R South Bay Highway Program (SBHP), noting that projects must reduce vehicle delay on a state highway/freeway and be within a mile of a state highway/freeway. Mr. Lantz asked the group if the Measure M HEOI MSP should be an extension of the SBHP or if it should be broadened. Mr. Beste commented that in his opinion, the SBHP should continue focusing on larger freeway projects and that Measure M MSPs should focus more on city projects off the freeway. The group largely agreed that the HEOI program should be broadened to allow for Metro’s consideration of projects outside of the one-mile radius requirement in the SBHP.

Attendees then began sharing their local project priorities:

-Mr. Beste (Torrance): MSPs should focus on local ATP-type projects that all jurisdictions can take part in, as opposed to the SBHP where only those within a mile of a state highway/freeway are eligible. Projects that coordinate different modes of transportation should be considered as well.

-Ms. Scott (Beach Cities Transit): Transit Operators would like to expand ATP to include Complete Streets as well. Improvements such as bus shelters, wayfinding signage for transit centers, or new technology for transit stops that include real-time information would be possible projects.

-Mr. Lee (Torrance Transit): In addition to what Ms. Scott listed, Torrance Transit would want projects that connect the regional transit centers to other destinations in the South Bay. Torrance Transit would also consider applying for capital acquisition funding to allow for increased service to the South Bay.

-Mr. Johnson (LA County Dept. of Public Works): LA County would be interested in collaborative/multi-jurisdictional projects, particularly because there are isolated areas of unincorporated LA County throughout parts the South Bay. One example would be the coordination of the County’s bike routes with those of local cities.

-Mr. Berkman (El Segundo): El Segundo is very interested in bicycle improvements and implementation of the South Bay Bicycle Masterplan. Corridor improvements would be a great idea as well.

-Mr. Bakaly (Beach Cities Health District): BCHD is interested in increasing mobility, particularly by looking at corridors (such as Aviation Blvd and Prospect Ave/Meadows Ave) that serve as alternatives to already congested roads like PCH. Additionally, ADA access is a high priority for BCHD. BCHD is also interested in a multi-modal coastal corridor to increase access to the Strand. Lastly, BCHD has begun considering a coastal ferry to shuttle riders from Redondo Beach all the way to Malibu with stops along the way. This would eliminate cars from all roads and freeways, not just the 405.

-Mr. Semaan (Redondo Beach): Measure R should be fully exhausted before Measure M begins taking on large highway projects. Beyond the expansion of Measure M HEOI to include projects beyond one-mile from a state highway/freeway, the City is interested in expanding bike and pedestrian pathways throughout the city.

-Mr. Atwell (Inglewood): Inglewood’s biggest priority is the peplemover project to the stadium. In addition, the City is very interested in ITS and TSSP projects; changeable message boards and other development-related improvements are also of interest.

-Mr. Grammer (Rolling Hills Estates): Local arterial road improvements, such as Palos Verdes Drive North, would be high priority for Rolling Hills Estates and the other Peninsula cities. Additionally, pedestrian improvements (installing sidewalks where there are currently none) and designated bike lanes to improve safety would also be projects of interest.

-Mr. Garland (Carson): Carson has previously discussed the possibility of redesigning the road structure of designated trucking routes to better accommodate the heavy trucks that use them and would consider applying for MSP funding for these types of projects. Carson is also interested in creating a transit terminal, perhaps on Del Amo Blvd.

V. South Bay Application of Metro's Equity Platform Framework

Mr. Lantz began by explaining the Equity Platform Framework, which will help guide Metro when it considers its future investments. The framework would aim at correcting decades of transit investment inequity for under-privileged areas throughout the county. Mr. Lantz explained that this framework could potentially be imposed upon the MSPs and could require certain percentages of investments be made in particular areas, based off Metro's county-wide data. Mr. Lantz added that it could be in the South Bay's interest in developing a similar policy that reflects the data in the South Bay instead of the county-wide data. Task Force attendees did not believe this is an issue to be concerned with at this time but asked it to be monitored for future developments.

VI. 5-Year HEOI Program Goals Discussion

The Task Force briefly discussed prioritizing Freeway Improvements vs. Arterial Improvements and Corridor Improvements vs. Spot Improvements. Mr. Lantz and Mr. Panuco explained that when doing a multi-jurisdictional improvement, one city must volunteer to be the lead agency that enters into a funding agreement with Metro, in addition to agreeing to work together on the overall design of the project. Mr. Beste noted that he believes that guidelines should be left flexible to allow for multi-jurisdictional projects but should not require or prohibit them expressly.

VII. 5-Year TSMI Program Goals Discussion

Due to extensive discussion on other agenda items, there was no discussion on this topic.

VIII. Next Steps

Due to extensive discussion on other agenda items, there was limited discussion on this topic. Regarding a Measure M MSP Call for Projects, it was proposed that an early action list of projects be developed using Measure R SBHP requirements, removing the one-mile radius requirement. Projects that increase mobility could also be considered for funding as part of the proposed early action list of projects. Further discussion on this topic will be held at the next meeting.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:21 p. m. to October 17th, 2018.