

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

South Bay Measure M MSPs Task Force

**SBCCOG Office
20285 Western Avenue, Suite 100
Torrance, Ca. 90501**

AGENDA

Monday November 19, 2018

3:00 p. m. – 4:30 p. m.

- 3:00 p. m. Welcome / Self-Introductions**
- 3:05 p. m. South Bay Measure M MSP Task Force 10.17.18 Meeting Notes - Approve (Attachment A)**
- 3:10 p. m. Review Redlined Draft Project Selection Criteria for HEOI, TSMIP I, TSMIP II Programs (Attachment B)**
- 3:25 p. m. Review Outstanding Project Selection Criteria Issues**
- **Requiring a match for MSP funding vs documenting a “good faith effort” to secure a match for HEOI and/or TSMIP MSP projects**
 - **Providing MSP selection criteria points to cities that have never received Measure R SBHP project funding due to Measure R rules and limitations**
 - **Providing priority for projects under \$10 million in Selection Criteria for Year 1 and 2 projects vs all projects**
 - **Including geographic equity in the project selection process.**
- 4:25 p. m. Next steps**
- **MSP Task Force Review of Performance Measurement Requirements: December 2018**
 - **SBCCOG Adoption of Project Selection Criteria and Performance Measurement Requirements: November 2018**
 - **Call for MSP Projects: December 2018 - January 2019**
 - **SBCCOG Board Approval of Initial 5-Year MSP Program: January-March 2019**
 - **Metro Board approval of Initial 5-Year MSP Program: March-May 2019**
 - **Lead agencies and Metro execute funding agreements for Year 1 and Year 2 Projects: July-September 2019**
- 4:30 p. m. Adjournment**

Next MSP Task Force Meeting – Monday, December 17, 3:00 p. m. - 4:30 p. m.?

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

**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); Ted Semaan (Redondo Beach); Greg Grammer (Rolling Hills Estates); Robert Beste (Torrance); James Lee (Torrance Transit); Isidro Panuco & Catherine Saint (Metro); Lauren Nakano & Jacqueline Sun (Beach Cities Health District); Joyce Rooney (Beach Cities Transit); 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.

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Strawman Draft Selection Criteria for 3 Three South Bay MSPs **Revised as of 11.8.18**

The Project Selection Process Is Common To All MSPs

There are three sub-regional programs listed within the Measure M Ordinance: the Highway Efficiency Operational Improvement Program (HEOI), the Transportation System Mobility Improvement Program #1 (TSMIP I), and the Transportation Mobility Improvement Program #2 (TSMIP II). All candidate MSP projects ~~are~~ considered for funding within the South Bay Measure M Multi-Year Sub-Regional Program (MSP) are screened for eligibility based on project selection criteria that are unique to each of the three MSPs and different from the Measure R South Bay Highway Program (SBHP).

The annual update cycle for MSP Programs includes a period for solicitation of new projects submitted by lead agencies. The projects undergo an eligibility determination and assessment using the selection criteria to create three separate MSP Candidate Project lists. Eligible projects can be considered for any or all of the three MSPs. Eligible projects are added to the South Bay Measure R Highway Program Candidate Project List

MSP funding for candidate projects is programmed within a 5-year South Bay MSP Funding Allocation Program (MSPFAP). The funding allocation schedule is intended to be as consistent as possible with the MSP reimbursement schedule requested in the project application subject to the results of the project assessment and annually-available MSP funding within each of the three South Bay MSP programs. , and are considered for programming along with the other active MSP projects. This project programming process may need to modify the funding allocation requested schedule for specific projects. The MSPFAP process also allows for the opportunity for projects that are completed or not actively being implemented by the lead agency to be removed from or rescheduled in the 5-year funding allocation list.

The initial 5-year MSPFAP must be approved by the South Bay Cities Council Board of Directors and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors. The MSPFAP may be updated annually.

Separate project selection criteria are needed for each of the three MSPs (HEOI, TSMIP I, TSMIP II) Project selection criteria must be developed in consultation with all potential MSP funding recipients through an outreach process that must be described before a funding agreement is executed between Metro and the SBCCOG for development of the MSPs.

Potentially eligible HEOI Project Examples:

- Freeway Capacity Expansion and Operational Improvements
- Interchange and ramp modifications / improvements
- Auxiliary lanes for merging or weaving between adjacent interchanges
- Shoulder widening / improvements for enhanced operation of the roadway
- Freeway bypass / freeway-to-freeway onnections providing traffic detours in case of incidents, shutdowns or emergency evacuations
- Managed Lanes – HOV Lanes / Express Lanes
- Turnouts for safety purposes
- Intersection and street widening / improvements on a State Highway or within one mile of a State Highway , or on major / minor arterials beyond one mile from a State Highway on a case-by-case basis
- Left-turn or right-turn lanes on state highways or arterials

- Signal Synchronization / ITS / Autonomous Vehicle Infrastructure System and local interchange modifications
- Safety improvements that reduce incident delay
- Transit Centers, Park and Ride Lots/Parking Structures

HEOI Project Assessment

The following assessment criteria are used to assist in the process of programming the South Bay Measure M Highway Efficiency and Operational Improvements (HEOI) Program projects, as follows:

Assessment Criteria	Measures	Weight
1. Mobility/Accessibility Improvement	Project relieves congestion; improves travel times; improves effectiveness & reliability for street, highway and freeway users, eliminates trips	25%
2. Project Readiness	Project definition <u>of scope, total budget and proposed funding sources, and Measure M reimbursement schedule</u> sufficient to initiate environmental clearance, Caltrans Project Development documents, or project design. Public outreach process completed by lead agency. <u>City Council resolution or equivalent,</u> <u>Agencies requesting year 1 or 2 MSP funding reimbursements must be ready to execute a funding agreement with Metro. Requests for funding reimbursements during years 3-5 must document project progress needed to enable signing a funding agreement by year 3.</u>	15%
3. Project Need & Benefit to Transportation System	Regional or Sub-regional mobility benefits, integration with goods movement, reduce safety incidents, improve safety, eliminates operational deficiencies	15%
4. MSP leverage & Cost Effectiveness	Cost per unit of delay reduction, lead agency commitment to life-cycle O&M expenses, percentage of cost provided by non-SBHP funding allocated to project. <u>Document good faith effort to secure matching funds.</u> <u>Support costs capped at 10%</u>	10%
5. Land Use, Environmental Compatibility and Sustainability	Supports local land use, and transportation and environmental policies, VMT, GHG emissions reduction, improves environmental quality, public health, quality of life. <u>Address consequences of not implementing project.</u>	10%

5. Regional Significance, Multi-Jurisdictional Effort	Project crosses jurisdictional boundaries. Shared priority for affected jurisdictions' decision makers. Supports LRTP or regional program, on CSAN or CSTAN, connectivity/gap closure, <u>improves</u> access to activity centers	15%
6. Economic Vitality/Improved Quality of Life	Increase economic output; s Support job creation & retention; support goods movement; reduce household transportation costs;	10%
Total		100%

Potentially eligible TSMIP I, II Project Examples:

- Signal Synchronization
- Intelligent Transportation Systems
- Autonomous Vehicle Infrastructure System
- Broadband Infrastructure
- Bikeways and Bike Route/Slow Speed Infrastructure
- Pedestrian Infrastructure / ADA Improvements
- Complete Streets
- Transportation Enhancement / Beautification Elements of Transportation Improvements
- Transportation Management Systems (Traffic Operations Centers, Emergency Management)
- Goods Movement on CSTAN network
- Paratransit (Dial-a-Ride, Senior / Disabled Capital Projects)
- Metro / Municipal Transit Capacity Expansion
- Transit Centers / Park and Ride Lots and Parking Structures
- Car Sharing / Ridesharing / Vanpool / Telecommuting Capital Projects
- Sustainable SB Plan (Neighborhood-Oriented Development, First / Last Mile Infrastructure)
- Vehicle Conversion (Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure)
- Land Use and Transportation Projects that reduce vehicle miles travelled

TSMIP I Project Assessment Criteria

The following assessment criteria are used to assist in the process of programming the South Bay Measure M Transportation System and Mobility Improvement Program I projects, as follows:

Assessment Criteria	Measures	Weight
1 Mobility/Accessibility/Improvement	Project increases travel by transit, paratransit, shared transportation programs, bicycle, other local vehicle modes and pedestrian modes; improves travel times. Improves effectiveness & reliability for core riders.	20%

<p>2. Project Readiness</p>	<p><u>Project definition of scope, total budget and proposed funding sources, and Measure M reimbursement schedule sufficient to initiate environmental clearance, Caltrans Project Development documents, or project design. Public outreach process completed by lead agency. City Council resolution or equivalent.</u></p> <p><u>Agencies requesting year 1 or 2 MSP funding reimbursements must be ready to execute a funding agreement with Metro. Requests for funding reimbursements during years 3-5 must document project progress needed to enable signing a funding agreement by year 3. Project definition sufficient to initiate environmental clearance, Caltrans Project Development documents, or project design. Public outreach process completed by lead agency.</u></p> <p>Evidence that project will be completed by 2032.</p>	<p>15%</p>
<p>3. Project Need & Benefit to Transportation System Accessibility</p>	<p>Sub-regional mobility benefits, VMT reduction, reduced safety incidents, improved personal safety. Improved transportation options; improved service to transit; improved first / last mile connections to transit.</p>	<p>15%</p>
<p>4. MSP leverage & Cost Effectiveness</p>	<p><u>Qualitative assessment of project cost versus benefit, lead agency commitment to life-cycle O&M expenses, percentage of cost provided by non-SBHP funding allocated to project. Cost per unit of delay reduction, lead agency commitment to life-cycle O&M expenses, percentage of cost provided by non-SBHP funding allocated to project.</u></p> <p><u>Document good faith effort to secure matching funds.</u></p> <p><u>Support costs capped at 10%</u></p>	<p>10%</p>

5. Land Use, Environmental Compatibility and Sustainability	Supports local land use and environmental policies, GHG emissions reduction. <u>Address consequences of not implementing project.</u>	10%
<u>65. Regional or Multi-jurisdictional effort benefit or effort</u>	Project crosses <u>jurisdictional</u> boundaries with a shared priority by affected jurisdictions' decision makers. Supports Metro LRTP; project is on Metro' Countywide Strategic Arterial Network (CSAN) or CSTAN (Countywide Strategic Truck Arterial Network), project improves connectivity, closes a network gap, and/or improves access to activity centers.	10%
<u>76. Economic Vitality</u>	Increases economic output; supports job creation & retention; reduces household transportation costs.	10%
<u>87. Sustainability & Quality of Life</u>	Improve <u>ds</u> environmental quality; improve <u>ds</u> public health; improve <u>ds</u> quality of life.	10%
Total		100%

TSMIP II Project Assessment Criteria

The following assessment criteria are the same as for TSMIP I with the exception of project readiness. TSMIP I requires projects to be completed by 2032; TSMIP II funding does not expire. Selection criteria are used to assist in the process of programming the South Bay Measure M Transportation System and Mobility Improvement Program II projects, as follows:

Assessment Criteria	Measures	Weight
1 Mobility Improvement	Project increases travel by transit, paratransit, shared transportation programs, bicycle, and pedestrian modes; improves travel times. Improves effectiveness & reliability for core riders.	20%
2. Project Readiness	<u>Project definition of scope, total budget and proposed funding sources, and Measure M reimbursement schedule sufficient to initiate environmental clearance, Caltrans Project Development documents, or project design. Public outreach process completed by lead agency. City Council resolution or equivalent.</u>	15%

	<u>Agencies requesting year 1 or 2 MSP funding reimbursements must be ready to execute a funding agreement with Metro. Requests for funding reimbursements during years 3-5 must document project progress needed to enable signing a funding agreement by year 3. Project definition sufficient to initiate environmental clearance, Caltrans Project Development documents, or project design. Public outreach process completed by lead agency. Evidence that project funding will result in timely development and completion of the project.</u>	
3. Project Need & Benefit to Transportation System Accessibility	Regional or Sub-regional mobility benefits, VMT reduction, reduced safety incidents, improved personal safety. Improved transportation options; improved service to transit; improved first / last mile connections to transit.	15%
4. MSP leverage & Cost Effectiveness	Cost per unit of delay reduction <u>Qualitative assessment of project cost versus benefit</u> , lead agency commitment to life-cycle O&M expenses, percentage of cost provided by non-SBHP funding allocated to project.	10%
5. Land Use, Environmental Compatibility and Sustainability	Supports local land use and environmental policies, GHG emissions reduction. <u>Address consequences of not implementing project.</u>	10%
5. Regional Significance, multi-jurisdictional effort	Project crosses jurisdictional boundaries with a shared priority by affected jurisdictions' decision makers. Supports Metro LRTP; project is on CSAN or CSTAN, project improves connectivity, closes a network gap, and/or improves access to activity centers	10%
6. Economic Vitality	Increases economic output; supports job creation & retention; reduces household transportation costs.	10%
7. Sustainability & Quality of Life	Improved environmental quality; improved public health; improved quality of life.	10%
Total		100%