

# **South Bay Cities Council of Governments**

## **South Bay Measure M MSPs Task Force**

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

### **AGENDA**

**Wednesday, October 17, 2018**

**2:30 p. m. – 4 p. m.**

- 2:30 p. m. Welcome / Self-Introductions /**
- 2:35 p. m. South Bay Measure M MSP Task Force 9.19.18 Meeting Notes  
(Attachment A)**
- 2:40 p. m. Strawman Project Selection Criteria for  
HEOI, TSMIP I, TSMIP II Programs (Attachment B)**
- 3:40 p. m. Next steps**
- Adoption of Project Selection Criteria**
  
  - Adoption of Performance Measurement Requirements**
  - Call for MSP Projects**
  - Schedule for initial project selection**
  - Tracking tool**
- 4:00 p. m. Adjournment**

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

**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 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018.

## Strawman Selection Criteria for 3 South Bay MSPs

### 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. Eligible projects are added to the South Bay Measure R Highway Program Candidate Project List, and are considered for programming along with the other active MSP projects. This 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.

**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 connections 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

### 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 sufficient to initiate environmental clearance, Caltrans Project Development documents, or project design. Public outreach process completed by lead agency.	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	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.	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, access to activity centers	15%
6. Economic Vitality/Improved Quality of Life	Increase economic output; 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%
2. Project Readiness	Project definition sufficient to initiate environmental clearance, Caltrans Project Development documents, or project design. Public outreach process completed by lead agency. <b>Evidence that project will be completed by 2032.</b>	15%
3. Project Need & Benefit to Transportation System Accessibility	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, 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	10%
5. Multi-jurisdictional effort	Project crosses jurisdictional boundaries with a shared priority by affected jurisdictions' decision makers. Supports Metro LRTP;	10%

	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.	
6. Economic Vitality	Increases economic output; supports job creation & retention; reduces household transportation costs.	<b>10%</b>
7. Sustainability & Quality of Life	Improved environmental quality; improved public health; improved quality of life.	<b>10%</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>100%</b>

### **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:

<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Weight</b>
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.	<b>20%</b>
2. Project Readiness	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.	<b>15%</b>
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.	<b>15%</b>
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.	<b>10%</b>



5. Land Use, Environmental Compatibility and Sustainability	Supports local land use and environmental policies, GHG emissions reduction.	<b>10%</b>
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	<b>10%</b>
6. Economic Vitality	Increases economic output; supports job creation & retention; reduces household transportation costs.	<b>10%</b>
7. Sustainability & Quality of Life	Improved environmental quality; improved public health; improved quality of life.	<b>10%</b>
Total		<b>100%</b>

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK